# Procopius of Caesarea and Historical Memory in the Sixth Century

By

Jessica Moore

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfullment of

the requirements of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(History)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

2014

Date of Final Oral Examination: 12/12/2014

The dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:
Marc Kleijwegt, Professor, History
Leonora Neville, Professor, History
Karl Shoemaker, Associate Professor, History
Claire Taylor, Assistant Professor, History
Jeffrey Beneker, Associate Professor, Classics

For Lucy, who was so much easier to bring into the world.

"Our sense of 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 embodiement: there are sites, *lieux de mémoire*, in which a residual sense of continuity remains."

-Pierre Nora, *Realms of Memory*

Contents

Chapter One: Introduction 1
Part I: Historical Background 7
Part II: Scholarship on Procopius 14
` Part III: Memory and History 29
Part IV: Procopius' Prologue 41
Part V: Overview of Chapters 50

Chapter Two: Procopius' Relationship with Classical Historiography 54
Part I: Procopius and Thucydides
Section 1: Orations 60
Section 2: Characters 65
Section 3: Plague 73
Part I: Procopius and Herodotus
Section 1: The World and its Peoples 80
Section 2: Mapping the World 86
Part III: Procopius and Other Classical Writers 91
Part IV: Intertexts of Time and Space 96
Part V: Procopius' Explanatory Asides 98
Conclusions 109

Chapter Three: The Past in Procopius 112
Part I: References to the Historic Past 115
Part II: References to the Mythic Past I 128
Part III: (Myth,) History, and Change 133
Part IV: References to the Mythic Past II 141
Part V: Past and Present 150
Part VI: Time and Loss 162
Part VII: Memory Preserved (Remembrance of Things Past) 168
Conclusions 174

Chapter Four: Rome and the Romans 178
Part I: The City of Rome 182
Part II: Competing Memories of the Loss of the West 197
Part III: Ethnic Identity and *Romanitas* 208
Section 1: Roman Identity on the Persian and North African Fronts 213
Section 2: Arrival in Italy and Rome 221
Section 3: The Long War in Italy 229
Section 4: Problematizing "Roman" 236
Part IV: Rome and the Romans at the End of the *Wars* 256
Conclusions 266

Chapter Five: Conclusion (History as Memory) 270
Part I: Questions and Answers 271

Part II: Remembering and Forgetting in the Sixth Century 279
Part III: Memory and Place 286
Part IV: The Instability of Roman Memory 293
Postscript: What Might Have Been 312

Appendices
Appendix II: Tables
Table 2.1: Selected Herodotean Digressions in the *Wars* 315
Table 2.2: Explanatory Asides in the *Wars*, Latin Words 316
Table 2.3: Explanatory Asides in the *Wars*, Christian Usages 319
Table 2:4: Explanatory Asides in the *Wars*, Other Words 321
Table 3.1: References to Greek History 323
Table 3.2: References to Roman History 324
Table 3.3: References to the Mythological Past 329

Bibliography 332

**Chapter 1: Introduction**

In early 540, the general Belisarius faced a problem. The Roman forces besieging the town of Auximus had to contend with hilly, rocky terrain, and the men of the sorties sent against the town could not see the ambushes waiting for them. The soldiers in the Roman camps could see clearly when one was about to strike, but had no way to communicate that fact to their compatriots. Into this difficult situation stepped Belisarius' aide, Procopius, making one of several appearances in his own *History of the Wars*:

> Βελισαρίῳ δὲ τοῖς παροῦσιν ἀπορουμένῳ Προκόπιος, ὃς τάδε ξυνέγραψε, προσελθὼν εἶπεν· Οἱ ταῖς σάλπιγξιν, ὦ στρατηγέ, τὸ παλαιὸν ἐν τῷ Ῥωμαίων στρατῷ χρώμενοι νόμους τινὰς ἠπίσταντο δύο, ὧν ἅτερος μὲν ἐγκελευομένῳ τε ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἐῴκει καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας ἐς μάχην ὁρμῶντι, ὁ δὲ ἄλλος ἐπι τὸ στρατόπεδον ἀνεκάλει τοὺς μαχομένους... ἐπεὶ δὲ τανῦν ἀμαθίᾳ τε ἡ τοιαύτη τέχνη ἐξώλισθε καὶ μιᾷ σάλπιγγι ἄμφω δηλῶσαι ἀμήχανον, αὐτὸς οὕτω τὸ λοιπὸν ποίει. σάλπιγξι μὲν ταῖς ἱππικαῖς ἐγκελεύου τοῖς στρατιώταις διαμάχεσθαι τοῖς πολεμίοις, ταῖς δὲ πεζικαῖς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀναχώρησιν ἀνακάλει τοὺς ἄνδρας. (6.23.23-27)
>
> And when Belisarius was in perplexity because of this situation, Procopius, who wrote this history, came before him and said, "The men, general, who blew the trumpets in the Roman army in ancient times knew two different strains, one of which seemed unmistakably to urge the soldiers on and impel them to battle, while the other used to call the men who were fighting back to the camp... But since at the present time such skill has become obsolete through ignorance and it is impossible to express both commands by one trumpet, do you adopt the following course hereafter. With the cavalry trumpets urge on the soldiers to continue fighting against the enemy, but with those of the infantry call back the men to retreat."[1]

Belisarius is pleased with the suggestion, and implements it with great success.

---

[1] Text and translation adapted from those of Dewing, *Procopius, with an English translation.* 7 vols. (1914-40) Loeb Classical Library: London and Cambridge. All citations of Procopius are to the *Wars* unless otherwise specified.

Thus does Procopius of Caesarea encapsulate the state, utility, and importance of Roman cultural memory in the sixth century. This passage is wonderfully illustrative of the function of cultural memory of the Greco-Roman world in Procopius' *History of the Wars*.[2] Procopius, as a character in his own history, presents to an authority figure a compelling case for how knowledge of classical history and the ancient world is directly beneficial and eminently useful. Procopius is quick to note the greater skill and knowledge reflected in the ancient practice, but neither as a character or as narrator does he dwell overmuch on the loss of the τέχνη (expressed in a subordinate clause), but instead moves swiftly to a way in which the surviving knowledge can be adapted to serve present need. Procopius, as a historian, strives for a similar approach in the larger context of his history. His work offers a compelling presentation of the continuing relevance and indeed, renewed importance, of memory of the ancient world in general, and Roman history in particular.

We will be considering, in what follows, the phenomenon of historical memory in Procopius' *History of the Wars of Justinian*, one of three extant works.[3] Memory is a feature of the works of Procopius in desperate need of study for a whole constellation of reasons, and because of its genre and subject, the eight-book *Wars* is the best place to begin examining memory of the ancient world in Procopius' works.[4] First and perhaps

---

[2] For more on the terminology of memory studies as it is used here, including "cultural memory" and "historical memory," see below, pp 29-40.

[3] Procopius mentions a planned ecclesiastical history at *SH* 26.18; this work, if ever written, has not survived.

[4] Though practicality prohibits a study of all three works together, in the panegyric *Buildings* and the vitriolic *Secret History* memory does play an essential role as well, and a comparison of the role of memory in each work would add to our understanding and

most importantly, memory of the ancient world was of particular interest to Procopius as a historian. What is more, Procopius stands at a historical-turning point in the ancient world, and a better understanding of the ways in which he, as an author, approached questions of the relationship of his contemporary world to the classical past, of Roman memory and Roman identity, will help us better understand the world of the sixth-century Roman Empire more broadly: how the Roman past was remembered in Late Antiquity, and thus what it meant to be a Roman in Late Antiquity. Finally, the way his history has been used and approached by modern scholars makes a clear understanding of Procopius' overall engagement with the ancient past crucial in understanding the work as a whole.

Naturally, as a writer of history Procopius is greatly concerned with the past. Procopius, however, shows a particular concern with the distant past, beyond the scope of the events of which he tells the history. Procopius' *Wars* is a work of classical historiography, a genre whose own history now spanned nearly a millennium (from the writing of Herodotus and Thucydides in the fifth century BCE) and which had from its beginning set great store in referencing and interacting with its own long and ever lengthening tradition.[5] In the sixth century, however, classical historiography was no longer the only means of writing about the past: the genre of ecclesiastical history stretched back to Eusebius in the fourth century and was by Procopius' day well-

---

appreciation of Procopius as a writer and to the role of memory in the sixth century more broadly.

[5] See, for example: Croke, B and Emmett, A. (1983) "Historiography in Late Antiquity: An Overview" in B Croke and A Emmett, eds, *History and Historiography in Late Antiquity*. Sydney, New York. 1-12. Also Smith, R. (2006) "The Construction of the Past in the Roman Empire" in D. S. Potter, ed, *A Companion to the Roman Empire*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 411-438.

established, while the Byzantine proclivity for chronicle-writing was well underway with Procopius' near-contemporary, John Malalas.[6] Procopius chose this particular ancient mode of telling a story about the past, and he engages in the intertextual references to his predecessors that were a standby feature of erudite classical composition, and takes active part in debates of geography and ethnicity, historical causation, and the place of myth in history that the genre had been considering for a thousand years.

Even beyond the generic and stylistic ways in which the distant past plays a role in his history, Procopius works memories of the ancient world into his work in a wide variety of ways, constructing a nuanced, carefully considered picture of the ancient past and his contemporary world's relationship to it. He makes many references to both the historical past—primarily, but not exclusively, to Greco-Roman history—and to the mythic past, such as the travels of Odysseus and of Jason and Medea. He draws his readers' attention to the long course of time that has passed since the height of the classical era in a number of ways, overt and sub-textual. He comments on the ruined state of buildings, or the changes of names over time. He muses over the functioning of historical change and laments role of power in cultural remembering and forgetting. He is intensely concerned, as we will see, with the role of Roman memory in the formulation of contemporary *Romanitas*.

Nor was Procopius' the only voice concerned with Roman memory in the sixth century Empire, of course. On the contrary, the events of Justinian's reign ensured that

[6] On Malalas and another sixth-century John, the Lydian, as comparanda for Procopius' mode of relating to the past and utilizing cultural memory, see the conclusion below, Ch 5, pp 295-9.

the Roman past was a particularly relevant one. The emperor's reform agenda brought up troubled considerations of the empire's distance from its classical roots and the appropriate relationship to them. The wars of Justinian's reign, whatever their original impetus,[7] quickly became attempts at re-conquest of territories that had been sundered from the eastern Empire for half a century or more. The prospect of their re-integration into the empire forced a confrontation with the realities of their long separation, including the diverging nature of *Romanitas* in each, and the problematic nature of a Roman empire sundered from the city of Rome. In the works of Procopius and his contemporaries, the particular cultural capital of ancient and Roman memory goes hand-in-hand with their authors' awareness of the age of Justinian as a watershed moment in Roman history.

There are, then, two ways in which the character of the mid-sixth century calls out for a study of Roman historical memory. Inasmuch as the authors of this period were aware of their age as a historical turning-point, that is reflected in and impacts their thinking about their age's relationship to its own past. Similarly we, as historians, tend to put a great deal of emphasis on such watershed moments (often quite justifiably), making thorough study of all their nuances all the more desirable. Rather than letting our own perceptions of the character of the age color our research and understanding of it, we can turn a critical eye to the contemporary perspectives and viewpoints that are, after all, at the root of our own. The study of memory in the sixth century allows us to do just that: by investigating these Romans' understanding of themselves as Romans, with regard to

[7] Below, p 214 n 301

the Roman past, we can come to better understand and perhaps adjust our own perceptions of them as such.

Finally, in the scholarship on Procopius, there has for some time been a tension in how best to interpret our author's work, as we will discuss in more detail just below. Long leaned upon as the last major classical historian of antiquity, he was also looked down on for heavy stylistic and allusive "imitation" of the greats of classical historiography, primarily Herodotus and Thucydides. In recent years, this tension has found fuller articulation in the debate over whether to classify Procopius as a "classical," or a "classicizing," historian. This debate is an unhelpful one in many ways, and one that moreover looks at only a few aspects of a much larger picture of the way Procopius remembers and engages with his ancient history. We will be much better prepared to evaluate Procopius' intertextual engagement with the historiographical tradition, and his proper place in the halls of historiography, after we have set these isolated features in the context of the whole spectrum of the text's remembering.

* * * *

In this introductory chapter, we will begin in the traditional manner by providing some necessary historical background, and then reviewing the state of the field of research on our topic, discussing the major themes and minor but key oversights in scholarship on Procopius in the last 150 years, with a particular focus on Procopius' relationship to his classical past. The various ways in which modern scholars have studied Procopius' attitude toward and use of the past: the assumptions they have worked

under, the analyses they have undertaken, and the conclusions they have reached, address different parts of the larger question of historical memory in Procopius. A brief overview of collective memory studies will then be necessary, including theoretical background and an introduction to the terminology to be used here, including not least the "historical memory" of the title, from a certain perspective rather a contradiction.

The penultimate section will be an analysis of the prologue of the *Wars* (1.1), a preview of the multitude of ways in which Procopius invokes and crafts memory of the ancient past into his historiography. While in the body of the dissertation we will for the most part separate his uses of memory by the various forms they take, the better to provide an overview of historical memory in the whole of the work, here we will consider these closely associated memories together in their context.[8] As interesting as it is programmatic, Procopius' introduction to his history sets the tone for the many-layered and sometimes contradictory ways in which Procopius invokes, imagines, and interrogates the memory of the classical past. Finally, an overview of the chapters to follow will end the introduction.

## **Part I: Historical Background**

We can begin our review of the historical background to the study of Procopius' *Wars* with a brief review of much the same material Procopius himself covers in his own

---

[8] As we will also do in Chapter Four, for example see below Ch 4 Part I: the City of Rome.

survey of the run-up to the events of Justinian's reign. The slow but inexorable division between the eastern and western halves of the Roman Empire had begun centuries before Procopius' time with Diocletian's tetrarchy in 293 and Constantine's death in 337. Control of the ever more unstable western half of the empire came piecemeal into the hands of various Germanic groups. Visigoths famously invaded Italy and sacked Rome in 410 before moving off to settle in Hispania, while the Vandals moved through Gaul and Hispania to take control of North Africa between 429 and 439. After the general Odoacer deposed the last western emperor in 476, the emperor Zeno sent Theoderic and his Ostrogoths to Italy to oust the usurper. This also conveniently sent these Goths far from his own eastern empire, where they would ally and mingle with previous waves, such that the distinctions had become blurred by Procopius' time.[9][10]

These events were all decades in the past, the latest of them on the edge of living memory, at the accession of Justin I in the eastern Roman Empire in 518. Of humble origins in Illyricum, he had risen through the ranks of the army to be commander of the palace guards at the time of his predecessor's death.[11] Whether Procopius' portrayal of Justin in the *Secret History* as the hapless, illiterate, and doddering puppet to his nephew's machinations is grounded at all in reality, there is no denying that Justinian

---

[9] These events, key turning-points in the historical narratives of both the Romans and the Goths, are debated by Procopius' historical actors at 6.6.14-26.

[10] See below, Ch 4 pp 207-212 on the divisions between Gothic groups and the various barbarian identities in the *Wars*.

[11] The story goes that Justin, as the *comes excubitorum*, was given cash with which to bribe the palace guards in favor of another claimant to the throne, but Justin spent the money on himself, as it were. Averil Cameron, "Chapter III: Justin and Justinian," *The Cambridge Ancient History, XIV: Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors*, Cambridge University Press, 2000. 63.

became very influential during his uncle's reign. Certainly, he benefited from Justin's repeal of a law forbidding members of the senatorial class from marrying the lower classes (allowing him to wed Theodora in 525)[12], and was named him first his uncle's official successor in 526 and then co-emperor in early 527.[13]

Justinian was nothing if not a polarizing figure, an industrious ruler and zealous reformer whose reign left few aspects of his empire untouched. He involved himself in the Christological debates of his age, as with his issuance of the Three Chapters Edict in 543/4 and the calling the Second Council of Constantinople in 553.[14] His codification of Roman law resulted in the compilation of the *Corpus Juris Civilis*; and the new laws, *novellae Constitutiones*, represented significant legal reforms cloaked in the language of restoration.[15] Procopius' *Buildings* catalogues the extensive secular (both civic and defensive) and religious constructions undertaken by Justinian's regime, while the *Secret History*, of course, criticizes the emperor's activity in so many spheres as introducing change solely for the sake of putting his name on so many new things.[16] Justinian's reign

---

[12] Narrated by Procopius in the *Secret History* 9.51.
[13] On Justin, see A. A. Vasiliev (1950) *Justin the First.* Cambridge; as well as more recently, Cameron 2000.
[14] Cameron (1985) *Procopius and the sixth century*. The transformation of the classical heritage 10. Berkley.
26-28, 79, Patrick T R Gray (2005) "The Legacy of Chalcedon: Chistological Problems and their Significance" in Maas, M. (2005). *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 227-235.
[15] On Justinian's legal reforms generally, see Caroline Humfress, "Law and Legal Practice in the Age of Justinian," *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian.* Cambridge, 2005. 161-184, and Tony Honoré, *Tribonian* Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1978. On the novels, see Maas, Michael. 1986. "Roman history and Christian ideology in Justinianic reform legislation". *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. 40: 17-32, and pp 289-293 below.
[16] See below, pp 293-5.

saw something of a literary and cultural renaissance, of which Procopius was a part. This was once credited to the emperor's own interest in the classical tradition, but is now viewed as more of an independent phenomenon.[17]

Justinian's wars in the east and the west could easily be said to be the most relevant events of his reign to the present study. The empire had been involved in intermittent border conflicts with its Sassanid Persian neighbors since the time of Justin's predecessor Anastasius (502), and the general Belisarius first came to Persian front in 527 and rose to prominence leading the Roman forces against first Kavadh I (Cabades in Procopius' *Wars*, r. 488-531) and then his successor Khosrau I (Chosroes, r. 531-579). The conclusion of the so-called Eternal Peace in 532 between Constantinople and Persia allowed Justinian to focus his resources on the war in the west, although hostilities resumed in Lazia in 541 and continued intermittently for the next twenty years.

Meanwhile Justinian, having become embroiled in the succession troubles of the Vandalic kings of North Africa, mounted an expedition under Belisarius in 533 that was initially, ostensibly, intended to restore the sympathetic Vandal claimant to the throne. The Roman forces' speedy and spectacular victories, however, quickly changed the narrative to one of re-conquest of the lost Roman province. For his achievement, Belisarius was granted a traditional-style Roman triumph, which Procopius recounts in

[17] For more, see Tony Honoré (1978) *Tribonian*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press; Averil Cameron (1985) *Procopius and the sixth century*. The transformation of the classical heritage 10. Berkley. 19-27; and Chritian Wildberg, "Philosophy in the Age of Justinian," Joseph D. Alchermes, "Art and Architecture in the Age of Justinian," and Claudia Rapp, "Literary Culture under Justinian," all in Maas, M. (2005). *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

detail (*W* 4.9).[18] This paved the way for military expeditions against the Goths, first in Sicily and Corsica (535), and then in mainland Italy. The expedition in Italy met with early success, and after a forcible capture of Naples in 535/6, the Roman forces were welcomed into Rome on 9 December 536, an event that looms large in Procopius' narrative and the mantle of cultural memory he constructs around it (5.11-12).[19]

The Roman defense of Rome against Gothic siege, though ultimately successful, stretched from February 537 to March 538, and the war itself began to drag. The Romans and Goths traded advances and retreats, and the Franks became involved in the war to the detriment of the Roman cause, until the new Gothic king, Totila, recaptured most of southern Italy in 542 and re-took Rome in December 546. The city traded hands several more times, until renewed Roman forces under the general Narses retook Ravenna in 552, subsequently defeating the Goths at the Battle of Busta Gallorum, at which Totila was slain. The Roman victory was a pyrrhic one: incredibly destructive for Italy and draining the eastern empire of resources, its gains barely outlived Justinian himself. Much of Italy fell to the Lombards within a few years of his death, although Rome remained under imperial sway in the Exarchate of Ravenna, finally conquered in 751.

Procopius himself was a first-hand witness to many of these events. We know little of his life besides what he tells us of himself in his works. Likely born around 500, he identifies himself as a native of Caesarea in Palaestina Prima, and would certainly

---

[18] I refer to all books of the *Wars* numbered in continuous sequence, while some scholars divide the numeration by theater (often using Roman numerals), thus *Wars* 1-2= *Persian Wars* I-II, *Wars* 3-4= *Vandalic Wars* I-II, and *Wars* 5-8= *Gothic Wars* I-IV. *Wars* 8, or *Gothic Wars* IV, in fact covers events in all three theaters up to 552/3, dealing with events on the Persian front and North Africa relatively briefly before returning to Italy.
[19] See below, pp 181-192.

have received a traditional education in rhetoric based in the Greco-Roman classics, perhaps in his native Caesarea[20] or the celebrated school of Gaza. His post as Beliarius' aide and his evident knowledge of Latin suggest he had some legal schooling as well, [21] and the law schools of Berytus or Constantinople have been suggested.[22] The tenth-century *Suda*, our only other main source for his early life, describes him as a "rhetor and a sophist" (ῥήτωρ καὶ σοφιστής) before noting that he served as Belisarius' secretary (ὑπογραφεὺς χρηματίσας Βελισαρίου).[23] Procopius was Beliasrius' legal advisor and private secretary (he describes himself at 1.12.24 as ξύμβουλος, elsewhere he uses πάρεδρος or ὑπογραφεύς), presumably with him on the eastern front from the latter's first deployment in 527 until his recall following the Roman defeat at Callinicium in 531.[24] Procopius was in Constantinople to witness the Nika Riots in 532, where Belisarius helped lead the bloody suppression of an attempted overthrow of Justinian, and was with Belisarius for the expedition against the Vandals in North Africa, where he stayed when Belisarius returned to Constantinople in 534. Procopius rejoined him for the expedition against the Orstrogoths in Italy, through the siege of Rome (537-8)

---

[20] In its heydey in the fourth century, Cameron (1985) 5.
[21] Veh, O. (1952-3). *Die Geschichtsschreibung und Weltauffassung des Prokop von Caesarea*. Bayreuth: Gymnasium Bayreuth. 5.
[22] Downey, G. (1958) "The Christian Schools of Palestine: a chapter in literary history," *Harvard Review Bulletin* 12, 314
[23] "Προκόπιος" Suda On-line, pi 2479.2-3. http://www.stoa.org, accessed September 2014.
[24] Opinion on Procopius' exact education and duties on Belisarius' staff varies: see for example Howard-Johnson, J. (2000) "The Education and Expertise of Procopius" Carrié, J.-M., Duval, N., Roueché, C., & Association pour l'antiquité tardive (Lyons, France). (2000). De ædificiis*: Le texte de Procope et les réalités*. Turnhout: Brepols, 19-30 who argues based on the *Buildings* that Procopius was an architect and civil engineer.

and capture of Ravenna (540). Belisarius was recalled and sent to the eastern front in 541, and in 542 Procopius was in Constantinople for the outbreak of plague that shook the capital. Procopius would seem to have no longer been on the general's staff when Belisarius returned to Italy to fight Totila in 544. Thus the early books of the *Wars* are richly detailed, written it may be guessed using the author's notes or diaries, while the narrative in the later years becomes sketchy as Procopius presumably relied upon the accounts of other witnesses and official reports.[25] Books 1-7 were published around 550/1, and the *Secret History* likely dates from the same period.[26] *Wars* 8 can be assumed to have been published in 554, the year to which it brings the narrative, while the *Buildings* dates from either 554/5 or 559/60.[27] If the earlier dates are accepted for both these works, we know nothing for certain of Procopius after 555, and certainly nothing after 560 or so.

---

[25] Cameron (1985) 8-9

[26] In the *Secret History,* Procopius gives a span of thirty-two years for Justinian's reign, which must date the work to either 558/9, dating from Justinian's acsension in 527, or 550, dating from the start of Justin's reign in 518. The latter makes more sense in light of the relevance of Procopius' criticisms of Theodora, only recently dead in 550, as well as the work's intimate ties with the *Wars*. Haury, J. (1896) *Zur Beurteilung des Geschichtscheiberss Procopius von Casarea.* Proramm des K. Wilhelms-Gymnasiums in Muchen. 10ff. See also Cameron (1985) 9-10, but Evans, J. A. S. (1969) "The dates of the *Anecdota* and the *De Aedificiis* of Procopius," *Classical Philology* 64, 29-30.

[27] Cameron again prefers the earlier date (pp 10-12), see also Greatrex, G. (1994) "The dates of Procopius' works" *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 18. 101-114.

**Part II: Scholarship on Procopius**

Procopius' *Wars* has essentially always been recognized as a, indeed *the*, major historical source for the reign of Justinian. He was "rediscovered" in the renaissances of the ninth (in Byzantium) and the fifteenth centuries (in the West).[28] The discovery of a manuscript of the *Secret History* in the Vatican Library in 1623, previously unkown, led to a renewal of interest in Procopius and a flurry of debate as to the authenticity of this scandalous piece. Procopius was the primary source for the period for generations of historians of the late empire and ancient world: Gibbon,[29] Bury,[30] Stein and Palanque,[31] and Jones[32] all relied on Procopius, more or less uncritically. The first text of the *Wars* was published before the discovery of the *Secret History* (it also included summaries of each book of the *Buildings*) in 1607; the first complete edition of Procopius came in 1661-3, by Maltretus.[33] It will come as no surprise to most that in the nineteenth century, German scholars were responsible for the bulk of scholarship on Procopius. The edition of Maltretus, with Latin translation, was re-published by Wilhelm Dindorf as part of the *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae* between 1833 and 1838.[34] While imperfect,[35]

---

[28] Cameron (1985) ix.
[29] Gibbon, E. (1900). *The decline and fall of the Roman empire.* New ed. New York: P. Fenelon Collier.
[30] Bury, J. B. (1967). *A history of the later Roman empire : from Arcadius to Irene (395 A.D. to 800 A.D.).* Chicago: Argonaut Inc.
[31] Stein, E., & Palanque, J. (1949). *Histoire du Bas-Empire.* Paris: Desclée de Brouwer
[32] Jones, A. H. M. (1964). *The later Roman Empire, 284-602: a social, economic and administrative survey.* Oxford: B. Blackwell.
[33] Dewing v 1, xv.
[34] Dindorf, W. and C. Maltret. 1833. *Procopius*. In: *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae.* Bonnae: E. Weber.

this text formed the basis of the detailed comparative work of Braun and others prior to the first publication of the Teubner text (see below).

Procopius' classicism, always evident, was given detailed study by Herman Braun, who catalogued Procopius' "imitation," first of Thucydides in his 1885 doctoral dissertation *Procopius Caesariensis quatenus imitatus sit Thucydidem,*[36] and subsequently of Herodotus in *Die Nachahmung Herodts durch Prokop*.[37] In both works, though they are organized somewhat differently, Braun cites and quotes the relevant passage of the model historian, followed by Procopius' allusive passage, often quoting in full the first or best instance of the imitation, and providing citations for any subsequent or related instances. Though Braun does provide some amount of commentary on the nature of the imitations (and the quality of Procopius' prose), the works are essentially lists of the allusive passages, with comments drawing attention to the commonalities of language. These range from the small-scale and pervasive borrowing of vocabulary that Braun considers to be particularly Thucydidean or Herodotean, to more substantial similarities in phraseology and sentence structure in speeches, and descriptions of characters and events.[38] Thorough to a fault, Braun included in his study many instances of "imitation" which scholars of more recent years would be more likely to attribute to a more general classicizing style, or merely coincidence.

---

[35] Braun laments using the 'notoriously poor' text and expresses hope in the speedy publication of Haury's text: *Die Nachahmung Herodts durch Prokop.* Beilage zum Jahresbericht 1893/94 des K. Altes Gymnasium zu Nurnberg. Nuremburg. 4ff
[36] Braun, H. (1885) *Procopius Caesariensis quatenus imitatus sit Thucydidem*. Diss.Erlangen.
[37] Braun (1894).
[38] See below, Ch 2, pp 2ff

Fellow countrymen Haury and Liberich followed Braun in the study of Procopius's allusions to classical historiographers. Haury, in his assessment of Procopius as a historian, rejected many of Braun's examples of "imitation" and sought to defend Procopius' credibility in reporting contemporary events.[39] Lieberich, meanwhile, took Braun's work as a starting-point for studying the proems of other classical and Byzantine Greek historians, first identifying further allusive gestures to the prologues of Diodorus and Polybius in all three of Procopius' works.[40] The early years of the twentieth century saw the first publication of Haury's long-awaited text of Procopius' complete works as part of the Teubner series (1905-13).[41] Procopius was also inducted into the Loeb Classical Library, with a text based on Haury's and an English translation by H.B. Dewing (1914-40).[42] Like Haury, Soyter also sought to assess Procopius' credibility as a historian, given the debt of language he owed his classical predecessors, the inaccuracy of some information in the *Wars*, and inconsistencies between the *Secret History* and the *Buildings*, ultimately defending him as one who understandably looked toward classical Athens to understand the momentous events of his day.[43]

---

[39] Haury, J. (1896) *Zur Beurteilung des Geschichtscheiberss Procopius von Casarea.* Proramm des K. Wilhelms-Gymnasiums in Muchen. Munich.
[40] Lieberich, H. 1900. *Studien zu den Proomien in der griechschen und byzantinischen Geschichtsreibung*, 2. Teil. *Die byzantinischen Geschichtsschreiber und Chronisten*. Programm de K. Realgymnasiums Muchen. Munich
[41] Haury, J. (1905). *Procopii Caesariensis Opera omnia*. Lipsiae: In aedibus B.G. Teubneri.
[42] Dewing, H. B. (1914-40) *Procopius, with an English translation.* 7 vols. Loeb Classical Library: London and Cambridge.
[43] Soyter, G. (1951) "Die Glaubwurdigkeit des Geschichtsschreibers Prokopios von Kaisarea." *ByzZ* 44: 541-45.

Like their predecessors, two mid-twentieth century classicists—Otto Veh, exploring Procopius' worldview in *Die Geschichtsschreibung und Weltauffassung des Prokop von Caesarea,*[44] and B. Rubin in his monumental Pauly-Wissowa article,[45]—saw in Procopius a largely reliable neutral observer to the momentous secular and religious events of his day. They both concerned themselves, among other things, with the question of Procopius' personal religiosity in the face of the obvious interest in the classical world and apparent distance from and disinterest in Christian matters. While Veh argued that Procopius, though a Christian, was prevented by his 'critical intellect' from truly embracing Christian dogma, Rubin claimed him as a "free-thinking skeptic," a Christian in name only. Both display the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century tendency to view Procopius relative to his classical models.

In the meantime, a sea-change was beginning to take place in the wider world of the study of classical historiography, drawing from the techniques of literary criticism to analyze the rhetorical elements of ancient history-writing, and to seek to understand their contribution to the work as a whole, its aims and methods, rather than assess the impact on the author's credibility as a reporter of historical fact that such literary devices entailed. While there are many notable works on the more 'mainstream' classical historians that could be cited in this trend, we will mention here one only, whose work more directly impacts the study of our Late Antique historian: Jacqueline de Romily's

---

[44] Veh, O. (1952-3). *Die Geschichtsschreibung und Weltauffassung des Prokop von Caesarea*. Bayreuth: Gymnasium Bayreuth

[45] Subsequently republished as a monograph: Rubin, B. (1954). *Prokopios von Kaisareia*. Stuttgart: A. Druckenmüller

*Histoire et raison chez Thucydides.*[46] As we will explore in more detail in Chapter Two below, one of the literary de Romily analyzes in Thucydides' text is the conscious arrangement of themes in the speeches of opposing commanders to their troops before battles. These themes, playing out in the battle itself, validated the predictions of one of the other of the commanders, providing a complex sub-textual commentary on each sides' leadership. Such a shift in approach to the study of history-writing would take some time to take hold in the study of Procopius and other late classical historians, revolutionized it in due time.

In the study of the sixth century, this wave of fresh approaches went hand in hand with a flowering of scholarly interest in the period of the later Roman Empire. Peter Brown is generally (and justly) credited with the 'invention of Late Antiquity,' but his work has been focused on the earlier centuries of Late Antiquity, as well as Christianity and the Western Roman world. It is Averil Cameron, the matriarch to Brown's patriarch, if you will, whose work revolutionized the study of the sixth century generally and Procopius specifically. Prior to her 1985 monograph on Procopius, Cameron's earlier publications touched on several key strains in her arguments concerning the study of Procopius. Regarding Procopius' depth of engagement with classical sources, she argued with Alan Cameron in "Christianity and tradition in the historiography of the late empire," that the conventions in the genre of classical historiography were so strong they

[46] de Romilly, Jacqueline. (1956) *Histoire et raison chez Thucydide*. Paris: Les Belles lettres.

were followed by Christian and pagan alike, and did not indicate personal religious feelings.[47]

Several of Cameron's articles that are important to our present investigation turn on the interpretation of a distinct feature in the writing of Procopius and other Late Antique historians: the explanatory aside, or *periphrasis*, as Cameron terms it.[48] These will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 2 below, but they are, in brief, a device by which late antique authors incorporated non-Attic words into their classicizing texts by ascribing their use to a particular group: "[Latin term,] as the Romans say" is the most common iteration in Procopius' *Wars*. Cameron first studied these in an article with Alan Cameron in 1964, where Procopius and other later authors were used to give context to Ammianus Marcellinus' use of the device,[49] and again in 1965, where she explained that Procopius' glosses of the name of the church of St. Sophia did not necessarily indicate that his contemporaries were ignorant of its theological implications, but were rather part of his classicizing affectation.[50] Earlier scholars had long taken these explanatory asides as indication of, among other things, Procopius' distance from Christianity and thus pagan sympathies, but Cameron drew together her arguments in "The scepticism of Procopius" (1966)[51] and again in her 1970 monograph on Agathias[52] that these were a

[47] Cameron, Alan and Averil Cameron (1964) "Christianity and tradition in the historiography of the late empire." *Classical Quarterly* 14: 316-28.
[48] Cameron (1985) 35ff
[49] Cameron and Cameron (1964)
[50] Cameron, Averil. 1965. "Procopius and the Church of St. Sophia". The Harvard Theological Review. 58 (1): 161-163.
[51] Cameron, Averil M. 1966. "The "Scepticism" of Procopius". Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte. 15 (4): 466-482.

rhetorical device and not indicative of personal religious inclinations or experiences on his part. Finally, *Continuity and Change in the Sixth Century* (1981) drew together a number of Cameron's previous articles into one volume.[53] Thus Cameron combines a close and comparative reading of Procopius' text (and those of other late antique historians) with an analysis of the cultural context in which he wrote to identify the stylistic elements of Procopius' writing as part of an intentional classicizing program. Rather than taking these *periphrases* and other features of Procopius' text as indicative of his distance from his contemporary Christian world and essential affinity with the classical world, she argues for an understanding of Procopius firmly rooted in his sixth-century Byzantine world.

Nor is Cameron the only scholar whose work on dealt with or touched on Procopius in the 1970s and 1980s. J.A.S Evans has argued in a series of articles that the varied attitudes towards Justinian evident in the three works reflect Procopius' evolving feelings over the course of their composition dates.[54] Evans also published a monograph on Procopius as part of the *Twayne World Authors* series in 1972.[55] This slim volume presents a general overview of Procopius' world and work: it contains little that was new, but is notable for being the first English-language monograph on Procopius, as well as his inclusion in a series on important authors.

---

[52] Cameron (1970) *Agathias.* Oxford: Clarendon. Cameron complies a list of Procopius' periphrases as Appendix J

[53] Cameron, Averil (1981) *Continuity and Change in sixth century Byzantium.* Variorum: Collected Studies Series CS143. London.

[54] See especially J. A. S. Evans (1969) "The dates of the *Anecdota* and the *De Aedificiis* of Procopius," *Classical Philology* 64, 29-30.

[55] Evans, J. A. S. (1972) *Procopius*. Twayne's World Author Series 170: Greece, New York.

Cameron's monograph, *Procopius and the sixth century* (1985), brought together and fleshed out her arguments on Procopius from the preceding decades, arguing passionately that the oft-studied classicizing elements in Procopius' writing were more superficial than substantial; that he shared much more in common, in terms of viewpoint, concerns, and background with other Byzantine writers of his own day than with the greats of classical historiography; and that it is in the context of the former, not the latter, that he should be studied and understood. To rectify what she saw as an over-reliance on the *Wars* and its classicizing style in understanding Procopius and his relationship with his past and present, Cameron deals first with the once-neglected *Buildings*, then the *Secret History*, and only then delves into the *Wars*, aiming thereby to place the latter in the context of the other two. She contends that while together these three works begin to form a reasonably good representation of sixth century Byzantium, the *Wars* on its own is constrained by Procopius' (classical) views of history as exclusively secular, and primarily military and political. His choice not to include such events as church councils represents, for Cameron, a failure of Procopius to reflect well his contemporary world.[56] Conversely, those elements in the *Wars* which she judges to be out of place in a 'true' classicizing history—such as Procopius' interest in the miraculous and in holy men—are evidence of his underlying affinity with the sixth century and its pervasively Christian worldview.[57] In Cameron's final judgment Procopius is "more of a reporter than a

[56] Cameron (1985) 226
[57] Cameron (1985) 30-31, 113-133

historian, better at the narrative of events than at the analysis of causes or the delineation of motives."[58]

Cameron's challenge to the traditional approach to and understanding of Procopius as history-writer was met by Byzantine scholar Anthony Kaldellis in 2004. His *Procopius of Caesarea: tyranny, history and philosophy at the end of antiquity* argues just as passionately that the sophistication and pervasiveness of Procopius' engagement with the tradition of classical historiography marks his classicism as anything but superficial, and that he deserves study alongside other classical historiographers.[59] While he lauds Cameron's insight that relevant passages of Procopius' work must be studied in context of the work(s) as a whole, he faults her for not always carrying through on this, arguing that he in fact will do so.[60] He promises that he will, pointedly amending Cameron's goal, "situate Procopius in his immediate historical context as well as his transhistorical literary context."[61] His chapters are case-studies in Procopius' engagement with a variety of classical authors and traditions, such as Herodotean anecdotes and Platonic philosophy. He examines Procopius' use of rhetorical techniques, including engagement with the classical tradition, to make subtle points about such weighty issues as Justinian's tyranny and the role of *tyche* in the unfolding of history. Disagreeing with Cameron's conclusions that Procopius was a fairly conventional Christian, he goes

---

[58] Cameron (1985) 241

[59] Kaldellis, A. (2004) *Procopius of Caearea: tyranny, history and philosophy at the end of antiquity.* University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia. Kaldellis himself casts the debate and his book in this light, charting the development of the "classicizing" view of Procopius, pp 26f.

[60] *ibid* 28-29

[61] *ibid* 15

beyond even the "skeptical Christian" label to describe "the deism of Procopius."[62] Kaldellis' approach—analyzing the minutiae of his classical references and situating them, and him, in the contexts of both his contemporary sixth-century world and the "trans-historical" world of classical historiography and literature—epitomizes the contemporary approach to the study of Procopius.

These two monographs, Cameron's and Kaldellis', constitute the two poles of an axis in current English scholarship on Procopius. The debate over the nature of the *Wars* and Procopius more generally contributes a tension in understanding him that informs much of recent scholarship. Cameron's arguments concerning the importance of Procopius' contemporary context in analyzing him, as well as the influence of genre in understanding his three works have been broadly accepted. This has not, however, lessened the interest of scholars in the complex relationship Procopius creates between his texts and the classical world (present author included). It has rather led to a more nuanced and well-grounded approach to the study of such influence, and investigation into the ways in which Procopius' interest in the classical past interacted with and informed his interest in his own contemporary world. The best example of this is the work on Procopius by Charles Pazdernik, whose articles study the intertextual relationships created by Procopius between the figure of Belisarius in his own history on the one hand, and Thucydides' Brasidas[63] and Xenophon's Pharnabazus[64] on the other.

---

[62] Kaldellis (2004) 172
[63] Pazdernik, C. (2000) "Procopius and Thucydides on the Labors of War: Belisarius and Brasidas in the Field." *Transactions of the APA* 130: 149-87
[64] Pazdernik, Charles. 2006. "Xenophon's Hellenica in Procopius' Wars: Pharnabazus and Belisarius". *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*. 46 (2): 175.

In the first of these, Pazdernik elucidates the ways in which Procopius uses Thucydidean allusion (including the vocabulary of ἐλευθερία and δουλεία) to not only cast his general in a heroic light, but to explore the morally ambiguous nature of the "liberation by force" that Belisarius was occasionally obliged to threaten or carry out. Thus Pazdernik studies Procopius' use of his classical sources, in order to investigate the subtextual points the author sought to make about contemporary figures and events.

There have been, in addition, a variety of other approaches to Procopius and his work in recent years that touch on issues important to the present study. In a conference paper from 1996, Geoffrey Greatrex sought to contextualize the depth of Procopius' engagement with the classical past; specifically, Republican Rome.[65] To do so, he compares the number and quality of Procopius' references to this period to those of Ammianus Marcellinus, and finds them lacking. Considering the availability in the sixth century of classical sources covering the Republican period, Greatrex surmises that Procopius must have made a choice not to included more mentions of Republican history, perhaps because Belisarius' late Roman army could not compare to the army at the height of Rome's glory in the Second Punic War, and so Procopius chose instead to concentrate on the more remote, safer mythological past.[66]

In 2001 the *Association pour l'antiquité tardive's* eighth volume was dedicated largely to papers from a conference which brought together literary scholars and

---

[65] Greatrex, G. (1996b) "The Classical Past in the Classicizing Historians," in L. Hardwick and S. Ireland (eds) *The Reception of Texts and Images*, 2 Vols., Milton Keynes, The Open University.

[66] For more on this approach, see below, pp 283-4.

archaeologists to study Procopius' *Buildings.*[67] Several of these touch on themes related to memory, such as Procopius' text's relation to earlier panegyric[68] and the role of *ekphrasis* in the *Buildings*.[69] In her "Conclusion" piece, Cameron remarks that she is less certain than she was when she wrote her book that the influence of genre can fully resolve questions about Procopius' motivation in writing. She notes that while Procopius' Christianity is a non-issue to the contributors of the volume, the nature of the work's reception in contemporary Constantinople is still very much in debate.[70]

Certainly, this narrative of shift from earlier positivistic to more recent literary critical approaches does not mean that approaches seeking to draw out historical data from the texts in a more or less straightforward fashion are either no longer pursued or undesirable. One such avenue of research that will impact our topic is into the plague that ravaged the empire under Justinian, as well as that of the fourth-century Thucydidean plague, which account influences Procopius'.[71] P. Allen's 1979 article on the Justinianic plague laid important groundwork for further study of the epidemic by bringing together (for the first time) the three major surviving accounts of the plague: those of Procopius, Evagrius Scholasticus, and John of Ephesus. He compares symptoms across the three

---

[67] Carrié, J.-M., Duval, N., Roueché, C., & Association pour l'antiquité tardive (Lyons, France). (2001). De ædificiis*: Le texte de Procope et les réalités*. Turnhout: Brepols.
[68] M. Whitby. "Procopius' *Buildings*, Book I: a Panegyrical perspective." Carrié, J.-M., Duval, N., Roueché, C., & Association pour l'antiquité tardive (Lyons, France). (2001). De ædificiis*: Le texte de Procope et les réalités*. Turnhout: Brepols. 45-57.
[69] R. Webb, "Ekphrasis, Amplification, and Persuasion in Procopius' *Buildings*" Carrié, J.-M., Duval, N., Roueché, C., & Association pour l'antiquité tardive (Lyons, France). (2001). De ædificiis*: Le texte de Procope et les réalités*. Turnhout: Brepols. 67-71.
[70] A. Cameron, "Conclusion" Carrié, J.-M., Duval, N., Roueché, C., & Association pour l'antiquité tardive (Lyons, France). (2001). De ædificiis*: Le texte de Procope et les réalités*. Turnhout: Brepols. 177-180.
[71] see below, Ch 2, pp 72-9

accounts, estimates a mortality rate, and looks at the socio-economic effects of the plague. Meanwhile work of this sort and more has been done concerning the Athenian plague of Thucydides, leading Littman et al to argue in 1973, and again based on new paleopathology modeling in 2009, for identifying that mallady as smallpox.

The symptoms of plague which Procopius describes, so different from Thucydides,[72] are so obviously similar to those of the Black Death of fourteenth century Europe that it has commonly been identified as *Yersinia pestis.*[73] Interestingly, a recent study using DNA extracted from the tooth pulp of plague victims found in a Bavarian cemetery determined that the strain of *Y. pestis* which led to the Justinianic plague is unrelated to either the fourteenth or the early twentieth century outbreaks, and so must have died out in the intervening years, with the later strains making the jump from rats to humans independently.[74] Peregrine Horden covers some of the same ground as Allen and traces recent debate over the identification of the disease in his *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian* chapter, but makes a fascinating and compelling case for the ultimate irrelevance of scientifically identifying the disease, and focusing rather on contemporary interpretations and reactions.[75]

---

[72] The differences in described symptoms allowed Soyter (541-2) to reassure doubters that, although he borrowed language and structure from Thucydides' account, this did not necessarily detract from the historic reliability of Procopius' account, thus preventing, in Kaldellis' words, "the details of that event... vanish[ing] from the history books in a puff of Teutonic source-criticism." (26)

[73] Allen pp 8ff

[74] Wagner, D. "Yersinia pestis and the Plague of Justinian 541–543 AD: a genomic analysis" *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 28 January 2014

[75] Horden, Peregrine. (2005) "Mediterranean Plague in the Age of Justinian" in Maas, M. *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 134-160

There are, in addition, a number of works on other topics relating to the sixth-century empire that are highly relevant to our current study and its approach. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian* came out in 2006, and features numerous essays relevant to our topic of Procopius and memory.[76] Most important is Pazdernik's "Justinianic Ideology and the Power of the Past,"[77] a worthy follow up to Michael Maas' (the volume's editor) own 1986 article on "Roman history and Christian ideology in Justinianic reform legislation."[78] Both of these deal with the way that Justinian's legislation utilized the memory of the ancient past, specifically Republican Rome and legendary history, in order to justify innovation and reform.[79] Tony Honoré was studying the references to classical Roman jurists in the legislation of Justinian's queastor Tribonian in 1978,[80] and Maas has also published a monograph on the writings of another sixth-century writer, John the Lydian, who wrote several antiquarian treatises on topics of classical Roman culture.[81]

Finally, the conference volume *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity* offers a selection of essays that come variously near our approach, either in terms of subject

---

[76] Maas, M. (2005). *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[77] Pazdernik, Charles. (2005) "Justinianic Ideology and the Power of the Past" in in Maas, M. *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 185-212.
[78] Maas, Michael. 1986. "Roman history and Christian ideology in Justinianic reform legislation". *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. 40: 17-32.
[79] See below pp 289-93 for much more on this.
[80] T. Honoré. (1978) *Tribonian*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press.
[81] M. Maas (1992). *John Lydus and the Roman past: Antiquarianism and politics in the age of Justinian*. London: Routledge.

matter or theoretical outlook.[82] "Literary Convention, Nostalgia, and Reality in Ammianus Marcellinus" seeks to contextualize Ammianus' classical historiographical features,[83] while "The Use of the Past in the Gallic Panegyrists" traces both the historical periods from which *exempla* are drawn, and the way in which those *exempla* are used to further the panegyrist's rhetorical agenda.[84] The two essays on Procopius' contemporary John Malalas, "Malalas' Use of the Past"[85] and "Malalas' View of the Classical Past"[86] provide a neat encapsulation of the subdivided way in which questions of ancient memory have been approached in late ancient authors. Lastly, the volume contains a piece by K. Adshead on "Procopius' *Poliorcetica*: Continuities and and Discontinuities" which examines Procopius' Thucydidean debt, and his originality, in portraying siege warfare in the *Wars* and the *Buildings*. She suggests that Procopius' shift in focus to the construction of defenses in the latter reflects his desire to tackle "the key miliatry issue of

---

[82] G. W. Clarke (1990). *Reading the past in late antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press.
[83] T.D Barnes "Literary Convention, Nostalgia, and Reality in Ammianus Marcellinus" in Clarke, G. W. *Reading the past in late antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press. 59-92
[84] C. E. V. Nixon, "The Use of the Past in the Gallic Panegyrists" in Clarke, G. W. *Reading the past in late antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press. 1-36.
[85] E. Jeffreys (1990c) "Malalas' Use of the Past" in Clarke, G. W. *Reading the past in late antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press. 121-146.
[86] R. Scott (1990) "Malalas' View of the Classical Past" In *Reading the past in late antiquity*. ed. G. W. Clarke. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press. 147-164.

the hour," as had Thucydides before him, and even "was willing to experiment with the stylistic vehicle in which his analysis was set."[87]

There has thus been a great deal of work in the last few decades exploring the attitudes towards and interest in the ancient past in the time of Justinian—the state of Roman cultural memory in the sixth century, though not necessarily phrased in those terms. Though the scholarship on Procopius has touched on these themes, it has most often been in a limited or one-sided way. Additionally, research on both Procopius and the sixth century, while examining "uses of the past" or "attitudes toward the past" has not engaged much with the burgeoning field of memory studies, the theories and approaches of which have a great deal to offer the study of the sixth century Romans' relationship with their past.

## Part III: Memory and History

We should turn, then, to introduce the field of social memory studies and to discuss some of the terminology that we will use here, including not least "social memory studies," "collective memory," and of course "historical memory." We will trace a brief sketch of the theoretical development of collective memory, with a focus on how different scholars have conceived of the relationship between collective memory and

---

[87] Adshead, K. (1990) "Procopius' *Poliorcetica*: Continuities and Discontinuities" in Clarke, G. W. *Reading the past in late antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press. 93-115.

history. This will provide an opportunity to examine the several competing terms and explain the reasoning behind the choices for those used here, and to then discuss the understanding of the relationship between memory and history that underlies the present study. Finally, we will look briefly at a selection of other studies which apply the theories of collective memory to the ancient world.

While the literary texts that are pointed to as the deep roots of memory theory stretch as far back as the ancient world,[88] the flowering of scholarly interest in memory (the "turn to memory"[89] or "memory boom"[90]) in the twentieth century[91] found an early philosopher and theoretician in Maurice Halbwachs, whose works developed and popularized the concept of *collective memory*.[92] Halbwachs was interested in *The Social Frameworks of Memory*—the title of his first book[93]—and argued that "each [individual's] memory is a viewpoint on the collective memory": the memory of the various groups to which we belong and in which contexts we remember: our "various

---

[88] The story of Simonides's identification of the bodies of his fellow symposiasts after the cave-in of the roof caused by the Dioscuri, found in Cicero (*de orat.* 2.86.351-4) and Quintilian (*Inst.* 11.2.11-16), Moses' exhortation to the Israelites to "Remember the days of old/Consider the years of the many generations." (*Deut. 32:7*), as well as more recent works such as Proust's *A la recerche du Temps perdue* are a handful of examples of texts which anticipate some of the primary themes and concerns of modern memory studies.
[89] Cubitt, G. (2007). *History and memory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 2ff
[90] Olick, J. K., Vinitzky-Seroussi, V., & Levy, D. (2011). *The Collective Memory Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.1ff
[91] The opinions on the causes of this are numerous, but see in particular Nora, Pierre. (2002) "Reasons for the Current Upsurge in Memory." *Transit* 22:1-8.
[92] But cf Olick et al, *ibid*, on the way in which Halbwach's sole role as "founding father" of collective memory studies tends to be overstated,pp 16-22.
[93] *Les cadres sociaux de la memoire* (Paris: F. Alcan 1925), has never been translated into English in full. Large portions of this work as well as the conclusion to Halbwachs' 1941 *The Legendary Topography of the Holy Land* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France) were translated and published by L. Coser as *On collective Memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press.)

collective milieux."[94] For Halbwachs, collective memory was to be firmly distinguished from history. Collective memory is a continuous current, internal to and dependent on the individual memories of the members of the group: it cannot remember past their lifetimes. History, meanwhile, is external to the group, attempts to deal with the entirety of human events and necessarily introduces demarcation (in the form of periodization).[95] Memory, what is more, is as multiple as the many groups that each have their own collective memories (Halbwachs thinks of families, professional associations, all the way up to nations), while history, in seeking to deal with the whole, is singular and unitary.[96]

Halbwachs was responding, naturally, to a very 19th-century conception of history, one which sought to be a universal, objective record and explanation of human development. Some more recent theorists of social memory, responding to the developments in the field of historiography of the last century, conceptualize the distinction between the two as more fluid. In his essay "History as Social Memory," the historian Peter Burke characterizes the contemporary practice of historiography as more "relativist," one which treats history writing "much as Halbwachs treated memory, as the

---

[94] Halbwachs *The Collective Memory* (1980). New York: Harper & Row. 80

[95] "By definition it does not exceed the boundaries of this group. When a given period ceases to interest the subsequent period, the same group has not forgotten a part of its past, because, in reality, there are two successive groups, one following the other." (*ibid* 81)

[96] "History can be represented as the universal memory of the human species. But there is no universal memory. Every collective memory requires the support of a group delimited in space and time. The totality of past events can be put together in a single record only by separating them from the memory of the groups who preserved them..." (*ibid* 84)

product of social groups."[97] He argues for two ways in which historians are, and should be, concerned with memory: memory as a historical source, and the study of memory as a historical phenomenon. Others, like Allan Megill, still see memory as something fundamentally distinct from history, a dialectic that "does not resolve." He goes on to argue, succinctly and forcefully, that

> ...far from being history's raw material, memory is an Other that continually haunts history. Memory is an image of the past constructed by a subjectivity in the present.[98]

The distinction between memory and history, then, often rests as much on a scholar's understanding of the concept of history, as long-established as the discipline is, as on their understanding of the relatively new field of collective memory.

Halbwachs' "collective memory" is one of several overlapping (but not identical) concepts used to describe the memories of groups of people variously distributed across space and time. A quick survey of the several terms in circulation will be suggestive of the diversity of thought and approaches current in memory studies. Jan and Aleida Assmann have popularized the term *cultural memory*, especially among European scholars.[99] Out of Halbwachs' collective memory, they distinguish between *communicative memory*, which passes among living generations in everyday communication, and *cultural memory,* the inherited memories of the often more distant past:

---

[97] Burke, Peter (1989) " History as Social Memory" in Butler, T. *Memory: History, culture, and the mind*. Oxford, UK: B. Blackwell. 97-113
[98] Megill 61-2
[99] While Jan Assman's work is more widely known in the U.S., Aleida Assmann's is no less heavy hitting, and her scheme of the storehouses of cultural memory as *canon* and *archive* will be of great use to us, see below pp 278-282

> The concept of cultural memory comprises that body of reusable texts, images, and rituals specific to each society in each epoch, whose "cultivation" serves to stabilize and convey that society's self-image. Upon such collective knowledge, for the most part (but not exclusively) of the past, each group bases its awareness of unity and particularity[100]

While the conception of cultural memory can run the risk, on the one hand, of reifying the abstract memories of a culture beyond any individual evocation of them in a particular work;[101] and on the other of focusing too heavily on the static and unitary nature of a culture and its memory at the expense of their often dynamic and contested natures;[102] the attention paid to the relevance of the distant past to the present (Jan Assmann was originally an Egyptologist), as well as the focus on the role of memory in identity construction, make the concept of cultural memory particularly useful for certain types of historians generally and for the present study in particular.[103]

Among American scholars, some form of the term *social memory* has been gaining ground: often, but not entirely, in the field of sociology. Fentress and Wickham eschew "collective memory" both because they find its emphasis "too deindividulaized" and because of methodological issues with oral history and orality.[104] Somewhat similar is the work of Jeffrey Olick, a prolific and highly influential sociologist who has contributed a number of important works, including the 1998 "Collective Memory: the

---

[100] Jan Assmann "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity" *New German Critique* 65: 125-133 (1995).
[101] cf Olick and Robbins, n 105 below
[102] cf Cubitt (222ff) and his focus on processes, discussed just below
[103] Assmann also argues that the goal of memory studies should be "mnemo-history": "not to ascertain the possible truth of traditions... but to study these traditions as phenomena of collective memory." *Moses the Egyptian: the Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997. 9.
[104] Fentress, J., & Wickham, C. (1992). *Social memory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Two Cultures" with Joyce Robbins. They outline the distinctions between, on the one hand, an individualistic approach where collective memory is understood as "the aggregated individual memories of a group" (what they term "collected memory") and, on the other, true collective memory which holds that "symbols and their systems of relations have a degree of autonomy from the subjective perceptions of individuals."[105] In this article as well as his eminently useful *Collective Memory Reader*, Olick acknowledges the "residual value" of that term for its widespread recognition, but prefers "social memory studies" as one which distinguishes between Halbwachs' two sides of collective memory: "socially framed individual memory" and "the common memory of groups" and furthermore "remains presuppositionally open to a variety of phenomena while pointing out that all remembering is in some sense social."[106]

Geoffrey Cubitt is another historian who also favors the term *social memory,* in this case for its emphasis on historical processes rather than fixed phenomena. The term...

> covers the process (or processes) through which a knowledge or awareness of past events or conditions is developed and sustained within human societies, and through which, therefore, individuals within those societies are given the sense of a past that extends beyond what they themselves personally remember.[107]

In his book, he spins out the complex ways in which history and memory interact and have been studied together, schematically and lucidly tracing the functioning of social memory in society, from the individual level up through to the societal, observing how

[105] Olick, Jeffrey K., and Joyce Robbins. 1998. "Social Memory Studies: From "Collective Memory" to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices". *Annual Review of Sociology*. 24: 105-140.
[106] Olick et al (2011) 40-41.
[107] Cubitt 15

these nesting, interlaced functions have been studied by historians and theorized by sociologists. Cubitt is, additionally, one of several authors we will turn to in due course for theoretical background on studying the role of memory in the construction and negotiation of identity in the sixth-century Roman world. We will do well to remember, as he observes, that "the past is always the past of something," and to interrogate what and whose past it is that Procopius evokes.[108]

* * * *

Before proceeding to explore how we will be using the various terms for the study of memory in the current work, we should pause to examine briefly a selection of studies which approach classical topics through the lens of memory, focusing primarily on those which deal with textual sources, in order to further situate and contextualize the current project. Given the breadth and heterogeneity of memory theory, it will perhaps be no surprise that these approaches have been applied to the field of ancient history in a diverse and uneven manner. The unevenness of the application of memory theory to classical studies is perhaps best typified by the essays in *Cultural Memory and Identity in Ancient Societies* (2011).[109] The volume is generally heavy on theory and at times strays into jargon: some papers offer interesting analyses of less well-studied texts, such as *Ρωμίζω...ergo sum: becoming Roman in Varro's de Lingua Latina,*[110] while others, such as the contribution of the volume's editor, fall prey to lapses in historical critical thinking

[108] Cubitt 199
[109] Bommas, M. (2011). *Cultural memory and identity in ancient societies*. London: Continuum.
[110] by Diana Spencer, *ibid* pp 43-60

in the midst of so much memory theory and fail, ultimately, to demonstrate what is added either to the study of memory or their ancient subject by such an approach.[111] In the former, though, Diana Spencer traces the construction of *Romanitas* in the tension between Latin and Greek word-origins in Varro's work; a useful, if not precisely parallel for our purposes, model for examining memory's role in the construction of Roman identity in an ancient text.

*The Sites of Rome: time, space and memory* is also a volume of essays, rather more coherent in subject and approach, organized around the intersection of ancient (and modern) texts with the geography and physicality of Rome. The contributors examine the impact of the physical city's palimpsest-like nature on the experience and conceptualization of Rome that has emerged and endured in the Western imagination:

> We propose that finding out how to balance a coherent urban 'legend' against the fragmentary, messy, and lived experience of being in the city is as much of a concern of ancient Rome as it is of the 'rediscovered' Rome of the Renaissance or of successive modern and postmodern cosmopoleis. The position of Rome as the rediscovered object of an increasing variety of refracting gazes has, in addition, made it a city that exhibits a unique susceptibility to exist synchronously and symbiotically in successive texts and eras.[112]

*The Sites of Rome*'s emphasis on the interplay between physical space and textual memory makes it particularly germane to parts of our present study, as we will examine the ways in which Procopius responded to and characterized the memory-laden landscape of Rome and Italy. The same is true for another volume of essays, on Pausanias' travels across an equally ancient landscape, simultaneously ruinous and timeless. Among several interesting papers in *Pausanias: travel and memory in Roman Greece*, the most

[111] Martin Bomas, "Pausainais' Egypt" *ibid* pp 79-108
[112] Lamour and Spencer, "Introduction- *Roma, recepta"* pp 1-60, 3

relevant to our topic is “Ideals and ruins: Pausanias, Longinus, and the second sophistic,” in which James Porter examines the two authors’ skillful manipulation of the current of nostalgia, always present in Greek thought but particularly trendy and relevant in the Second Sophistic, in crafting identities as Roman Greeks.[113]

* * * *

It remains, then, to explore how these various concepts and terms will be used in the present study, and to situate our key concept of “historical memory” in terms of the tensions between collective memory and history, as well as between individual memory and social memory. As far as the terminology goes, we will find use for each of the three main alternatives at different times. “Cultural memory” will be employed when examining particularly how Procopius and the sixth-century Romans related to and understood their ancient past and cultural heritage, and on those occasions when simply “memory” is used, it is primarily with the connotations of cultural memory that it is intended. Meanwhile, “social memory” will be useful in broader and more theoretical situations: in discussing the current field of scholarship, or, by contrast, elements of more contemporary remembering in Procopius. “Collective memory” will be reserved, when

[113] Porter, James “Ideals and ruins: Pausanias, Longinus, and the second sophistic,” Alcock, S. E., Cherry, J. F., & Elsner, J. (2001). Pausanias: Travel and memory in Roman Greece. New York: Oxford University Press. 63-92. The issues that Porter addresses of the tension in Roman and Greek identity, as well as that inherent relating to an increasingly distant past, will be relevant to us as our investigation proceeds.

used at all, as an umbrella term for all of these, and finally each appropriate term will be used when drawing on the theory of scholars who use it.[114]

Turning again to the relationship between history and memory, as we have seen, the distinction is not always formulated so starkly as Hawlbachs envisioned it in his efforts to define and develop the concept of collective memory in opposition to the former, well-recognized mode of relating to the past. Nevertheless, the study of social memory remains rooted in what we might term primary sources, for lack of a better word, of various kinds: oral history, elements of "cultural production" such as monuments, commemorative events as wells as documentary sources such as contemporary journalism and other media, and finally literature. This last is in part how we will be approaching Procopius' text in the present study, as a work of literature that is a cultural production and reflective of the memory-culture that produced its author. However, this would be to study *cultural* memory in the *Wars*, and we will be interested, not only in our author's reflection and reporting of the cultural memory of his time, but in his, and his text's, role in creating memory: *historical* memory, about which more in just a moment.

There is, moreover, a significant strain in social memory studies that (not unjustly) values its particular approach specifically for the ability to discover and study the memories of those left out, for one reason or another, of the official narrative of

---

[114] Related tems, such as remembering and memorialization, will be used in a self-explanatory way; I have also used in places a division of the past into distant/ancient, recent (within living memory), and immediate past (those being treated in the work of history or rhetoric) drawn from Nixon's "The use of the past in the Gallic panegyrists," (see above, n 80) though I have more often termed the latter subgroup "contemporary events."

history.[115] Indeed, the very capacity of social memory to transmit (and its study to uncover and understand) multiple and various strains of memory means that there is a place, among all the others, for history-based and –transmitted memories; and surely there is value in studying history and its modes of remembering and memorialization in the context of the wider field of social memory.

History, moreover, is emphatically not Halbwachs' exclusive domain of the monolithic, "official" narrative of, say, a nation state or empire's rise to power. Rather, historiography as it is understood and practiced today, and has actually existed since its birth in the ancient world, is itself multifaceted and various. An individual work of historiography is capable of conveying multiple alternative memories[116] and as a genre history thrives on the combination and accumulation of multiple narratives, contrasting and overlapping and widely spread in terms of subject matter, space, and time. Nevertheless, it is still nearly always the case that any single work of historiography is ultimately the product of a single individual, and conveys their interpretation of the past they record, as well as the broader narrative that history is situated in, however influenced by and influential to the wider world of cultural memory as that author might be.

---

[115] This is conveyed in the term "countermemory," used by scholar such as Y. Zerubavel, in *Recovered roots: Collective memory and the making of Israeli national tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995. It is also the focus of the work of the "Popular Memory Group," who have their preferred term, *popular memory*, and emphasize the study, not just of popular memory, but its interaction with the "dominant memory." Popular Memory Group (1998) "Popular Memory: Theory, Politics, Method," *Oral History Reader.* Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson, eds. New York: Routledge. 43-53.

[116] This feature of Herodotus' work is one Procopius imitates, see below pp 79-83.

The historian stands in some ways at the intersection of individual and cultural memory. The same could be said of all authors, each a product of their time and place, but it is uniquely true for as one who has made it their business to write and reflect on the shape of the past, how it has resulted in the present circumstances in which men and women live. Additionally, writers of history often incorporate the remembrances of others in the construction of their work, combining the testimony of witnesses or the evidence of documentary sources into the constructed image of the past conveyed to the reader. [117] The historian, on the one hand, reflects the memory-culture of their own time in their own perspective. In the case of Procopius, he is a product of a sixth-century, Eastern Roman sense of *Romanitas,* and evinces a connection to but distance from the classical past, a tension that can be observed in other sources of the period.[118] On the historian's other hand, they can preserve and convey elements of contemporary cultural remembering by means of the history. There are a number of key passages in Procopius' history—the triumph of Belisarius (4.9) and the ship of Aeneas (8.22.8), to name just two—we will discuss in this light in due course.

We come, finally, to the use of the term "historical memory" in the present study. There are in circulation a handful of different ways one could use this term,[119] but here, it

[117] cf Cubitt 178-9, 203 on the subtextual ways in which attitudes toward and memory of the distant past can be incorporated into a work of history, even one that does not deal with them directly, including tone and assumptions about how the present events recorded in the work are expected to fit into the larger scope of history.
[118] See Conclusion, pp 289-299 below.
[119] For example, as nearly synonomous with "cultural memory," or as cultural memory of a historical period which includes, but is not limited to, textual sources: "By the "Greek historical memory" of warfare, I mean the multi-ethnic cultural memory of warfare as presented in Greek and Hellenizing material culture and in textual and documentary

is used to signify memory-- mostly in the present study "cultural memory"-- encoded in and conveyed by a work of history. It is cultural memory of historical eras: the memory of the distant past, communicated and mediated not just by person-to-person interactions, but by the relationships between different texts and authors (which may be separated by decades or centuries) and authors and their readers. Historical memory involves the transmission of cultural memories into a more lasting form in a work of historiography; it also involves an author's engagement, in any of a number of forms, with the memory of a past more distant than the events he is retelling.

## Part IV: Procopius' Prologue

The first chapter of Procopius' history is, unsurprisingly, replete with intertextual references to classical historical and literary texts, and naturally programmatic for the way Procopius will approach history-telling. Procopius begins his history in an extremely traditional manner, signaling first of all his debt to Thucydides and Herodotus. Following this, he adds a few other notes to the programmatic chord of first lines of his history. On the one hand, he makes further allusive gestures to what we might term secondary classical sources-- both literary and historiographic-- and on the other, and in part using these, he asserts some measure of individuality, beginning to suggest the distinct

sources that are from either a Greek ethnic and linguistic perspective." Kathy L. Gaca, "The Andrapodizing of War Captives in Greek Historical Memory" *Transactions of the American Philological Society* 140:1, 2010. n 4.

approach to his classical sources and the ancient past that characterizes his historiography.[120]

Procopius signals his project of writing a history in the classical tradition in his first lines, with a traditional introduction of himself and his topic, the origins of which stretch back to Thucydides and Herodotus:

> **Προκόπιος Καισαρεὺς τοὺς πολέμους ξυνέγραψεν** οὓς Ἰουστινιανὸς ὁ Ῥωμαίων Βασιλεὺς πρὸς Βαρβάρους διήνεγκε τούς τε ἑῴους καὶ ἑσπερίους, ὥς πη αὐτῶν ἑκάστῳ ξυνηέχθη γενέσθαι, **ὡς μὴ ἔργα ὑπερμεγέθη** ὁ μέγας αἰὼν λόγου ἔρημα χειρωσάμενος τῇ τε λήθῃ αὐτὰ καταπροηται καὶ παντάπασιν ἐξίτηλα θῆται… (1.1.1)
>
> Procopius of Caesarea has written the history of the wars which Justinian, Emperor of the Romans, waged against the barbarians of the East and West, relating separately the events of each one, so that the long course of time might not overwhelm deeds of singular importance through lack of a record, and thus abandon them to oblivion and obliterate them utterly.

In placing his mane at the very beginning, and in using ξυνέγραψεν as his verb (cf. Thucydides' ξυνέγραψε (*Thuc.* 1.1.1)), Procopius first strikes a very Thucydidean note, while the ὡς μὴ and the ἔργα ὑπερμεγέθη of the purpose clause (*so that* the long course of time might not overwhelm *deeds of singular importance...*) are strongly Herodotean (cf. ὡς μήτε… μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα… (*Herod.*1.1)). Slightly different from either, though, Procopius writes of πολέμους, plural wars, rather than singular.

[120] As we proceed, we will take our cue from Procopius in studying his intertextuality as part of a larger methodology of relating to the classical past: first, focusing on how he uses and positions himself in relation to the two fathers of historiography, and then secondarily, how he diversifies this by drawing upon other classical historians and authors. We will then examine how his use, juxtaposition, and originality in the context of all of these furthers his rhetorical and historiographic aims, and, moreover, contributes to the broader picture of the memory and relevance of the ancient world in Procopius' texts.

As Kaldellis has observed, rather than a single conflict between two powers (Greeks and Persians, Athens and Sparta), Procopius' unbalanced construction locates Justinian at he center of these wars and responsibility for their effects, for good or ill, with him.[121] From the very start, through these intertexts, Procopius positions himself as writing in a Thucydidean manner with Herodotean aims: from the one, he takes his position as a history-writer, from the other, the urgency of preserving memory, the danger of its loss.

Next in his prologue, Procopius cites the usefulness of the memory of these events to future generations as an impetus to history-writing, another traditional note. In specifying "men who purpose to enter upon a war or are preparing themselves for any kind of a struggle," (τοῖς... πολεμησείουσι καὶ ἄλλως ἀγωνιουμένοις) (1.1.2) as an intended audience, Procopius echoes Polybius particularly.[122] This reinforces the centrality of Justinian's wars to his project, and his own commitment to the classical mode of history-writing and its core subject of military matters. Procopius next makes traditional claim that he is well-qualified to write a history of these events, as an advisor to Belisarius (ξυμβούλος) and "an eyewitness of practically all the events to be described" (σχεδόν τι ἅπασι παραγενέσθαι τοῖς πεπραγμένοις) (1.1.3). In identifying himself as a participant in the events to be described, and one attached to a prominent general, he places himself in the tradition, not only of Thucydides, but also Polybius, and more recently, Ammianus Marcellinus.[123]

---

[121] Kaldellis (2004) 18-19.
[122] especially Polybius 2.35.5-10, cf Kaldellis (2004) 19.
[123] The possibility of Procopius' awareness of Ammianus is a difficult question, as his awareness and allusive use of Latin literary sources more broadly is realatively unexplored. Procopius certainly had working familiarity with Latin. See pp 97-108

Procopius ends this section of his prologue with a pair of intertextual sentiments, broadening his allusive reach by adding Polybius and Diodorus to the matrix of referents.[124] First, he characterizes history by its relationship to truth:

> πρέπειν τε ἡγεῖτο ῥητορικῇ μὲν δεινότητα, ποιητικῇ δὲ μυθοποιΐαν, ξυγγραφῇ δὲ ἀλήθειαν. (1.1.4)
>
> It was his conviction that while cleverness is appropriate to rhetoric, and inventiveness to poetry, truth alone is appropriate to history.

This echoes a passage from the early lines of Diodorus Siculus:

> συμβαίνει τὴν μὲν ποιητικὴν τέρπειν μᾶλλον ἤπερ ὠφελεῖν, τὴν δὲ νομοθεσίαν κολάζεῖν, οὐ διδάσκειν... μόνην δὲ τὴν ἱστοπίαν (DS 1.2.7.2)

While the sentiments are clearly linked, Procopius chooses construction and vocabulary different from Diodorus'. Procopius, furthermore, elaborates his predecessor's formulation to make history all the more clearly the superior genre. Poetry and myth are devalued, from the realm of "piety and justice" to mere "inventiveness," and rhetoric, with its "cleverness," adds another less desirable alternative to history.[125] This perhaps reflects a need felt by Procopius' to defend classical historiography against so many

---

below on Procopius' incorporation of Latin military and administrative terminology into his history. For a comparison of Procopius' and Ammianus' use of classical sources, see Greatrex (1996b). For a few instances of Procopius' intertextual use of Latin sources, see Evans (1972) 101, and more recently Börm, Henning (2007). *Prokop und die Perser : Untersuchungen zu den römisch-sasanidischen Kontakten in der ausgehenden Spätantike.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, who argues that Procopius was aware of Vergil and Sallust (46).

[124] For a fuller study of Procopius' many references to Diodorus and Polybius as well as others, in his and their prologues, see Lieberich, H. 1900. *Studien zu den Proomien in der griechschen und byzantinischen Geschichtsreibung*, 2. Teil. *Die byzantinischen Geschichtsschreiber und Chronisten*. Programm de K. Realgymnasiums Muchen. Munich, pp 4ff.

[125] The complex relationship between history and myth in Procopius' work is discussed in Chapter 3 below, pp 127-149.

encroaching alternative methods of relating to the past, epitomized by John Lydus and John Malalas, as well as his own *Buildings.*[126]

Finally, Procopius connects this intertextual reflection with one drawn from Polybius (1.14.4):

> ταῦτά τοι οὐδέ του τῶν οἱ ἐς ἄγαν ἐπιτηδείων τὰ μοχθηρὰ ἀπεκρύψατο, ἀλλὰ τὰ πᾶσι ξυνενεχθέντα ἕκαστα ἀκριβολογούμενος ξυνεγράψατο, εἴτε εὖ εἴτε πη ἄλλῃ αὐτοις εἰργάσθαι ξυνέβη. (1.1.5)
>
> In accordance with this principle he has not concealed the failures of even his most intimate acquaintances, but has written down with complete accuracy everything which befell those concerned, whether it happened to be done well or ill by them.

The dynamic between the remembered past and remembering present, and the to-be-remembered present and the future whose remembering is being sought, pervades history-writing of all kinds, and it is this tension which Procopius trades on as he transitions from one section of his prologue to the next. In this traditional, allusive claim to impartiality as maker of historical memory (which in the process bolsters his claims to reliability and worthiness to be read and remembered), Procopius asserts a particular formulation of the role and priorities of memory in history-writing. The preservation of memory for the sake of its usefulness to future generations trumps the concerns of those being remembered, that they are remembered well.

* * * *

[126] below, pp 189-193

Now we come to the second half of Procopius' prologue, a more thoroughly original—though still allusive—and rather curious passage. It provides the first explicit statements on how Procopius' present compares to the ancient past, embedded in a highly allusive discussion of the merits of particular types of warriors. How we read the passage as a whole is dependent on understanding the complex interplay of the textual and intertextual layers of meaning. In constructing his formulaic claim that the greatness of the events of his history surpass any that have gone before, he envisions the only possible objection to this being an unquestioning belief in the superiority of antiquity:

> Κρεῖσαν δὲ οὐδὲν ἢ ἰσχυρότερον τῶν ἐν τοῖσδε πολέμοις τετυχηκότων τῷ γε ὡς ἀληθῶς τεκμηριοῦσθαι βουλομένῳ φανήεσται. πέπρᾱκται γὰρ ἐν τούτοις μάλιστα πάντων ὧν ἀκοῇ ἴσμεν θαυμαστὰ οἷα, ἢν μή τις τῶν τάδε ἀναλεγομένων τῷ παλαιῷ χρόνῳ τὰ πρεσβεῖα διδοίη καὶ τὰ καθ᾽ αὑτὸν οὐκ ἀξιοίη θαυμαστὰ οἴεσθαι (1.1.6-7)
>
> It will be evident that no more important or mightier deeds are to be found in history than those which have been enacted in these wars,--provided one wishes to base his judgment on the truth. For in them more remarkable feats have been performed than in any other wars with which we are acquainted; unless, indeed, any reader of this narrative should give the place of honor to antiquity, and consider contemporary achievements unworthy to be counted remarkable.

Procopius then gives a specific example of this view: there are some who denigrate contemporary soldiers by referring to them by the derogative Homeric term "bowmen" (τοξότας), while for ancient warriors they reserve such nobler terms as "hand-to-hand fighters" (ἀγχεμάχους) and "shield-men" (ἀσπιδιώτας). He forcefully states his contempt for such a position: "they think that the valor of those times has by no means survived to the present—an opinion which is at once careless and wholly remote from actual experience of these matters." (ταύτην τε τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐς τοῦτον

ἐληλυθέναι τὸν χρόνον ἥκιστα οἴονται, ἀταλαίπωρόν γε καὶ τῆς πείρας ἀπωτάτω τὴν περί αὐτῶν ποιούμενοι δόξαν.) (1.1.8).

The project of defending the greatness of the deeds of one's own time stretches back to Thucydides 1.1. Furthermore, Procopius' detailed refutation of his opponents' position is dense with Homeric allusion. Homeric archers had neither horse, shield nor spear (*Il* 5.192) and were forced to seek protection behind a comrade's shield (*Il* 8.267, 11.371) or a tombstone (*Il* 4.113). They were thus unable to save themselves in a rout or take part in a decisive struggle in the open, and finally in shooting they only drew the bowstring back to the breast (*Il* 4.123), so that their arrows often fail to wound (*Il* 9.390) (*W* 1.1.9-11). Modern archers, by contrast, are well armed and armored, ride well on horseback, are able to shoot while in motion, and draw the bowstring to the ear, increasing its force (*W* 1.1.12-15). Procopius gives detailed information about the armor (corselet, greaves, shield), weapons (bow, sword, and sometimes spear), and practices of contemporary archers, supporting his self-positioning as an informed observer of modern warfare. He ends with a concession that "Still there are those who take into consideration none of these things, who reverence and worship the ancient times, and give no credit to modern improvements" (εἰσι δὲ οἳ τούτων ἥκιστα ἐνθυμούμενοι σέβονται μὲν καὶ τεθήπασι τὸν παλαιόν χρόνον, οὐδὲν δὲ ταῖς ἐπιτεχνήσεσι διδόασι πλέον) (1.1.16), but that this will not stop him from telling his history, which he then proceeds to begin in earnest.

This passage has elicited mixed reactions from modern scholars. Several have noted what they felt to be the inadequacy of Procopius' defense of contemporary

warriors, and by proxy the greatness of Justinian's wars more generally.[127] Anthony Kaldellis has taken a different approach, or perhaps it is that he takes this same approach much further. He argues that Procopius here intentionally provides a weak, logically flawed argument, in order to present Justinian and his wars as by no means superior to antiquity, and so to covertly undermine the official propaganda to that effect. In order to refute the claims of those who automatically valorize antiquity and so deny the greatness of Justinian's wars, Kaldellis feels that:

> ...Procopius must either defend archery itself or argue that modern soldiers, whether archers or not, are equal to the hand-to-hand fighters of antiquity. But he does neither, and this is to say nothing about whether a contest of archers can by itself establish the greatness of Justinian's wars.[128]

Kaldellis further holds that in Procopius' "fatuous contest," Homeric archers are intentionally underestimated to give the argument any plausibility, and promises to argue in a forthcoming article that far from valorizing modern cavalry, Procopius "was highly troubled by their prominence in sixth-century warfare and expressed nostalgic admiration for the infantry armies of ancient Rome.[129]

Kaldellis' analysis, though plausible, is not the only way to interpret this passage. It is certainly possible that Procopius has constructed such a covert criticism of the official imperial position: as we will see in due course, we have reason to believe he did just this on other occasions. We must ask ourselves, though, if this early moment in Procopius' great work is a fitting place for the satire and "mockery of the classical

---

[127] Scott, (1981) "The Classical Tradition in Byzantine Historiography" 73.; Lieberich v.2, 2.; E Gray (1973) 24, 37 "The Roman Eastern *Limes* from Constantine to Justinian: Perspectives and Problems" *Proceedings of the African Classical Association* 12: 24-40.
[128] Kaldellis (2004) 22
[129] *ibid.*

tradition"[130] which Kaldellis attributes to him, or why an author with so little respect, not just for the emperor who commanded them, but for all the deeds and events of such momentous wars, would choose to write a lengthy eight-volume history on the subject.

Kaldellis and other scholars have evaluated Procopius' proof as an argument about the greatness of Justinian's wars, and found it wanting. (Indeed, Kaldellis provides a list of ways he feels Procopius might better have defended that position, from warfare on all three continents, to the capture of kings and the devastation of the plague.[131]) If, however, we read the passage as proof, not of the superiority of Justinian's wars, but of the foolishness of those who thoughtlessly valorize the past over the merits of the present, then the argument makes perfect sense. While the Homeric archers were forced by their weaknesses of armor and skill to behave in a cowardly fashion, modern mounted bowmen have no such limitations, and are in fact impressively armed and skilled—making the naysayers' use of "bowmen" as a derogatory term ridiculous and uniformed: "an opinion which is at once careless and wholly remote from actual experience of these matters" (1.1.8). Procopius demonstrates the incomparability of the two types of archers, pointing out the folly of denigrating modern soldiers by the term, while showing off his detailed knowledge of both Homeric bowmen and contemporary mounted archers, establishing his credentials as a historian qualified both to write a history of contemporary military events, and to write it in the classical tradition. The passage is programmatic for Procopius' approach as a historian, carefully considering the merits and relationships between both past and present; not (yet) for any conclusions on that score.

[130] Kaldellis (2004) 23
[131] Kaldellis (2004) 21

We see in the prologue to Procopius' text, then, an indication of the ways in which his history will remember the classical past. The well-established genre of classical historiography furnishes a mode and several specific models of writing the history of one's own recent past, with a focus on military and political matters, featuring prominent individuals such as rulers and generals, but promising to tell both the good and bad of their actions. The aims of Procopius' history are caught up in the role and function of memory (preservation from loss, value for future generations) and are phrased in classical, allusive terms. His history can be at times highly allusive, but in ways that serve his own rhetorical ends. Procopius early and readily acknowledges the distance between the ancient (here, mythical) and his contemporary world, and expresses contempt for an approach that automatically values the former for its age and seeming grandeur, but at the same time he demonstrates the usefulness of classical sources and modes of thought in writing history the history of and making sense of that contemporary world.

## Part V: Overview of Chapters

In Chapter Two we will consider a sampling of the many ways and occasions in and on which Procopius utilizes allusion[132] to evoke the classical past and reference the classical historiographic tradition. In such a lengthy work as the *Wars*, from an author

[132] On the use of these and related terms in the present study see below, Ch 2, pp 56-59

who engaged pervasively and systematically with the ancient past, a detailed study of his intertextuality would (and as we have seen, has[133]) constitute an entire book-length study by itself. Rather than dive too deeply into the mechanics and nuances of Procopius' allusions to classical historiography and the Greco-Roman past, we will examine a selection of examples, some new and some drawn from previous scholarship, that illustrate the different types and scales of allusive gestures Procopius incorporates into his work. These will illustrate pervasive and thoughtful engagement with the classical past that Procopius undertook, as well as the awareness of distance from it that he incorporated into his remembering, and will set the stage for what is in many ways the central focus of this project.

In Chapter Three, then, we will carefully examine Procopius' many explicit statements which in some way implicate the ancient past and cultural memory. In order to present the most complete view of such statements and their impact, as well as to examine the functioning of the diverse types of passages, we will consider each type of reference or statement in turn, before beginning to summarize and draw conclusions from this analysis. We begin by collecting those passages in which Procopius refers to a specific historical period, figure, or event, again subdivided: first those to Greek and then to Roman history, and then we begin considering Procopius' references to the mythological past. This is a complex subject, for both Procopius and ourselves, and exploring Procopius' self-contradicting inclusion of mythic material into his history will demonstrate the importance of the topic for our study of cultural and historical memory in

[133] Braun (1885), (1894)

his works. After several sub-sections dealing not only with the mythological references but with the digressions on the nature of historical change that they inspire, we will consider a collection of passages in which Procopius comments on the passage of time. These include comparisons between the present with the ancient past, and statements musing on the effects of the passage of time: what is lost, and what survives. The conclusions of this section are diverse and far-reaching: they have implications throughout the project and will be considered and re-considered through the rest of the dissertation. One important theme that will emerge from this chapter is the recurrance of concerns of Roman cultural memory in the *Wars*.

Thus while Chapters Two and Three undertake a systematic consideration of the various ways in which Procopius evokes memory of the ancient past, Chapter Four endeavors to examine this one particular, particularly important theme across the numerous types of passages and levels of textual engagement where it appears. We will look in this chapter at the unflagging concern Procopius shows in his history for the city of Rome and the complexity of being Roman in the sixth-century Roman world. Structured around the simple but intensely revealing technique of studying when and how Procopius applies the term “Roman” to the various actors and groups in his historical narrative, this chapter will also examine Procopius’ depiction of the city of Rome as a locus of cultural memory and its sad fate over the course of the war. We will attempt to parse out the nuances and paradoxes of Roman identity in an empire from which the city of Rome was separable, and at moment in time when prolonged contests over the fate of the city only highlighted this fact.

In the conclusion we will return to several of the themes we have explored in the course of the work, naturally. We will take the opportunity to explore in more depth a few of handful of the theoretical approaches of memory studies that offer interesting insight into cultural and historical memory in Procopius' *Wars*.

**Chapter Two: Procopius and Classical Historiography**

An investigation of historical memory in the *Wars* that seeks to be thourough and holistic, as this endeavor does, must consider Procopius' engagement with the classical past in every form it can be found, from the most minute to the large-scale, the covert and implied along with the explicit, and the well-known as well as the relatively under-studied. In this case, the small-scale evidence is some of the most well-studied. Procopius' careful, Atticizing language is a means of engaging with memory of the classical past that pervades every word and sentence, rich and varied, and one that modern scholarship has still only scratched the surface of. It is out of this classical lannguage that Procopius crafted his history, and all the rest of his references to and engagements with the memory of the ancient past. Both for this reason, and because it is one of the most well-studied areas in scholarship on Procopius, it is the best place for us to begin.

This chapter, then, examines some key elements of the relationship of Procopius' text to classical historiography; the imitations and interactions that Procopius created between his work and those of his predecessors. This is a project that has been undertaken by a number of other scholars, but often with quite different aims. As mentioned in the introduction, the concern on this score in much of modern scholarship has been to evaluate Procopius' participation in the genre of classical historiography. If he is understood as a "classicizing" historian, then despite his superficial "imitation" of his classical models, he ought to be examinedt in relation to his sixth-century

contemporaries. If, however, he is accepted as valid participant in the "classical" historiographic tradition, perhaps the last in that long line, then his work is best studied and understood in relation to his predecessors.[134] These questions have often been approached though an evaluation of the success and quality of Procopius' classic(-izing) style: his Atticizing prose in imitation of Thucydides', the strength of his classical allusions, and analyses of a set of curious passages we will term "rhetorical asides." In as much as questions of Procopius' classical style and the quality of his classical allusions are implicated in Procopius' relationship with his classical past, we will deal with them somewhat, but the painstaking study of Attic language, of the mechanics of erudite allusions and the subtlety of covert criticisms of contemporary politics are quite beyond the scope of the present inquiry. For our purposes, it is enough to note that he did use such tools to draw from his classical models such complex observations and critiques, so that we may then examine instead the views about the past, rather than the present, that they belie. Our concern is not the precise point Procopius sought to make about his own day, nor the minutiae of how he constructed the allusion, but instead the value he saw in his classical sources in helping him make that point.

We will concern ourselves primarily with Procopius' intertextual relationship with Thucydides and Herodotus, for a number of reasons. By far the most research has

[134]The tension between "classicism" and "classicizing" in Procopius scholarship is discussed more fully above, pp 18-23. This is of necessity a stark simplification of nuanced stances, but it highlights the extent that neither interpretation is necessarily the more valid, neither approach should be pursued to the exclusion of the other. The tension, rather, is indicative of the the need to study memory in Procopius more broadly, to better understand where he locates himself in relation to classical historiographic tradition, as well as how he locates his contemporary world in relation to the classical past.

been done on the influence of these two on Procopius. Moreover, though, that they are the "fathers of history" suggests a key factor: they were highly influential, not only on Procopius, but on all those others he might imitate, and thus are a natural starting point for investigating his classicizing. There is, additionally, reason to think Procopius might imitate those two especially: both as the "fathers of history," and also for particular similarities between Procopius' situation and their works. In the case of Thucydides, in addtion to the similarity in perspective on their wars (see just below), the fighting in Procopius' *Wars* includes many features familiar from Thucydides: sieges, pitched battles, diplomatic and battlefield speeches, and so on.[135] In Herodotus' case, Procopius' text shares with his a smilarly wide scope of narrative, the presence of a Persian front, and a plethora of strange tales and interesting back-stories on which to digress. We will, however, also examine some of Procopius' intertextual references to other authors, and there are doubtless many more such allusions waiting to be discovered by careful, painstaking study beyond the reach of this project.

We will be looking first, then, at some of the ways in which Procopius modeled his history on his classical predecessors, instances where the particular kinds of references and intertextual allusions he makes give us insight into his views on the value

---

[135] Naturally we risk a circular argument if we take Procopius' classicizing, Thucydidean-inspired text as evidence for the similarity of his war to Thucydides', but archaeological and other literary and textual sources cporroborate the general picture found in Procopius of seige warfare, cavalry-based armies, etc. See further A. D Lee, "The Empire at War" in *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. ed M. Maas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2005). 113-133, but also Adshead, K. (1990) "Procopius' *Poliorcetica*: Continuities and Discontinuities" in Clarke, G. W. *Reading the past in late antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press. 93-115, on the changing nature of warfare in the sixth century.

of the classical past. Also worth examining, though, are instances where it would seem that Procopius' own ways of thinking, or at least of writing, about the past were influenced by his classical models. Intertexts involving references to the ancient past, the passage of time, and relationships of space and time can help us understand how Procopius viewed and depicted the progress of history, a topic we will investigate more fully in the next chapter. Finally, we will consider a unique way in which Procopius both styles himself as belonging to, and separates himself from, the classical tradition of his predecessors. In pointedly explaining instances where he deviates from the Attic vocabulary of his models, Procopius' rhetorical asides, or *periphrases*, negotiate a tension between past and present which pervades his work.

* * * *

As this chapter will rely heavily on the language of the scholarship of allusion and intertextuality, we should pause before proceeding to discuss the relevant terminology and theory. The vocabulary of the earliest work on Procopius' relationship to his classical predecessors, of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, is mostly of "imitation" (Dahn's *Nachmung*) and "influence." The former seems to posit a conscious, pruposeful act on Procopius' part, while the latter implies an ealier text exerting power over a later author's writing, without addressing the question of the author's intentions or awareness of this process.[136] While either of these terms could be applied to any one of many different types of imitation of his classical models on Procopius' part, the

---

[136] Dahn, *Die Nachahmung Herodts durch Prokop.* Beilage zum Jahresbericht1893/94 des K. Altes Gymnasium zu Nurnberg. 1894, Lieberich 4ff, etc

vocabulary of the field more broadly and on Procopius specifically solidified into discussions of his classicizing or Atticizing language, on the one hand, and of his classical allusions, on the other. The trend in studying both has been to focus on the author's intentional use of the technique: Procopius' classical Greek has been viewed as so purposeful as to be forced and artificial.[137] Meanwhile, Classics as a field pursed a great deal of work on the study of allusion, the purposeful imitation or echo of particular passages meant to invite comparison with another author and work, as typified by the Hellenistic poets.[138] Procopius, as we will see momentarily, often engages in such a way with his predecessors' texts, and the careful study of allusions in the *Wars* and his other works has been highly profitable.

This study of allusion, however, is not without its problems, not the least of which is that the interpretation assumes, indeed demands, authorial intent. It limits study of an author's engagement with an ealier text to a narrow field of interaction, leaving little room for a spectrum of echoes and influence. In Procopius' case, the rich field of his classical vocabulary, style, borrowing of phrases and tropes, and modeling of historiographic set-pieces is certainly largely intentional, but are those instances where we cannot prove with certainty that our author intended to echo a specific passage of of a classical author not worthy of study in either case?

---

[137] Cameron (1985) 33-46

[138] Hinds 17-25 on allusion rigidly defined, cf also R. F.Thomas (1986), "Virgil's *Georgics* and the art of the reference (64.1-18), *American Journal of Philology* 103:144-64; D. A.West and A. J. Woodman, eds. (1979) *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature.* Cambridge.

The approach and language of intertextuality offers a greater degree of freedom, as it does not hinge on authorial intention or limit itself to the types of passages where such is provable, but studies the spectrum and variety of interactions between classical texts. An extremely New Critical approach, though, the original, purest form of intertextual studies takes the disregard of the author much further than is useful in the present endeavor.[139] An approach that denies the relevance of authorial intent completely, and examines texts ahistorically, may certainly be appropriate for the study of poetry as literature, but is hardly desirable our study of historical memory. Instead, the middle ground of Stephen Hind's *Allusion and Intertextuality* offers a useful, balanced approach.[140] Although Hinds studies Latin poetry, his exploration of the intersections and grey areas betweeen conscious imitation and the broader field of more ambiguous echoes is in fact singularly useful for studying the rich and varied classiciscm of Procopius. Hinds utilizes the language and approach of allusion without the exclusive focus on authorial intent, and takes advantage of the flexibility of intertextual, reader-based approaches to explore the "countless negotiations within and between the discourses of Roman culture" of which allusion is a "special, stylized subset."[141]

Here, we will often be looking at straightforward allusion, a purposeful device of Procopius' to create comparison and "classicize" his history. The broader subject of his

---

[139]Hinds 17ff, 47-51 cf also G. B. Conte (1986), *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, ed. C. Segal. Ithaca; R. O. A. M Lyne (1994), "Vergils' *Aeneid*: subversion by intertextuality" Greece & Rome: 41:187-204; L. Edmunds (2001), Intertextuality and the reading of Roman poetry. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

[140] Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and intertext: Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*. Cambridge.

[141] Hinds 33

"intertextuality" is also relevant, however, and a part of our discussion. In examining Procopius' Atticizing language, it is not always necessary to know exactly when he is purposefully using Thucydidean language and when he does so simply out of habit, because that is how one writes a history: it is surely often a mixture of both, and the effect is largely the same in either case. It is, moreover, useful to have one convenient umbrella term "intertextuality," which is how it will usually be used here: to include purpoeful allusion, whether to a particular author and text or to a broader trope, classical language whether specifically intended or habitual, and, as we move toward the end of the chapter, devices that play with the status of his work as both part of the classical tradtion and awareness of distance from it, the ways of exploring that distance that are woven into the text itself.[142]

**Part I: Procopius and Thucydides. Section 1: Orations**

That Procopius was heavily influenced by Thucydides' style and methods of hsitory-writing has long been recognized, though it is only lately that we have begun to understand the many levels on which Procopius interacted with his predecessor's text. Procopius writes as a latter-day Thucydides, adopting a high Attic Greek style and

[142] When we come eventually to Chapter Four, we will return to Hinds, for other elements of his analysis of poetic allusivity, including the signposting of allusion, will be eminently useful see below, pp 181-196.

vocabulary as he narrates the history of a war in which he himself played a part.[143] As we have seen, in the late ninteenth century Herman Braun meticulously catalogued many instances of Procopius' "imitation" of Thcydides: that is, the many places in which he borrowed Thucydidean vocabulary and phrasing.[144] However, Procopius also borrows from and is inspired by Thucydides in more substantial ways. Or rather, he crafts from these small-scale, stylistic gestures larger and more complex interactions with his model. In the pages that follow, we will consider several different areas where Procopius uses Thucydidean language to construct intertextual references between his text and his predecessor's, and instances where he draws on Thucydidean technique to discuss and analyze the characters and events of his history. We will begin by looking at Procopius' use of two characteristically Thucydidean elements of history-writing: battlefield and diplomatic orations, and depictions of complex, ambiguous historical figures. In the next section, we will examine in detail Procopius' relationship with his model text in a particularly notable episode: the plague of 542.

Procopius undoubtedly draws substantially on Thucydidean language and techniques in crafting his orations. Procopius frequently uses Thucydidean formulae for introducing and returning from orations: some variation on "coming forward he spoke thus," παρελθὼν ἐλέξε τοιάδε or ὧδε, παρεκελέσατο τοιάδε; or after a speech, "thus he spoke," τοσαῦτα μὲν εἶπον or a variant thereof each occur

143 Kaldellis has further suggested that Procopius' vocabulary is purposefully limited, a Thucydidean technique allowing readers to track key concepts and form connections. Kaldellis (2004) 12.

144 Braun, H. (1885) *Procopius Caesariensis quatenus imitatus sit Thucydidem*. Diss. Erlangen.

numerous times.[145] Within the speeches, there are a great number of verbal echoes of the type found at 6.21.5: Belisarius had sent a force under the commanders Martinus and Uliarius to break the Gothic siege of Milan, but they had been delaying crossing the Po for some time when an envoy is sent from the city to tell them:

> Μαρτῖνέ τε καὶ Οὐλίαρι, οὐ δίκαια ποιεῖτε οὐδὲ δόξης τῆς ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἄξια, λόγῳ μὲν ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν βασιλέως πραγμάτων ἥκοντες, ἔργῳ δὲ τὴν Γότθων δύναμιν αὔξοντες.
>
> Martinus and Uliaris, you are not acting justly nor in a manner worthy of your own fame, seeing that in appearance you have come for the saving of the emperor's cause, but in reality to magnify the power of the Goths.

This passage would seem to be drawn from Thucydides 2.71.2

> Ἀρχίδαμε καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, οὐ δίκαια ποεῖτε οὐδ᾽ ἄξια οὔτε ὑμῶν οὔτε πατέρων ὧν ἐστε, ἐς γῆν τὴν Πλαταιῶν στρατεύοντες.
>
> Archidamus and Lacedaemonians, you are not acting justly, nor in a manner worthy either of yourselves, or of the fathers from whom you are sprung, when you invade the territory of the Plataeans.

Such borrowings as this are common, and lend a distinctly Thucydidean flavor to particular elements of Procopius' narrative. The combination of rather bland moralizing with pithy construction of the statement make it easy to see why Procopius found it to be a useful intertext, and that he chose to reference this particular passage perhaps cannot bear too much interpretive weight. We can, however, look more closely at when he deploys this particular Thucydidean reference. The address to Martinus and Uliaris is an impassioned plea by a native Italian for the importance of Milan as an outpost and bulwark of the Roman Empire against the barbarians, and of the importance of its defense

[145] cf for example Th 1.79.2, 2.86.6, and 2.12.1; P 1.16.1 and 1.24.26 (during the Nika Riots). For τοσαῦτα μὲν εἶπον and its variants, Braun remarks that Procopius uses these no less than sixty times. Braun (1885) 182-3.

at that moment as a historical turning-point (6.21.5-10). It is a speech much concerned with history, and Procopius gives his speakers the appropriate classical flourish appropriate to the theme of their plea. Procopius also uses similar language at 3.9.10 and 5.8.7. The latter comes in the course of one of the Neapolitans' speeches to Belisarius discussed below, [146] an example of how Procopius often layers his classical references, as it were: he is particularly likely to utilize intertextual language in conjunction with another, larger reference to the past, allusive or explicit.

Elsewhere, Procopius makes fairly predictable associations between the speakers of his history and those of the world of Thucydides by his verbal borrowings and the substitutions he makes to adapt them to his own time and needs. Thucydides' "O Athenian men" (ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι) of 1.53.2 is adapted to "Roman men" (ἄνδρες Ῥωμαῖοι) when Procopius references the passage at 6.6.14. Similarly, a noble sentiment of Pericles' at 2.60.15 is given to Belisarius for his speech at 6.3.13.[147] A favorite Thucydidean episode of Procopius' seems to have been the debate between the Corinthians and the Corcyrans. He bestows lines drawn from this passage on both the Romans (3.10.8) and the Goths (6.30.16), and elsewhere puts Justinian in place of the Athenians (7.34.25). Braun charts numerous smaller verbal echoes of this episode, as well.[148]

In this vein, but on a larger scale, Anthony Kaldellis has analyzed the very Thucydidean way in which Procopius structures his orations and the events surrounding

---

[146] pp 69-70
[147] We will explore in more detail below the complex web of intertextual associations woven around the character of Belisarius.
[148] Braun (1885) 184-6

them to privide subtextual commentary on the speakers and combatants. Kaldellis draws on the work of Jacqueline de Romilly, who closely analyzes speech-and-battle sequences of Thucydides, such as 2.86.90, which narrates the naval battle of Naupactus in 429 BCE. In such instances, the two sides' orations before the battle addressed the same issues from opposite points of view, and the description of the battle bore out the predictions of one speaker or the other, validating that commander's understanding of the situation and hence skill as a leader.[149] Kaldellis applies Romilly's model to Procopius to show that our author both observed and reproduced this highly refined technique of Thucydides' in his own work. In an episode of the Vandalic War, the Romans, under the command of Solomon, battle the Moors at Mames (4.11). Procopius describes the troops of both sides as demoralized in Thucydidean language.[150] Each commander then makes a speech which addresses the issues that will prove decisive in the battle to come: previous victories, the better arms of the Romans, the greater numbers of the Moors, and the presence of the Moors' camels. In the course of the battle, while the Moors' predictions about their camels is borne out, otherwise it is Solomon's understanding of the situation that is proved correct, and the Romans win the victory.[151] Procopius was thus interested in, and capable of, more than superficial imitation of Thucydidean style: he sought to craft his history into a work of similar subtlety and complexity on a par with Thucydides'.

---

[149] Romilly, Jacqueline de. 1956. *Histoire et raison chez Thucydide*. Paris: Les Belles lettres.
[150] cf τοὺς πολλοὺς διὰ τὴν προτέραν ἧσσαν φοβουμένους (Th 2.86.6) with P 4.11.22, τοὺς πολλοὺς εἶδε πεφοβημένους. Braun (1885) 182
[151] Kaldellis (2004) 29-31

In other types of orations the correspondence, or lack thereof, between the speakers' claims on the one hand and the actual course of events on the other is highlighted by Procopius' Thucydidean language and serves to make Procopius' narratorial judgments for him. In Book 5, the Gothic king Vittigis delivers two sizeable speeches, promoting prudence and preparation (5.11.12-25) and calculated sacrifice to achieve eventual victory (5.13.17-25). As Vittigis' reign progresses, though, his actions are increasingly erratic and his decisions self-interested and short sighted. He is unable to live up to the plans and values he himself outlined in his speeches, an "implicit standard by which we must judge him."[152] Procopius looked to Thucydides not only as a source for language or material, but as a model for how to analyze and judge the role of prominent figures in the sweep of history.

**Part I: Procopoius and Thucydides. Section 2: Characters**

Similarly, Procopius uses Thucydidean references to add depth and nuance to his characterization of historical figures. We will pay particular attention here to those characteristics of the Thucydidean figures Procopius seeks out for use in describing his own. Procopius' attitude toward and use of his model text is ultimately of greater concern in the present investigation than the points which Procopius seeks to make about the figures of his own day by use of these intertextual references. That is to say, we wish

---

[152] Kaldellis (2004) 32

to explore how he viewed and made use of the memories of the classical past that were preserved in Thucydides' text, and which had acheived the status of cultural memory as they remained relevant across the intervening years.

To begin with, Pericles, as one of the more straightforwardly positive figures in Thucydides' narrative, is referenced a number of times to provide an especially complimentary description of a leader. At 4.19.3, Solomon, left in charge in North Africa, "ruled in moderation and guarded Libya securely," μετρίως τε ἐξηγεῖτο και Λιβύην ἀσφαλῶς διεφύλασσε. This echoes Thucydides' statement on Pericles, that he μετρίως τε ἐξηγεῖτο και ἀσφαλῶς διεφύλξεν αὐτὴν (2.65.5). Similarly, Belisarius is described at 7.1.25 as having come to power by virtue of τῷ τε ἀξιώματι καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ, his respected-ness and sound judgment, a word-for-word borrowing from Thucydides 2.65.8. Elsewhere, descriptions of commanders eloquently rousing troops are given Periclean language: compare Procopius 4.11.37 and 5.23.14 and Thucydides 2.65.9. Both Belisarius (5.22.9) and, interestingly, Theoderic the Gothic king (5.12.32) are praised for their "foresight," the very Periclean προνόια (c.f. Th 2.65.6). Finally, a self-description of Pericles' at 2.60.5 is alluded to by Procopius in reference to the hated John the Cappadocian, who is described as "most capable in deciding upon what was needful and in finding a solution for difficulties," γνῶαί τε γὰρ τὰ δέοντα ἱκανώτατος ἦν καὶ λύσιν τοῖς ἀπόροις εὑρεῖν (1.24.13). The Thucydides passage runs:

> ὃς οὐδενος ἥσσων οἴομαι εἰναι γνῶναί τε τὰ δέοντα καὶ ἑρμνεῦσαι ταῦτα, φιλόπολίς τε καὶ χρημάτων κρείσσων. (Th 2.60.5)

> ...one who, I believe, is second to no man in either knowledge of the proper policy, or in the ability to expound it, and who is, moreover, not only a patriot but an honest one.

Procopius' grudging acknowledgment of John's undeniable talents is turned to sharper criticism by the implicit comparison: John had been given the potential of a latter-day Pericles, but he chose to use it to selfish ends, becoming πονηρότατος δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἁπάντων (1.24.13). Furthermore, the difference between the Thucydidean model and the contemporary figure is made all the more harsh in light of the full passage of Thucydides', the second half of which is pointedly missing from Procopius' echo, and indeed is contradicted by the narrative that follows. John is decidedly neither a patriot nor honest. For Procopius, the figure of Pericles is an aspirational one, a benchmark for wise and just leadership to which his own historical characters may draw near at their best moments, but from which other political leaders fall grossly and tragically short.

The characterization of John the Cappadocian is further complicated by a reference to another Thucydidean character, the much less straightforward Themistocles. In John's first major appearance at the brutal quelling of the Nika Riots, Procopius twice references the famous passage in which Thucydides sums up the genius of Themistocles. First, he says of John, φύσεως δέ ἰσχύι πάντων γέγονε δυνατώτατος ὧν ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν, "...but by his natural sagacity he became the most powerful man of whom we know" (1.24.12), echoing Thucydides' ἦν γὰρ ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς, βεβαιότατα δὴ φύσεως ἰσχὺν δηλώσας, "For indeed Themistocles was a man who had most convincingly demonstrated the strength of his natural sagacity" (1.38.3). Again,

Procopius echoes Thucydides' φύσεως δυνάμει (1.38.3) with his own τῇ τῆς φύσεως δυνάμει (1.24.12). Both accounts also emphasize the ability to make quick and shrewd decisions and that these talents were not due to education or study, but were native. Themistocles is a complex character in Thucydides' work, and here the reference can be seen as working in two ways. First, it serves again as a negative comparison: that is, John had the native gifts of a latter-day Themistocles but chose to use them for wrongdoing. Additionally, Themistocles is an excellent model for one who uses his mental talents to serve not only the good of state but also his own, self-interested ends and whose pursuit of power leads him to questionable extremes.

For simple, straightforward treason, though, Procopius preferred a less nuanced Thucydidean reference: Pausanias, the Spartan who releases Persian prisoners in order to convey a traitorous message to Xerxes. Intertexts involving Pausanias merit three pages in Braun's 1885 study; by comparison, Pericles gets roughly a page, and Alcibiades and Themistocles a paragraph each.[153] Theophobius, a Lazi, tries to hand over a Roman fort to the Persian forces at 8.16.4-5; very similar to Thucydides on Pausanias at 1.129.3. The same Theophobius is then described as being elated by promises of gratitude from his would-be Persian benefactor (οἷς δὴ Θεοφόβιος ἐπαρθεὶς πολλῷ ἔτι μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ἠπείγετο), echoing Thucydides 1.130.3. Procopius also uses twice to great effect the critical description of Pausanias' descent into Medism. Thucydides' observation that "he could no longer live in the usual style... and could not conceal his

[153] There is especially little for Alcibiades: seemingly Procopius did not find him a useful model for any of his own characters, or perhaps he was somehow out of fashion as a classical reference. Braun (1885) 174-9

intentions," οὐκέτι ἠδύνατο ἐν τῷ καθεστηκότι τρόπῳ βιοτεύειν... καὶ κατέχειν τὴν διάνοιαν οὐκ ἠδύνατο (1.130.1) is borrowed for Gelimer, the barbarian king, at 3.9.8 and for Narses, Belisarius' rival for command in Italy, a Romanized Armenian and a eunuch to boot (6.18.10). The loaded accusation of Medism points to the ways in which Procopius found Thucydidean inspiration helpful in dealing with the fraught relations and ambiguous divisions between Greco-Romans and barbarians, to be discussed in more detail in Chapter Four. Procopius also borrows heavily from Thucydides' description of two major events in the story of Pausanias. First, his intentional release of Persian captives to carry his treasonous message to Xerxes (1.128.5) is transposed to Cabades, the Persian king, releasing Roman prisoners (1.7.34-35). Second, Pausanias' eventual entrapment by the Spartan ephors (1.132) is echoed in the foiling of a plot against Justinian by Germanus (7.31-32).[154] Pausainias seems to have been a useful reference for Proccopius to lend a particularly negative coloring to a character.[155]

The foregoing are relatively simple intertexts, verbal echoes, and borrowed phrases which add Thucydidean flavor to Procopius' characterizations while perhaps allowing him to make subtle digs here and there against contemporary figures. Procopius was also capable of much larger scale and, in some ways, more subtle interactions with his predecessor's text, spinning out elaborate parallels of character and thematic

---

[154] For the full passages, see Braun (1885) 174-6

[155] Cabades' release of Roman troops at 1.7.34-35 is a notable exception; we might instead imagine this to be an instance when Procopius had "just the right" intertext for the right time, and sould not resist using a Thucydidean quote for the covert release of prisoners, even if the intertextual implications did not quite fit.

development. Charles Pazdernik has explored one such parallel, between the character and actions of Belisarius and the Spartan commander Brasidas. He argues convincingly, from evidence within Procopius' text as well as a sixth-century Thucydides scholiast, that these parallels were intentionally drawn by Procopius in order to critically explore, under a veil of classical reference, the ambiguity of the actions and motivations of one of his work's principal figures, and perhaps the closest thing it has to a hero. Belisarius, like Brasidas, led a relatively small force in hostile territory, attempting to win over cities not just by siege but first by a combination of charisma and the rhetoric of liberation. Belisarius appealed to the cities of Vandal North Africa, and later, Gothic Italy, to embrace the erstwhile Roman identity they shared with the emperor's army, and to throw off their barbarian overlords. In much the same way as Brasidas' had, Belisarius' appeals to liberty carried the threat of violence behind them, and would have exposed the cities to the anger of the overthrown masters. The two generals' claims as to the justifications of their threats of violence ultimately reflect back on those who sent them, the Spartans and the emperor Justinian respectively.

Pazdernik analyzes the dueling conceptions of ἐλευθερία and δουλεία in the speeches of Belisarius and the cities' representatives, particularly that of Naples, which Belisarius was ultimately required to liberate by force. While his arguments to the Neapolitans betrayed a Brasidean disinterest in their plight, Belisarius flirts with but ultimately rejects the role of a Kleon, as his speech at 5.9.27 "cunningly reappropriates"

Kleon's in the Myteline debate (Th 3.40.7).[156] Pazdernik's well-argued conclusions are relevant to our current study:

> The thematic interplay of ἐλευθερία and δουλεία in Thucydides' analysis of geopolitics thus furnishes Procopius with a conceptual armature upon which claims made by the emperor himself about his motives and intentions can be held up to view and animated in the pages of Procopius' works. He does not seek a rigid template or a pattern of facile correspondence between his work and that of his classical predecessor. Instead, we must suppose that each point of contact between the two texts represents an attempt by Procopius to **lend historical depth and imaginative shading to his portrait of contemporary events**. The cumulative effect of these gestures, which are very carefully focused, is not merely to cultivate an air of learned antiquarianism, but rather to **contextualize events in a manner that shapes expectations and colors the reader's reaction to the unfolding of the narrative**.[157]

Furthermore, for our purposes we should also emphasize that Procopius uses Thucydides both as a font for allusions that carry veiled meaning, but also as a model for thought and analysis: Thucydides is both source and model, and Procopius is, as it were, both classicizing, and classical.

Finally, Procopius draws on another major player in Thucydides' history: the Athenian people, who have as strong and distinct a personality as any individual. Like many individual actors in Thucydides, they are a complex and morally ambiguous force in the narrative, and so the intertextual references Procopius chooses to make to descriptions of the Athenians are particularly interesting. The emperor Justinian, like the Athenians, is "quick to form plans and prompt to execute them," (ἐπινοῆσαί τε ὀξὺς καὶ ἄοκνος τὰ βεβουλευμένα ἐπιτελέσαι) a positive but not entirely complimentary statement in its original context (Th 1.70.2; P 3.9.25). In Belisarius' eyes,

[156] Pazdernik (2000) 180
[157] Pazdernik (2000) 181-2 (emphasis mine)

the Vandals are no Athenians, for one who thinks that they "will be daring beyond reason and will incur risks beyond the strength which they have" (τολμήσειν μὲν παρὰ γνώμην, κινδυνεύσειν δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν) would be mistaken (Th 1.70.3, P 4.1.24). Again, we see in these Procopius' appreciation for Thucydides as a means to describe complex personalities, to acknowledge positive characteristics while questioning the lengths to which they are taken or the ends to which they are put.

In one last example, though, Procopius allows his most brilliant figure to rise above the complexity and ambiguity, and to unabashedly better the Thucydidean model being referenced. While the Athenians are παρὰ δύναμιν τολμηταί καὶ παρὰ γνώμην κινδυνευταὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς εὐέλπιδες, "bold beyond their strength, venturesome beyond their better judgment, and sanguine in the face of dangers," (1.70.3), the same passage referenced above; Belisarius is, by contrast, ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς εὔελπιν τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ ταραγῆς παρέχετο κρείσσω, "sanguine without incurring unnecessary risk and daring to a degree without loosing his cool judgment." (7.1.15). Here Thucydides serves as a means to allow Procopius to convey the magnitude of his admiration for his general; he is even better than the classical comparanda.

There are many more such references, those charted by Braun and others as well as those still waiting to be found, of varying levels of complexity and subtlety; indeed, we will look at a few others when we examine Procopius' references to other classical authors shortly. For now, though, what is important for us is that we consider the ways in which Procopius found Thucydides' text to be useful in depicting and analyzing the

figures who populated his history. As we have seen, Thucydidean references provided Procopius with a way to subtly, or not so subtly, layer criticism (or, more rarely, praise[158]) upon his characters by comparison to their historical predecessors. He also found in Thucydides a useful model for complex techniques of narration and subverted expectation. Procopius used Thucydides to make covert observations and analysis of his contemporary world, as a model as well as a sort of code-book for critical analysis of power and those who wield it.

## Part I: Procopius and Thucydides. Section 3: Plague

One of the more oft-noted episodes in Procopius' history for Thucydidean influence is his account of the plague of 542. Despite the fact that Procopius' account of the plague and its similarity to Thucydides' has been much commented upon in attempts to attack or defend Procopius' historical reliability,[159] as well as endeavors to identify the disease in question,[160] the intertextual relationship Procopius crafts bewtween his and his predeccessor's text has recieved scant attention for its literary or rhetorical impact. It should come as no surprise that in structure and language Procopius' account is modeled on and inspired by Thucydides' account of the Athenian plague of 430 BCE. In its content, however, our author clearly distinguishes his plague, its symptoms, and its

---

[158] Procopius seems to have been more likely to locate positive comparisons between his historical characters and ancient figures on the explicit, textual level, pp 149-154 below.
[159] cf Haury (1896), Soyter (1951), Cameron (1985) 40-43.
[160] Allen (1979), Horden (2005)

effects from that of his model. In the following analysis, we will study the ways in which Procopius works within the structure provided by Thucydides' plague account to describe a quite different phenomonon, and moreover uses intertextual reference and technique to define his own epidemic and explore its effects in direct contrast to his predecessor's.

The broad structure is undeniably similar. Both accounts introduce their plagues and emphasize the enormity of the disaster (Th 2.47.3-4; P 2.22.1-4). Both authors state that they will leave discussion of causes to others, while they will describe the actual course and symptoms of the disease (Th 2.48.3; P 2.22.5). In each case, the disease is said to have come from Africa (Th 2.48.1 ἐξ Αἰθιοπίας τῆς ὑπὲρ Αἰγύπτον; P 2.22.6 ἐξ Αἰγθπτίων), and spread from the coasts and harbors inland (Th 2.48.2; P 2.22.15-39). The symptoms of the plague are described (Th 2.49; P 2.22.15-39), the death toll is emphasized (Th 2.51.6-2.52.3; P 2.23.1-3), the problems of disposing of so many dead are dwelt on (Th 2.52.4; P 2.23.3-11), and in each case the usual burial customs are no longer observed (Th 2.52.4; P 2.23.12). Finally, each account considers the effect of the death toll on public morality (Th 2.53; P 2.23.13-16).

However, within this general structure, and often using the very Thucydidean language he is borrowing, Procopius carefully separates his account from his predecessor's. To begin with, he closely follows the first half of Thucydides' statement concerning the aims of the account:

> λεγέτω μὲν οὖν περὶ αὐτοῦ ὡς ἕκαστος γιγνώσκει καὶ ἰατρὸς καὶ ἰδιώτης ἀφ᾽ ὅτου εἰκὸς ἦν γενέσθαι αὐτό, καὶ τὰς αἰτίας ἅστινας νομίζει τοσαύτης μεταβολῆς ἱκανὰς εἶναι· ἐγὼ δὲ οἷόν τε ἐγίγνετο λέξω καὶ ἀφ ὧν ἄν τις σκοπῶν, εἴ ποτε καὶ αὖθις ἐπιπέσοι, μάλιστ᾽ ἂν ἔχοι τι προειδὼς μὴ ἀγνοεῖν, ταῦτα δηλώσω αὐτος τε νοσήσας... (Th. 2.48.3)

> Now any one, whether physician or layman, may, each according to his own personal opinion, speak about its probable origin and state the causes which, in his view, were sufficient to have produced so great a departure from normal conditions; but I shall describe its actual course, explaining the symptoms, from the study of which a person should be able, having knowledge of it beforehand, to recognize it if it should ever break out again.

Procopius, however, modifies his version of the statement to reflect his earlier musings that it is not possible to discover the reasons behind such a disaster; one can only "refer it to God" (ἐς τὸν Θεὸν ἀναφέρεσθαι, P 2.22.2). Thus rather than imply that anyone, doctor and layman alike, may appropriately have their own views on the matter, Procopius substitutes "sophists" and "astrologers," who presumably number among those charlatans "who fabricate outlandish theories of natural philosophy," not to be believed (P 2.22.1). Further, Procopius omits Thucydides' final reasoning that his account may be of use in recognizing the disease should it ever return, instead stressing the plague's destructive power.

> λεγέτω μὲν οὖν ὡς πη ἕκαστος περὶ αὐτῶν γινώσκει καὶ σοφιστὴς καὶ μετεωρολόγος, ἐγὼ δὲ ὅθεν τε ἤρξατο ἡ νόσος ἥδε καὶ τρόπῳ δὴ ὅτῳ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους διέφθειρεν ἐρῶν ἔρχομαι. (P 2.22.5)

> Now let each one express his own judgment concerning the matter, both sophist and astrologer, but as for me I shall proceed to tell where this disease originated and the manner in which it destroyed men.

Continuing the theme of the plague's destructive power, Procopius' account as it continues stresses the implacable geographic spread of the disease and the unpredictable nature of its mortality.[161]

[161] Kaldellis (2004) 210-213 discusses the implications for Procopius' views about the roles of "Fate" and God in history.

It is in the descriptions of symptoms that Procopius most clearly differentiates his account from Thucydides'.[162] The 4th century BCE plague has not been identified for certain, but it was perhaps some form of Typhoid fever or smallpox.[163] Thucydides describes fever, redness and inflammation of the eyes, mouth, and throat, and foul breath in the first stage of the disease, and then charts its descent into the chest, with hoarseness and coughing, followed by an upset stomach and vomiting. He also describes blistering of the skin, thirst and intense fever and, if this last was not fatal, severe diarrhea which often was (Th 2.28.6). Procopius' malady, meanwhile, was certainly Bubonic Plague. He describes an initially mild fever, the characteristic buboes in the groin or armpit (or less commonly neck or thigh), the onset of either coma or a violent delirium, and emphasizes that it was impossible to predict at the outset who would survive and who would not, save that those who exhibited either small pustules all over or vomited blood were sure to die quickly (P 2.22.30-32).

Not only are the historical facts or the disease he had to report different, but Procopius seems to have gone out of his way to differentiate his plague account from Thucydides' in the reporting of those details. Both illnesses begin with a fever, but Procopius eschews Thucydides' τῆς κεφαλῆς θέρμαι ἰσχθραὶ (2.49.2) for the less specific ἐπύρεσσον ἄφνω (2.22.15). He goes on to emphasize that there was no change in color nor any inflammation, as one might expect in a Thucydidean-style plague narrative:

[162] Thus it is long since anyone seriously questioned the historical veracity of Procopius' account, despite the obvious Thucydidean influence; Cameron 40 n 42

[163] Littman 2009, Littman and Littman (1973)

> καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα οὔτε τι διήλλασσε τῆς προτέρας χροιᾶς οὔτε θερμὸν ἦν, ἅτε πυρετοῦ ἐπιπεσόντος, οὐ μὴν οὐδε φλόγωσις ἐπεγίνετο.. (P 2.22.16)
>
> And the body showed no change from its previous color, nor was it hot as might be expected when attacked by a fever, nor did any inflammation set in....

While Procopius follows Thucydides in describing the physicians as ἀγνοίᾳ (Th 2.47.4; P 2.22.29) concerning the best course of treatment, he also explicitly states that doctors and those tending the sick did not contract the disease from their patients (another distinctive feature of the bubonic plague, famously spread by rats and their fleas) (P 2.22.23), negating a key detail from Thucydides' account, in which the plague spread as doctors (2.47.4) and others (2.51.4) frequently became infected from contact with the sick.

In his description of the sociological effects of the plague, Procopius also distinguishes his account from his predecessors'. In general terms, both describe the disorder and chaos in the streets that ensued (Th 2.52.1-4; P 2.23.9-12), and that the usual burial customs were abandoned (Th 2.52.4; P 2.23.12). It is significant, however, that while Thucydides discusses the laws concerning burial, νόμοι περὶ τὰς ταφάς, Procopius, while using the same vocabulary, instead talks about τὰ περὶ τὰς ταφὰς νόμιμα. The adjectival form perhaps takes emphasis away from the laws themselves and the lawlessness that ensued and instead concerns itself with the departure from what was customary and usual. Indeed, the passage that follows in Thucydides focuses on the lawlessness, ἀνομία, that reigns in the city when men, feeling that they are likely to die anyway, sought to get what pleasure they could out of what time remained to them:

> θεῶν δὲ φόβος ἢ ἀνθρώπων νόμος οὐδεὶς ἀπεῖργε, τὸ μὲν κρίνοντες ἐν ὁμοίῳ καὶ σέβειν καὶ μὴ ἐκ τοῦ πάντας ὁρᾶν ἐν ἴσῳ ἀπολλυμένους, τῶν δὲ ἁμαρτημάτων οὐδεὶς ἐλπίζων μέχρι τοῦ δίκην γενέσθαι βιοὺς ἂν τὴν τιμωρίαν ἀντιδοῦναι... (Th 2.53.4)
>
> No fear of gods or law of men restrained them; for, on the one hand, seeing that all men were perishing alike, they judged that piety and impiety came to the same thing, and, on the other, no one expected that he would live to be called to account and pay the penalty for his misdeeds.

Procopius, on the contrary, depicts a quite different change:

> ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅσοι πράγμασι τὰ πρότερα παριστάμενοι αἰσχροῖς τε καὶ πονηροῖς ἔχαιρον, οἵδε τὴν ἐς τὴν δίαιτιαν ἀποσεισάμενοι παρανομίαν τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἀκριβῶς ἤσκουν, οὐ τὴν σωφροσύνην μεταμαθόντες οὐδὲ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐρασταί τινες ἐκ τοῦ αἰφνιδίου γεγενημένοι· ἐπεὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὅσα ἐμπέπηγε φύσει ἢ χρόνου μακροῦ διδασκαλίᾳ ῥᾷστα δῆ οὕτω μεταβάλλεσθαι ἀδύνατά ἐστιν, ὅτι μὴ θείου τινὸς ἀγαθοῦ ἐπιπνεύσαντος· ἀλλὰ τότε ὡς εἰπεῖν ἅπαντες καταπεπληγμένοι μὲν τοῖς ξυμπίπτουσιν, τεθνήξεσθαι δὲ αὐτίκα δὴ μάλα οἰόμενοι, ἀνάγκῃ, ὡς τὸ εἰκός, πάσῃ τὴν ἐπιείκειαν ἐπὶ καιροῦ μετεμάνθανον. (P 2.23.14-15)
>
> Nay, more, those who in times past used to take delight in devoting themselves to pursuits both shameful and base, shook off the unrighteousness of their daily lives and practiced the duties of religion with diligence, not so much because they had learned wisdom at last nor because they had become all of a sudden lovers of virtue, as it were—for when qualities have become fixed in men by nature or by the training of a long period of time, it is impossible for them to lay them aside thus lightly, except, indeed, some divine influence for good has breathed upon them—but then all, so to speak, being thoroughly terrified by the things which were happening, and supposing that they would die immediately, did, as was natural, learn respectability for a season by sheer necessity.

He emphasizes that this temporary betterment did not last, but once they supposed the danger was past, they returned to their baseness (πονηρία) and illegality (παρανομία).

Indeed, with regards to the particular language of the two accounts, several things should be noted. Procopius embroiders his account with vocabulary borrowed from the

Thucydidean account: compare αἰφνιδίου and ῥᾷστα in the two preceding passages. However, for one of Thucydides' key concepts, Procopius pointedly does not use precisely the same wording. While Thucydides dwells on the amorality or lawlessness of ἀνομία brought by the plague, Procopius repeatedly discusses the παρανομία, immoral or unlawful behavior, that was the norm before and after the plague. In his account, Procopius is essentially reversing the effect the plague has on the populace's morals, but he demures from making his the exact opposite of Thucydides' telling.

Procopius' Constantinopolitans start out in a worse state than the Athenians, and then return to it after temporarily bettering themselves out of fear: perhaps this reflects a low view Procpoius had of his own present, or at least of the capital city and its citizens. Presumably, however, this depicted at least in part the actual reactions of the people of the very Christian sixth-century Constantinople. Moreover, though, this alteration reflects Procopius' distinct theme in his description of his plague: the completely unpredictable nature of the plague's mortality. While the 5$^{th}$ century BCE Athenians were sure they would die and so ἀνομία ensues, the 6$^{th}$ century CE Constantinoploitans cannot know, even after they become sick, whether they will live or die. They thus turn in fear to religion and righteousness, however fleetingly, in hopes of securing their survival. Procopius' plague is unpredictable and inscrutable, from the beginning of the passage to the end.

From his original theme and distinct descriptions, we can see that while using Thucydidean language and structure for his account, Procopius clearly sought to differentiate his account from his model's, even while utilizing the obvious inspiration

and parallels. Moreover, he subtly subverts the expectation of a too-close imitation of Thucydides' narrative by choice alterations of vocabulary and reversions of tropes. Procopius uses Thucyides as a resource for how to tell history and talk about the world, but not for what to say. That is, his description of the 542 plague showcases his desire to be numbered among the classical historiographers, rather than to simply imitate them.

## **Part II: Procopius and Herodotus, Section 1: the World and its Peoples**

Let us turn now to the other father of history, and explore Procopius' use of Herodotus as a model for history-writing. As we will see, the structure of the *Wars* is in some ways as Herodotean as it is Thuydidean, and while many particular elements of the military narrative were very like those narrated by Thucydides, the bigger picture of Justinian's wars shared more in common with the Persian War. In addition, Procopius enthusiastically embroiders his military narrative with very Herodotean digressions on a variety of subjects, particularly ethnographic and miraculous ones. The characterizations of peoples, as well as some individual persons, are often influenced by Herodotus. Finally, Procopius notably mentions Herodotus explicitly in the course of his narrative—something he does not do in the case of Thucydides—as he weighs in on the longstanding historiographical debate over the proper divisions between Europe, Asia, and Africa (8.6.9-12).

Even though the quotidian features of the campaigns of Belisarius lend themselves so well to Thucydidean modeling (sieges, orations, battles, marches, embassies, and so on), the overall structure of the wars had more in common with Herodotus' Persian War, and Procopius was not blind to this fact. Obviously, to begin with, the first two books narrate events on the Persian front, and the Sassanian kings are portrayed very much like their Achmaenid predecessors. In the Vandal and Gothic wars, too, the Romans are fighting a powerful and tyrannical barbarian foe. While allusions to Herodotus are more common for Cabades,[164] Chosroes,[165] and the Persians, the language used to describe peoples such as the Vandals and Goths also contains Herodotean language, both drawn from descriptions of Persians and others.[166] At 4.5.7, the Vandals are becoming used to the luxury of conqured North Africa, and clothe themselves in "Medic garments, which they now call Seric." On the Persian front and in the west, the armies are in strange, foreign lands, and Procopius borrows Herodotean tropes such as ethnographic digressions, tales of miraculous or wondrous happenings, and historic or mythical references to highlight their different-ness. The first two of these will be discussed presently, the third will be addressed in the next chapter, dealing with Procopius' explicit references to the past.

In structuring his narrative, Procopius turns to some key relevant strategies of Herodotus'. As the army, or narrative, moves into a new geographical area, Procopius will pause to describe the geography of the land, complete with the very Herodotean

---

[164] Braun (1893) 28, 29
[165] Braun (1893) 29, 32
[166] Braun (1893) 24-27, 34

technique of giving relevant distances in days' marches for 'an unencumbered traveler' (εὐζωνῳ ἀνδρί). For instance, from Auximus to "the Egyptian boundaries of the Roman domain" at Elephantine is a journey of 30 days, although before Diocletian the boundary was a further seven days' journey south. (1.19.27-37).[167] This digression on the historical Egyptian boundaries and the tribes thereabout ends with the Herodotean ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν πρότερον λόγον ἐπάνειμι.[168] At the opening of Book III, Procopius gives the distance in days' marches around the entire Mediterranean, in stages, remarking that "Such, then, was the size of the Roman Empire in ancient times" (3.1.13).[169] This is a favorite rhetorical embellishment of Procopius' that we will see again and again, to layer on a explicit reference to the past together with an intertextual one, whether or not the two are directly related, though in this case they are both occasioned by the geographical discussion. It is interesting that while Herodotus' day's marches are 200 *stades* (4.101.9), Procopius' are 210 (3.1.17).[170] We might see in this another example of Procopius seeking to set himself just apart from his predecessors. Perhaps, feeling that his altered distance was more correct or reasonable, he sought to make a contribution, not just to the oeuvre of historiography, but to the craft of it as well.

Similarly, Procopius will give the relevant historical (and occasionally less relevant ethnographic) background to a new group of people at the start of the episode

---

[167] Ἐκ δὲ Αὐξώμιδος πόλεως ἐς τὰ ἐπ᾽ Αἰγῦπτον ὅρια τῆς ῾Ρωμαίων ἀρχὴς, οὗ δὴ πόλις ἡ Ἐλεφαντίνη καλουμένη οἰκεῖται, τριάκοντα ὁδὸς ἡμερῶν ἐστιν εὐζώνῳ ἀνδρί.
[168] pp 83-4 just below
[169] τοσαύτη μὲν ἡ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴ κατά γε τὸν παλαιὸν ἐγένετο χρόνον.
[170] Braun (1893) 20. Procopius further justifies his emendation by saying that this is the distance from Athens to Megara, a detail that Herodotus does not supply

where they are introduced. This can be relatively small-scale, as with the digression on the Eruli (6.14) or the Sclaveni and the Antae (7.14), discussed below, but it also takes place on a much larger scale, leading to large scale structural similarities between Procopius' work and Herodotus'. Like Herodotus' history, Procopius' *Persian Wars* is often structured and narrated from the Persian point of view. The Persian-centric historical background to the Persian wars occupies chapters 2-7 of Book I. The narrative picks up the thread of events in the Roman Empire in chapter 8, which begins, "At that time the emperor Anastasius, upon hearing that Amida was besieged..." (Τότε δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἀναστάσιος πολορκεῖσθαι μαθὼν Ἄμιδαν...) (1.8.1). Particularly in Book 2, the narrative is often advanced from the Persian point of view, as we follow Chosroes' often destructive and occasionally aimless pillaging of the cities of Syria and Asia Minor, as at 2.5. We hear at the outset that this was the end of the thirteenth year of Justinian's reign, but the rest of the book deals with Chosroes' invasion of Roman territory, his siege and capture of the town of Sura, and the story that he allowed the bishop of the neighboring Sergiopolis to buy back the captives of Sura as a favor to a woman of the town with whom he had fallen in love (2.5.28-33).

Furthermore, Procopius uses these techniques elsewhere in his history, not just in the Persian wars, the most obvious place for Herodotean influence. Book III, the first of the *Vandal Wars*, uses the same approach: after a geographical tour of the Mediterranean coastline (3.1.4-19), Procopius narrates the history of the western empire since the days of Honorius, including Alaric's 410 sack of Rome, up through the Vandal seizure of North Africa, by way of providing historical background on the Vandals (3.2-3). He then

narrates the intervening events, including the previous wars between the Vandals and the Eastern Empire, primarily from the barbarian point of view (3.4.1-3.9.9), particularly after the death of Gizeric (3.7.30), sometimes providing little more than a list of emperors to "catch up" the two halves of the empire to the narrative of events in North Africa, as at 3.7.1-4, in which he quickly surveys Anthemius, Olybrius, and Majorinus in the West, and Leo and Zeno in the East.

Procopius's narrative is given a distinctly Herodotean feel by his frequent use of digressions on ethnographic or miraculous subjects.[171] His narrative is only just under way; in fact he is still in the midst of the historical background to his own time, when he pauses to tell the story (ἄξιον) of an extraordinarily large and beautiful pearl, procured for the Persian king Perozes by an intrepid fisherman, and supposedly thrown away by him just before his death in battle, so that no other man might have it (1.4.14-31). There are many more such digressions, some factually pertinent to the narrative, other more rhetorically so: a description of Goths and their customs at the opening of Book III, the first book set on a western front but not the first book of the Gothic wars (3.2.1-6); a history and ethnography of the Eruli (6.14) spawns a further, tangentially related digression on the island of Thule.[172] (6.15); an *Arsenic and Old Lace*-style anecdote about two women in Italy who kill 17 traveling lodgers (6.20.29); an account of using elephants in a siege of Edessa which leads again to another tale concerning Edessa, about a two-headed baby that is surely a portent that the city will be fought over by two

[171] See also Kaldellis (2004), ch 2, "Tales Not Unworthy of Trust."
[172] Which is perhaps Iceland or Scandinavia, Dewing, Loeb vol 5 p 415, n 4

sovereigns, Roman and Persian; and so on. A fuller, though not exhaustive, list is provided at the end of the chapter as Appendix A.

Moreover, the language which Procopius uses to enter and return from these digressions marks them as intentionally Herodotean. Braun records dozens of these verbal echoes, from the very simple, such as τὴν μὲν δὴ... (cf H 1.14.1; P 3.4.1) or τὰ μὲν ... ἔσχε (H 6.31.1 P 1.15.25); to the more elaborate, such as (καὶ) περὶ μὲν ... τοσαῦτα εἰρήσθω (H 2.35.1ff; P 8.3.11). To pick up the main narrative after a digression, Herodotus' ἄνειμι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν πρότερον λόγον (1.140.13) is closely followed by Procopius' ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν πρότερον λόγον ἐπάωειμι (1.4.31), or again, compare Herodotus' ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ἐγένετο χρόνῳ ὕστερον. τότε δὲ.. (6.73.1) with Procopius' ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν χρόνῳ τῷ ὑστέρῳ ἐγένετο. τότε δὲ... (1.20.8). Each of these is only the first or best example of a number of similar usages.[173]

Procopius also uses Herodotean turns of phrase to distance his authorial voice from some of the unusual or controversial stories that he reports. He is fond of Herodotus' technique of inviting others to hold their own opinion, but as for himself, he will tell such-and-such: ἐγω δὲ ... ἔρχομαι ἐρέων (or φράσων) (1.5.11, 1.194.2ff). The most notable of these instances is in Procopius' introduction, discussed above, but Braun notes dozens of instances of these phrases.[174] To express doubt specifically about some of the more fantastical things he retells, he borrows Herodotean phrases of the type

[173] Braun (1893) 9-11
[174] Braun (1893) 13-14

φασὶ ... ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες (cf H 1.82.1ff with P 1.4.14), as with the story of Perzoes' pearl, also discussed above. For uncertainty between two options, Procopius echoes Herodotus' οὐκ ἔχω τὸ ενθεῦτεν ἀτρεκέως εἰπεῖν (2.103.8) as at 3.19.25 or 5.12.2. Thus in the inclusion, but also the handling, of these miraculous tales especially we see Procopius drawing on Herodotus for inspiration in the craft of history-writing, rather than simply language or material.

## Part II: Procopius and Herodotus. Section 2: Mapping the World

Herodotus is the subject, finally, of a unique passage in which Procopius explicitly cites and quotes the father of history. Not only this, but he does so in the context of discussing the use of classical models in contemporary thought. The passage is a fitting one to end our discussion of Procopius and Herodotus, as it includes both issues we have been talking about thus far as well as those that we will see in the next chapter, as we move on to looking at passages in which Procopius discusses outright the differences between past and present and the effects of historical change.

Procopius begins the last book of his history with an extended geographic (and occasionally ethnographic) digression on the kingdom of Lazica and the lands and peoples beyond, in which the Huns play a prominent role. Having discussed the Euxine Sea and the lands that border it, he remarks that this seems to him a good time to mention the opinions concerning the boundary between Asia and Europe. Some say, he reports,

that the Tanais River forms the dividing line, but Procopius refutes this, pointing out that the Tanais rises deep in Europe, and so here and for some portion of its length, the land all around it is Europe. Where then does the river begin forming the boundary between the two continents (8.6.4-6)? Others say the Phasis River performs this function, and Procopius supplies a geographical argument in support of this view: the river empties into the Euxine at the far end, continuing the division between Europe and Asia formed by the Euxine and ultimately Mediterranean Seas (8.6.7-9). These are the arguments, he says, which each side puts forth as they argue (διαμάχονται) over the question. He then goes on:

> Ὡς δὲ οὐ μόνος ὁ πρότερος λόγος, ἀλλὰ καὶ οὗτος, ὅνπερ ἀρτίως ἐλέγομεν, μήκει τε χρόνου κεκόμψευται καὶ ἀνδρῶν τινῶν παλαιοτάτων δόξῃ, ἐγὼ δηλώσω, ἐκεῖνο εἰδὼς ὡς ἐκ τοῦ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἄνθρωποι ἅπαντες, ἥν τινος φθάσωσι λόγου ἀρχαίου πεποιημένοι τὴν μάθησιν, οὐκέτι ἐθέλουσι τῇ τῆς ἀληθείας ζητήσει ἐμφιλοχωροῦντες ταλαιπωρεῖν, οὐδὲ νεωτέραν τινὰ μεταμαθεῖν ἀμφ᾽ αὐτῷ δόξαν, ἀλλὰ ἀεὶ αὐτοῖς τὸ μὲν παλαιότερον ὑγιές τε δοκεῖ καὶ ἔντιμον εἶναι, τὸ δὲ κατ᾽ αὐτοὺς εὐκαταφρόνητον νομίζεται εἶναι καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ γελοιῶδες χωρεῖ. (8.6.9)
>
> But not only the former argument, but also that which I have just stated, can boast, as I shall show, of high antiquity and the support of some men of very ancient times; for I am aware that as a general thing all men, if they first discover an ancient argument, are no longer willing to devote themselves to the labor involved in the search for truth nor to learn instead some later theory about the matter in hand, but the more ancient view always seems to them sound and worthy of honor, while contemporary opinions are considered negligible and are classed as absurd.

Procopius boasts that his position, as well as the opposing one, has the authority of antiquity behind it, while at the same time criticizing those who rely too much on that authority. He elaborates why this is particularly foolish in this instance:

> πρὸς δὲ τούτοις τανῦν οὐ περὶ νοερῶν ἢ νοητῶν τινὸς ἢ ἀφανῶν ἄλλως γίγνεται ζήτησις, ἀλλὰ περὶ ποταμοῦ τε καὶ χώρας· ἅπερ ὁ χρόνος οὔτε ἀμείβειν οὔτε πη ἀποκρύψασθαι ἴσχθσεν. (11) ἥ τε γὰρ πεῖρα ἐγγὺς καὶ ἡ ὄψις ἐς μαρτθρίαν ἱκανωτάτη, οὐδέν τε παρεμποδισθήσεσθαι οἶμαι τοῖς τὸ ἀληθὲς εὑρέσθαι ἐν σπουδῇ ἔχουσιν. (8.6.10–11)
>
> Furthermore, in the present case the investigation is not concerned with any matter to be grasped only by the mind or the intellect, or that is in any other way obscure, but with rivers and lands; these are things which time has not been able either to change or to conceal in any way. (11) For the test is near at hand and vision can provide most satisfactory evidence, and I think no obstacle will be placed in the way of those eager to discover the truth.

Having made his case that autopsy is the better method for detirming truth in such a matter of geography as this, Procopius proceeds directly to summarize and then quote his ancient authority, none other than Herodotus himself:

> ὁ τοίνυν Ἁλικαρνασεὺς Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῇ τῶν ἱστοριῶν τετάρτῃ φησὶ μίαν μὲν εἶναι τῆν γῆν ξύμπασαν, νομίζεσθαι δὲ εἰς μοίρας τε καὶ προσηγορίας τρεῖς διαιρεῖσθαι, Λιβύην τε καὶ Ἀσίαν καὶ Ἐυρώπην. καὶ αὐτῶν Λιβύης μὲν καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας Νεῖλον τὸν Αἰγύπτιον ποταμὸν μεταξὺ φέρεσθαι, τὴν δὲ δὴ Ἀσἰαν τε καὶ Εὐρώπην διορίζειν τὸν Κόλχον Φᾶσιν. εἰδὼς δέ τινας ἀμφὶ Τανάϊδι ποταμῷ ταῦτα οἴεσθαι, καὶ τοῦτο ἐν ὑστέρῳ ἐπεῖπε. καί μοι οὐκ ἀπὸ καιροῦ ἔδοξεν εἶναι αὐτὰ τοῦ Ἡροδότου τὰ γράμματα τῷ λόγῳ ἐνθεῖναι ὧδέ πη ἔχοντα· “Οὐδὲ ἔχω συμβαλέσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μιῇ ἐούσῃ γῇ ὀνόματα τριφάσια κέαται, ἐπωνυμίην ἔχοντα γυναικῶν, καὶ ὁρίσματα αὐτῇ Νεῖλός τε ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ποταμὸς ἐτέθη καὶ Φᾶσις ὁ Κόλχος. οἱ δὲ Τάναϊν ποταμὸν τὸν Μαιήτην καὶ πορθμήια τὰ Κιμμέρια λέγουσιν.” ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ τραγῳδοποιὸς Αἰσχύλος ἐν Προμηθεῖ τῷ Λυομένῳ εὐθὺς ἀρχόμενος τῆς τραγῳδίας τὸν ποταμὸν Φᾶσιν τέρμονα καλεῖ γῆς τε τής Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης. (8.6.12–15)
>
> To proceed, then, Herodotus of Halicarnassus in the Fourth Book of his *History* says that the entire earth is one, but is considered to be divided into three parts, having three separate titles, Libya, Asia, and Europe. (13) And between two of them, on the one hand, Libya and Asia namely, flows the Egyptian Nile, while Asia and Europe, on the other hand, are divided by the Colchian Phasis. But knowing as he did that some thought that the Tanais River performed this

> function, he mentioned this view also afterwards. (14) And it has seemed to me not inappropriate to insert in my narrative the actual language of Herodotus, which is as follows. "Nor am I able to conjecture for what reason it is that, though the earth is one, three names are applied to it which are women's names. And its lines of divison have been established as the Egyptian Nile and the Colchian Phasis. (15) But others name the Tanais River, which empties into the Maeotic Lake and the Cimmerian Strait." Also the tragic poet Aeschylus in the *Prometheus Unbound*, at the very beginning of the tragedy, calls the Phasis River the limit of the land of both Asia and Europe.

This is obviously a complex passage, in which Procopius seems to seek to distinguish himself from those who rely overmuch on the weight of ancient authority in deciding what to believe, but not so far that he will not also cite that authority, particularly when his preferred side is also the side taken by one of the fathers of historiography. He shows himself capable of participating in erudite-for-erudition's sake appeals to classical authority, but is quick to protest that it is not the most important factor to him. The geography has not changed over time, and in a question of geography, the evidence of the senses and of contemporary observation is just as authoritative a source of evidence as ancient opinion, if not more so. In this respect Procopius' attitude toward the present, as compared to the classical past, is quite favorable, but we must also consider his characterization of the opposing opinion, and his statement that "all men" are overly impressed by the weight of ancient authority: this presumably includes, though it is not necessarily limited to, men of his present day. In this sense, he seems to see his contemporaries as less worthy of respect than the authorities they mistakenly follow, inasmuch as the authors of antiquity were at least forming their own opinions on the basis of the evidence available to them at the time.

Thus Procopius portrays a complex and somewhat paradoxical relationship to the classical past in this passage. Just as he has no sooner dismissed reliance on appeals to ancient authority than he makes a careful and detailed one himself, so he suggests that the thinkers of the present ought to know that the present is as good as the past; and, since they do not, that makes the present that much less good. Not for the first or last time, Procopius suggests that we ought not to follow blindly the lead of antiquity, but at the same time, it does provide valuable information and examples, worth mentioning and considering. This suggests that Procopius is perhaps trying to chart a course between two extremes, one that over-valorizes classical authority, modes of thought and communication, and another that disregards them. We will examine these things in more detail in the next chapter, where we will see many more passages in which Procopius talks explicitly about history and the passage of time.

We have seen that while Procopius also turns to Herodotus as well as Thucydides for character description and the like, he is particularly likely to draw inspiration from Herodotus for geographic matters, for the spatial structuring and orientation of his history.[175] Procopius' world is not so unlike Herodotus' world, made up of large empires with smaller politites and cultures at the fringes and intersections of them, with a well-known center and peripharies of varying degrees of unknown (but no less important to history, potentially, for being so unknown). It would seem that Procopius found in Herodotus a useful model for understanding the world: the whole world, the shape of its

---

[175] By contrast, he relies more heavily on Thucydides for temporal orientation: we have already seen his debt to Thucydides for the major events that supply the pacing of his narrative: sieges, speeches, battles, etc; and we will discuss momentarily the allusions and Thucydidean language for years, sesaons, and time of day (pp 95-7 below).

continents, the widening scope of an empire's influence, the diverse cultures of widely dispersed peoples. [176] Quite litterally at 8.6.9-15, as he does figuratively elsewhere, Procopius uses Herodotus as a source for mapping the known world.

## **Part III: Procopius and Other Classical Writers**

Thus far, we have focused on Procopius' intertextual use of Herodotus and Thucydides primarily out of convenience, for by far the most work has been done on the correspondences between his text and these two authors'. There is ample reason to think, though, that Procopius was engaged in allusive endeavors with a host of other ancient authors, historians and otherwise. Indeed, while much of the most exciting recent scholarship on Procopius has been in uncovering and analyzing the impact of these references, there is clearly much more waiting to be uncovered, or rather, rediscovered. While the scolars in the past ten years have brought to light allusions to Xenophon and Plato, Arrian and perhaps Achilles Tatius,[177] we still know little to nothing on the possibilities of Procopius' intertextual use of post-classical Greek authors, or Latin literature.[178] While the endeavor of searching out such allusions is not the the focus of

---

[176] We will study in more detail Procopius' descriptions of diverse peoples and ethnicities below in Chapter Four.

[177] Kaldellis (2004) 247 n 74 comparing *SH* 9.31-32 with Xenophon's *Symposium* 4.25 and Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon* 1.5.6.

[178] Börm suggests Procopius was familiar with Vergil and Sallust, Börm, Henning (2007). *Prokop und die Perser : Untersuchungen zu den römisch-sasanidischen*

this dissertation, we will examine here briefly the work done on this subject thus far, and consider what, if anything, this adds to the understanding of the ways in which Procopius utilized and remembered the work of past historians and how it impacts the larger issue of memory of the classical past in Procopius' history.

By far the most work has been done on Procopius' use of other historians in constructing allusions. We discussed his use of Polybius and Diodorus in his prologue in our Introduction above. Lieberich also details Procopius' extensive use of Diodorus' prologue in the introduction to the *Secret History*, as well as assorted other possible references to both elsewhere in these works and in the *Buildings.*[179] There is little reason to doubt that the whole of Procopius' *Wars* contains many more intertextual references to the rest of these classical historians' works.

Procopius seems to have made extensive use of the works of Xenophon, contrary to longstanding belief.[180] He engages in an intertextual geographical debate with *Anabasis* 4.8.22 as well as Arrian's *Periplus* 11, regarding the distribution of Colchians, Trapexuntines, and other peoples around the Euxine Sea (*Wars* 8.1.7-8).[181] Kaldellis notes several instances of Procopius' allusive use of Xenophon's *Symposium* in his in-

---

*Kontakten in der ausgehenden Spätantike.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag. 46. Also above, n 123.

[179] Lieberich (1900) 4-8

[180] It was thought until recently that Procopius knew only Xenophon's *Cyropaideia,* which he alludes to in the *Buildings*. G. Greatrex (1996a) "Stephanus, the Father of Procopius of Caesarea?" *Medieval Prosopography* 17: 125-145.132 n 12 citing previous bibliography, cf also Pazdernik (2006) 175 n 1.

[181] Dewing vol 5 p 59 n 1

depth analysis of Procopius' covertly conveyed political thought.[182] We have noted above (pp 68-70) Pazdernik's analysis of the correspondences between Procopius' Belisarius and Thucydides' Brasidas.[183] In a more recent article, Pazdernik has anaylzed the intertextual relationship between Procopius and Xenophon in a similar way. He argued that Procopius used the figure of Xenophon's Pharnabazus to construct "an elaborate historical analogy, one that initially appears to involve Pharnabazus and Gelimer, but comes to focus instead upon the analogous positions of Pharnabazus and Belisarius vis à vis their respective monarchs."[184] While Pharnabazus in the *Hellenica* provided a different model for behavior for Beliarius, Procopius here uses his model Xenophon in much the same way he uses Thucydides, as a model for a complex intertextual relationship that allows him to make erudite and covert comments about politics and prominent figures in his own time. It is highly important to the study of Procopius as an author and as a political thinker to identify and study such references,[185] but particular instances such as this do not change substantially our investigation of *how* Procopius utilized his classical referents and classical memory more broadly, beyond,

---

[182] Kaldellis (2004) pp 78-80, p 247 nn 74, 76; Chapter 3, "*The Secret History of Philosophy,"* pp 94-117, pp 251 nn 17-20, 260 n 64, 263 n 130, 265 n 59.
[183] Pazdernik (2000)
[184] Pazdernik, Charles. (2006) "Xenophon's Hellenica in Procopius' Wars: Pharnabazus and Belisarius". *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*. 46 (2): 175-206.
[185] Pazdernik's arguments on the importance of the identification of such references are eloquent: "Yet the recovery of the intertextual dimensions of Procopius' work in this instance is vital because it enables that historian to speak, in a work intended for public consumption at a time when the principals were still alive and therefore in a manner that is necessarily oblique, to the allegiances and motivations of a prominent person at a moment of high political intrigue (175).

again, to note that he drew from many more sources than just Herodotus and Theucydides.

This is certainly not to say that the study of Procopius' references to other classical and perhaps post-classical authors is not relevant to the broad questions this disseratation seeks to address about Procopius' engagement with classical memory. Rather, it is the unfortunate case that the work that has been done thus far only begins to address those questions, and to expand our horizons of understanding Procopius' relationships with the memory of the historians and other authors of the classical past. To illustrate the possibilities of understanding, let us consider in more detail Kaldellis' analysis of Procopius as an astute writer of a nuanced and complex classical history, including his use of classical allusions. In analyzing the series of Herodotean-esque digressions at the start of the *Persian Wars*, Kaldellis argues convincingly that the story of Perzoes' pearl (1.4.14-31), an a-historical fable long puzzling to historians, is a part of a series of vignettes designed to chart the moral decline of Persian kings down to the time of Cabades. Moreover, the story of the pearl links the *pothos,* or unreasonable desire, that is Perzoes' cheif flaw (1.4.17) with the *pothos* of Arrian's Alexander (*An* pref .3), as well as the analysis of the concept found in Plato (*Rep* 572d-579b).[186] Similarly, the references to Xenophon's *Symposiumim* mentioned above are, Kaldellis argues, part of a complex web of allusions and comparisons drawn between Platonic philosophy and the philosophers and would-be philosopher-kings of Procopius' own day.[187]

---

[186] Kaldellis (2004) 75-80; 246 nn 57, 63

[187] Kaldellis (2004) 94-117. Kalldellis makes a strong (though not water-tight) case for Procopius' familiarity with at least the *Republic* and the *Gorgias*. He analyzes the

Kaldellis puts forward a strongly supported and passionately argued case for several instances of Procopius' pervasive and deliberate use of classical sources as referents for making points about particular historical figures, as well as abstract but particularly relevant concepts like tyrrany and political philosophy.[188] Kaldellis' denmonstration of the scope of Procopius' intertextual engagement with his sources, as well as the role of the allusions within larger, classically-inspired literary techniques and philosophical program, expands our understanding of Procopius'intertextual engagement with the classical past into new horizons. That engagement pervaded the breadth and depth of the whole work.

The work of Kaldellis, Pazdernik, and others demonstrates perhaps most of all that there is still much more to uncover regarding Procopius' intertextuality. It will, first, flesh out the arguments and commentary about his contemporary world Procopius sought to make by means of these allusions and engagement with these ideas. When eventually we have a much larger sample of the authors and works which Procopous alluded to, the occasions on which he does, and the ways in which he deploys these references, as well as the points he sought to make about his own day; then we will be able to say something more holistic and more decisve about how he used and related to the wider classical past by means of intertextual references. Then we will also be able to study better how this

---

introductions to both the *Persian Wars* and the *Gothic Wars*, summarizing the latter thus: "The dialogue between Theodahad and Peter caricatures the pretensions of philosopher-kings and reveals the truth about Justinian, casting him as the antithesis of philosophy." (115)

[188] see also Kaldellis (2010a) "Procopius' *Persian War*: a thematic and literary analysis" In Macrides, R. J. *History as literature in Byzantium: Papers from the Fortieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, April 2007.* Surrey, England: Ashgate. 253-273.

intertextual relationship interacts with and forms a part of a broader whole of memory of the classical past in the *Wars*, along with the ways in which memory is conveyed in overt and other ways, which we will come to in the next chapter. So, ironically, though his allusivity is one of the more well-explored areas of Procopius' writing, this is only relative to some other areas of the study of Procopius: there is still much more to be done.

## **Part IV: Intertexts of Time and Space**

Before we turn away from the subject of Procopius' intertextuality, we should pause to consider how Procopius talks about and understands the passage of time and the course of history in ways that are drawn from and indebted to Thucydides and Herodotus. Procopius marks the passage of time in several distinctly Thucydidean ways. Procopius is fond of a Thucydidean phrasing to note a change in place-name over the long sweep of history: "the country of old called ____, but now called ____." (e.g., ἐς τὴν πάλαι μὲν Κομμαγηνὴν, τανῦν δὲ καλουμένην Εὐφρατησίαν)[189] Most noticeable perhaps are the notices of year-endings, which are drawn straight from Thucydides: "Such then was the progress of events in Liguria, and the winter drew to its close, and the third year came to an end in this war, the history of which Procopius has written," τὰ μὲν οὖν ἐν Λιγούροις ἐφέρετο τῇδε καὶ ὁ χειμὼν ἔληγε, καὶ τρίτον ἔτος

---

[189] Braun (1885) 171

ἐτελεῦτα τῷ πολέμῳ τῷδε ὃν Προκόπιος ξυνέγραψε (6.12.41).[190] As Braun notes, these occur only for the Gothic War: fighting on the Persian front was not continuous, but rather a series of Persian inroads and border skirmishes punctuated by periods of truce; while the Vandal War was relatively short and hardly necessitated such notation.[191] The Gothic Wars are also where we find many other Thucydidean phrases which mark a specific time of year or day: ἅμα ἦρι ἀρχομένῳ, "at the beginning of the year/summer," drawn from Thucydides 2.2 and elsewhere, occurs once each in the Persian and Vandal Wars, and five times in the Gothic Wars.[192] The case is similar with ἀμφὶ θερινὰς τροπάς "at about the spring equinox," ἀμφὶ or περὶ δείλην ὀψίαν "around the time of late afternoon," and νυκτὸς ἐπιλαβούσης or a variant thereof, "night drew near."[193]

Conversely, while Procopius lifts a few such phrases from Herodotus' pages, such as περὶ λύχνων ἁφὰς "around the hour when the lamps were lit," (H 7.215.10, P 3.16.10 and 7 further instances), he is more likely to draw from Herodotus vocabulary dealing with the broad sweep of time. These include ἀνέκαθεν "from the beginning," as at (H 5.55.6; P 4.27.16), προιόντος δὲ χρόνου "as time went on" (see below), or τὴν κυρίην τῶν ἡμερέων "on the appointed day" (H 1.48.10; P P 1.25.23).[194] Again,

---

[190] The subsequent notations occur at the following points: 6.22.25 4th year, 6.30.30 5th year, 7.1.49 6th year, 7.5.19 7th year, 7.7.20 8th year, 7.9.23 9th year, 7.11.39 10th year, 7.16.5 11th year, 7.24.34 12 year, 7.29.21 13th year, 7.35.30 14th year, 7.39.29 15th year, 8.21.4 16th year, 8.25.25 17th year.
[191] Braun (1885) 167
[192] Braun (1885) 168
[193] Braun (1885) 168-9
[194] Braun (1893) 18-20

many of these are only the first or the best example of several passages where Procopius uses a given phrase. Interestingly, these intertexts occur most often at moments in the narrative that are either historically significant, or closely concerned with the past, or both. Take, for example, ἐξ οὗ γεγόνασιν ἄνθρωποι in the story of the Sabini inventing a new siege device, never thought of before (P 8.11.27, cf H 6.109.14); or Προιόντος δὲ χρόνου (6.24.1, cf H 3.96.2) during the siege of Rome; or when Alaric captures Rome, Ἐπειδή τε ἡ κυρία παρῆν (3.2.22, cf H 5.50.2).[195] Furthermore, Procopius often uses Herodotean phrasing to describe artifacts or customs which have survived from the ancient past into the present, to be used as evidence in judging the veracity of a tale.[196] As we observed above and will return to below, Procopius sought to invoke his classical predecessors at occasions in the narrative especially concerned with history and the passage of time. These borrowings of language are not merely ornamental; they draw the reader's attention to the engagement with the past that is taking place, a liguistic flag that we are delving into particularly historical territory.[197]

## Part V: Procopius' Explanatory Asides

In addition to his vocabulary and intertextuality, one of the primary features of Procopius' work cited in labeling him as "Classicizing" is his use of conspicuous

---

[195] Below, pp 153-4, pp 226-235, and pp 162-3, 193-4, repectively.
[196] Braun (1893) 15
[197] See above, pp 61-2 on the Thucydidean intertexts at the seige of Naples, and below Chapter Four, pp 183-196

periphrases that seek to explain, and in doing so call attention to, his use of words that do not conform with his Attic style and vocabulary. These explanations are sprinkled liberally throughout all the books of the work, and are often quite brief and simple: at 4.10.4, for example, the term "Bandifer" is explained as "the soldier who carries a general's standard." At 1.18.15 and again at 3.10.18, Easter is referred to as "that feast which the Christians call Easter." Taken together, however, their effect is anything but straightforward.

These explanatory asides, so striking, and to some, awkward, a feature of Procopius' writing, have been variously used by Procopius' scholars to characterize the author's relationship both with the Attic past his style aspires to, and the non-classical elements of his world they seek to explain. Nineteenth century Germans Dahn (1865) and Teuffell (1871) focused on those asides which explained Christian words or usages, such as the feast of Easter above, or at 3.10.18, "one of those priests they call 'bishops,'" and so on. There are also those places in which, rather than employing the modern, Christian term, Procopius found a way to bypass the problem by using an Attic-acceptable substitute: referring to the pope as "the chief priest of the city" of Rome (5.3.5; 5.11.20; 5.25.13),[198] baptism as "the sacred bath" (4.26.25), and the gospels as "the sacred writings of the Christians" (4.21.21). These, as well as Procopius' Attic language and obvious affinity for classical modes of writing and thought, led such

[198] Procopius eschews ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, the usual designation for the bishops of Rome and other leading cities from the fourth century onward, for the more classical-sounding ἀρχιερεύς, not completely inapropriate, as it was the traditional translation for *pontifex maximus.* Cf Sophocles, E. A. *Greek lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine periods: (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100).* Boston: Little, Brown and Co, 1870. 257, and Mason, H. J. *Greek terms for Roman institutions: A lexicon and analysis.* Toronto: Hakkert, 1974. 26.

scholars to see Procopius as an outsider: that is, a pagan, looking in on the unfamiliar world of Christianity. For some time, English-language scholars followed these conclusions more or less closely, as did Dowing (1949) and Evans (1971).

Averil Cameron, in a series of articles and in her 1985 monograph, marked a change in approach on the subject of these explanations, which she refers to as *periphrases*.[199] Cameron has argued convincingly for interpreting these asides as rhetorical strategy, part of Procopius' imitation of classical historiography. Procopius might wish to write a purely Atticizing work, but must on occasion bow to necessity and include some non-Attic word or employ some new word-usage, and so treats it as unfamiliar. He thus apologizes, in a roundabout way, for introducing such an intrusion, and at the same time maintains the pretense that he and his audience are not these same Romans and Christians, but rather would-be Attic observers of strange foreign customs. While I do not disagree with Cameron's analysis, I believe it falls short of explaining the full effect and role of this peculiar feature of Procopius' writing.

It should be noted, firstly, that both approaches focus primarily on Procopius' explanation of Christian terms. Cameron, to be sure, applies her approach passably well to all the asides, but in responding to the earlier interpretation of the specifically Christian ones, she seems to frame her conception of their function in terms of this specific subset. It is important, however, to here pause and examine the breakdown of the types of terms

---

[199] Alan Cameron and Averil Cameron (1964) "Christianity and tradition in the historiography of the late empire." *CQ* 14: 316-28. Averil Cameron (1981) *Continuity and Change in sixth century Byzantium.* Variorum: Collected Studies Series CS143. London. See also *ibid,* (1985) *Procopius and the sixth century*. The transformation of the classical heritage 10. Berkley. Cameron provides her own list of the periphrases as an appendix J to *Agathias.* Oxford: Clarendon. 1970.

that Procopius explains in this way. They fall into three broad groups: Christian words or word-usages, Latin words, and military terminology.[200] Tables are given as Appendicies 2.2-2.4 of the distribution of the asides into these categories. In the overwhelming majority of occasions when Procopius pointedly introduces a non-Attic word into his vocabulary, it is a Latin term, transliterated into Greek. These are primarily either Latin military terms, or the titles of Roman bureacratic and military officials. Given their high numbers, an explanation of Procopius' rhetorical asides ought to take into account the particular nuances of these Roman explanations. Certainly, as Cameron argues, Procopius must be seeking to use these words in a way not completely incongruous with his Attic style. But given the high percentage of Latin terms, a tension between Classical Attic and contemporary (Christian) Greek is obviously not all that is going on here, and Procopius', and his imagined audience's, would-be Attic identity is not all that is at stake. The Latin terms introduce an East-West element to the tensions being played on by these explanations, in addition to the classical-contemporary one.

Before we begin, however, to formulate a new approach, let us look more closely at a number of examples of these asides, keeping in mind two questions, inspired by the two existing approaches. Firstly, to what extent are these asides strictly "rhetorical," that is, unnecessary, practically speaking, and to what extent, if any, could there be real need for the explanations they provide? On the other hand, what is it that Procopius imagines, or pretends, that his audience needs explained to them, and how does this indirect characterization of his audience serve Procopius' ends? We cannot be certain that any

[200] A few examples fall outside these categories, or into a subset of them: peculiar Roman or barbarian usages of Greek terms; several proper names.

member of Procopius' audience would or would not know any given term, but we can make educated guesses about the broad familiarity, or lack thereof, especially of words on the two ends of the spectrum. Still in use Roman military-bureaucratic terms such as *queastor* (1.24.11ff) and *magister* (6.22.24), or *domesticus* (3.11.4ff) are likely to have been fairly widely known, and even more obscure posts and their titles as *optio* (3.6.1ff) and *excubitores* (4.12.17) may be supposed to have been recognizable to the career bureaucrats of the Constantinopolitan literary elite, but not perhaps to others. *Foederati*, at 8.5.13-14, were a major factor in late antique geopolitics, though perhaps the Latin meaning of *foedera* would have been less commonly known. The Latin *busta*, as in the place-name *Busta Gallorum* (8.29.4-9), would likely have been fairly obscure.

We may say, therefore, that while many of these asides provide an explanation that is likely only stylistically necessary, others would seem to introduce genuinely uncommon, unfamiliar terms (or potentially unfamiliar background information on familiar terms). The explanation of the words, then, is of varied necessity, but what about Procopius' use of them in the first place? Let us take a moment more to consider how necessary to his narrative it might have been for our author to employ these terms at all. Introducing the term *agesta* for a type of siege-mound (2.26.29) would seem to have been called for, as Procopius can only further identify it as "the thing they were making" (τὸ ποιούμενον) in his explanation. It is often the case, however, with the Latin military and bureaucratic terminology that Procopius goes out of his way to introduce the foreign word. Take, for example, the aside at 3.10.3: ὅ...ἔπαρχος, ὅν δὴ πραίτωρα καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι ("The prefect, whom the Romans call 'praetorian.'").

ἔπαρχος, for 'prefect,' or more commonly in this period, ὕπαρχος, can refer to the *praefectus praetorio* with no further designation, but Procopius choses to supply also a transliteration of the Latin.[201] Similarly, he provides τὰ Τρία Φᾶτα, "for thus the Romans are accustomed to call the Moirai," when he could have simply referred to the Fates as Moirai and left it at that (5.25.20). The meaning of *busta* at 8.29.4-9 adds historical interest to the description of the place-name, rather than providing necessary information.

We might thus ask why Procopius chose to include these words at all. Certainly, a desire for historical accuracy and exactitude would seem to be at work, a rather Thucydidean concern for the military details. The inclusion of such terminology lends an embedded-journalist style verisimilitude to the narrative: we feel we are there with him, acting as aide to Belisarius and encountering Latin place-names in the landscape of Italy. Moreover, Procopius' use of the proper military terminology perhaps suggests a certain pride in the distinctly Roman identity of the army:[202] Procopius' pride, and his audience's also. Just so the Latin place-names convey an interest and pride in the Roman history of the landscape through which Procopius' narrrative moves, but as we will see when we turn to Procopius' treatment of the issues surrounding Roman identity Chapter Four, pride in sixth-century *Romanitas* is complicated by a burden of responsibility. Here, in making a point of using these Latin words, he asserts that they are worth knowing and using, and his readers ought to know them. Furthermore, in assuming or pretending that

---

[201] Mason, H. J. *Greek terms for Roman institutions: A lexicon and analysis.* Toronto: Hakkert, 1974. 138-9.

[202] Rather than, for instance, the Peloponnesian army of Thucydides.

his readers do not know them by explaining them in his asides, we can see a subtle critique of those readers and the state of *Romanitas* among them, either in truth or in shared affectation. Procopius' use of Latin terms works to both Romanize his narrative and problematize his audience as Romans, in that they need Roman terms explained to them.

Procopius uses these asides to "play with" his characterization of his audience: they both are and are not Roman, an idea we will see much more of when we look at the more explicit statements Procopius makes about Rome and Romans. For now, however, let us consider further how Procopius uses his periphrastic asides more broadly to imaginatively characterize his audience. The most arresting difference between the Latin and the Christian terms which are explained is that the Christian terms were presumably already familiar to most, if not all, of Procopius' contemporary audience. These would seem to be rhetorically rather than practically necessary, as our author distances himself from the realities of the Christian world around him, and invites his readers to do the same. They also, by their stark descriptions of familiar practices (baptism as "the sacred bath" (4.26.25), for example) invite Procopius' readers to consider these things from the outside, from a historic, and indeed, pagan point of view. By referring to bishops as "priests" (3.1.18) and the bishop of Rome as the city's "chief priest" (5.3.5), Procopius encourages his readers to consider how the two were alike and different, not necessarily simply to pretend that they were the same. When we consider the last group of asides, those that are neither Latin nor Christian terms, we find some that are terms for military technology, which function similarly to the Latin ones discussed above. They often

provide useful, though not strictly speaking necessary, information to the reader (as, for example, *ballistae* at 5.21.14). Others seem to explain a term not because the word or usage is expected to be unfamiliar to Procopius' audience but because the explanation is. Procopius' lengthy explanation of the usage of "Delphix" and "palace" at 3.21.2, or the rock shaped like and named for an elbow at 6.13.7 have all the air of giving interesting background for its own sake, rather than serving the needs of the advancing narrative.

The asides are then partly a practical, and partly a rhetorical device, an indication to the reader that we, author and audience together, are conceptually stepping outside the framework of Christianity and modernity, outside of a world where Christianity is the pervasive, state-sanctioned religion. Procopius need not intend that the world he presents within his narrative be anything other than this, anything other than what it is, but he positions his narrative voice as conceptually exterior to it.

One of the questions that then remains is precisely where and how Procopius is situating his audience and himself as a narrator; where and when we are invited to imaginatively position ourselves, as we read the text. From his "pretending" that we do not know Latin or Christian terms and maintaining a clearly high Attic style, Cameron argues that Procopius conceives of his imagined audience as citizens of classical Athens, fresh from reading Thucydides. In addition to the Latin and Christian explanations, several other asides fit in with this model. For example, at 3.6.10, the place-name "Mercurium" is explained by pointing out that "Mercurius" is what the Romans call Hermes (the present tense is interesting). In discussing the Franks, Procopius adds the

side comment that these are the same group at the "Germans" that would be familiar to readers of classical historiography (5.11.29).

However, not all of Procopius' periphrases assume a Classical Athenian audience: he is not always consistent in his implicit characterization, suggesting perhaps that no one historical audience or context is meant or imagined. The many explanations of Latin terms that we have discussed assume a non-Latin speaking audience, but Procopius leaves unexplained many realities of living in the Roman Empire, which an imagined Athenian audience would of course not have known, but which his contemporary readers would have. For example, at 7.32.15, he describes a Justinus as one who had "risen to the dignity of the consular chair not long before." On the other hand, Procopius at times uses the formula to explain words that do have an appropriately classical pedigree. At 5.21.6, he speaks of "four [seige] engines which are called rams," although κρίος is found as "battering-ram" in Xenophon (*Cyr.* 7.4.1) as well as the animal in Homer (*Od.* 9.447,461) and Herodotus (2.42ff), among others. Here, it would seem that Procopius is explaining a term he expected to be unfamiliar to his contemporary audience, though he may be simply calling attention to the figurative nature of the term. He uses the same phrasing for several other siege devices in short order: the non-classical βαλλιστρα at 5.21.14, and the figurative wild asses and wolves at 5.21.19.

In another interesting variation on the usual formula of explanation, Procopius gives an unusually *explanatory* description of the city of Naples: "...they came upon a city on the sea, Naples by name, which was strong not only because of the nature of its site..." (5.8.5). Procopius would seem to be explaining the city to an audience that was

unfamiliar with it. However, this would not be necessary with an assumed Athenian audience: Neapolis was an archaic colony, and a classical Athenian audience likely *would* have heard of the city. Here we have a complex interaction between, on the one hand, the various historical contexts in which Procopius might situate his audience, and on the other, the realities of his contemporary audience, producing a unique authorial stance. Can we say whether Procopius offers an explanation about Naples because he imagines (mistakenly or not) a conceptual audience that would not know about the foundation of Neapolis, or because he fears that his Byzantine audience would not have heard of the contemporary city? We might imagine that, in crafting an explanation for the latter group, he styled the aside so that it had the appearance of being for the former.

Procopius' aside addresses to his audience are then related to particular historical times, including his own, and function to situate his audience ultimately in what Anthony Kaldellis has called Procopius' "transhistorical context of classical historiography."[203] A tension exists in Procopius' writing, between an effort to relate to particular of his models, especially Thucydides, and to create a timeless work (which needs to have a timeless audience), all while serving his actual, contemporary audience, without whom his work would not be read, appreciated, and preserved in the first place, offering it the opportunity to become a timeless, lasting work.

Lastly, a handful of these asides do not simply explain either a linguistic/cultural difference or a temporal one, but reference a difference that is both. At 2.21.9, Procopius makes the curious statement, by way of explanation, that "Caesar" is what the Persians

---

[203] Kaldellis (2010a) 18

call the emperor. Somewhat similarly, at 5.1.25, Procoipus explains, in talking about Theoderic, that "rex" (ῥήξ) is what barbarians are accustomed to call their kings, without mentioning the Latin, Roman origin of the term. Now, while we might suspect whether or not Procopius' audience would have been familiar with Latin terms such as praetorian prefect (3.10.3) or queastor (7.40.43), surely "Caesar" as a title for the emperor is right up there with "Senate" in being an explanation that is only rhetorically called for. For the "Caesar" remark as for the "rex," what is noteworthy is the detail provided of *who* uses the term.

These remarks call readers' attention to the cultural shift that has taken place over time: whereas once Romans called the emperor "Caesar," now it is a group of outsiders, the Persians no less, who do so. The case with the "rex" comment is more complex. In explaining a transliterated Latin term,[204] Procopius might just be keeping up his Atticizing pretense, or he may be offering a practical explanation to his contemporary audience. In considering the latter, though, we should keep in mind that at least some of Procopius' intended audience would have been, like himself, educated in the classics and aware of the weighty cultural baggage attached to the term *rex* for the ancient Romans. These need not be mutually exclusive: the aside can work on several levels. If at least some part of Procopius' audience were familiar with the Latin origins and history of the word, it makes the round-about explanation all the more pointed: Italy once again has a *rex*, that institution anathema to the ancient Romans, because the Roman empire has

[204] ῥήξ may also have been the Greek transliteration of the Gothic word, but the resonnance with the Latin likely would not have been lost on those of Procopius' audience keen enough to pick up on either connection.

failed to protect and secure its western provinces from the barbarians. The nuance the remarks add to the text is destabilizing: the barbarians have appropriated Roman titles, and the Romans, by contrast, have lost those titles over time.

By the placement and tenor of these explanations, Procopius calls attention to these terms and their changed usages, and changed users. These asides also have the effect of further destabilizing the temporal perspective of the narrator and the audience: they assume a knowledge of the past (that in which the terms were used by the Romans) without referring explicitly to it, but comment ultimately on a contemporary situation. The same can be said for the whole group of Procopius' explanatory periphrases. In referencing the past in one way or another, they argue for its importance and often implicitly privilege the past, but they call attention to the change that has taken place: they call up an illusion that we are a past audience, but with the same pen-stroke they make it impossible to get lost in that illusion.

## Conclusions

We have seen, then, that Procopius draws on his classical predecessors in a variety of ways, from the minute to the quite large-scale. He borrows elements from vocabulary and characteristic phrases such as Thucydidean year-endings or Herodotean days' marches to give his text an appropriately classical feel. He built up between his text and his predecessors' erudite comparisons of character, and used his classical model as a

springboard to subtley but purposefully establish his own history as independent of, though inspired by, theirs (as with the plague narrative). He took as given that, in writing a classical historiography, he was expected to allude to the greats of the genre, but he chose to do so in purposeful and sometimes unexpected ways. Moreover, he showed concern for addressing the problems of the classicizing enterprise, as he used the stylistic device of the rhetorical asides to highlight his audience's wide chronological separation, both from the ideal of a classical Athenian audience, and from their own professed Roman roots.

There is an unavoidable tension in Procopius' works (and perhaps in all latter-day historiography) between the past and present. History-writing is necessarily concerned with events that took place in the past, but its ultimate goal is to explain how the circumstances of the present came to be. This primacy of the present is all the more strained by the lengthy tradition of classical history-writing Procopius chose to partake in. While he sought to engage meaningfully with the thousand-year-old landmark texts of his predecessors, he was manifestly concerned with current events and the attitudes and identity of his contemporary audience, as we will see more and more as we proceed. We have seen that Procopius sought to use his predecessors as models for thought and analysis, as well as for particular attitudes toward the past. In his agreement with these fathers of history that those who automatically value the past over the present are foolish, Procopius walked a fine line between classicism and hypocrisy, but I believe he navigates it successfully. In all his conscious, classicizing habits and his classical attitudes and approach, Procopius sought, not merely to imitate the works of Thucydides and

Herodotus and others, but to produce a work that could justly be counted among their number. Procopius obviously saw great value in the worldview and approach of classical historiography, and one of the elements of that approach that deeply influences his work was the measured consideration of the value of the past itself and its appropriate role in informing, but not dictating, present action and thought.

Indeed, we might go so far as to speculate that this concern played a large role in Procopius' choice to utilize a classicizing method and framework for his history: because of the model for undertanding the past's role in and relationship to the present that it provided. As an author who chose to compose a lengthy and involved undertaking of a history, one of the most significant things we can say about Procopius, outside of the biographical details he provides about himself in the narrative, is that he was deeply interested in the present's relationship to the past. Given then that he chose to write a classicizing history, we can be sure that he greatly valued something about the genre, and that he believed, moreover, that there was something important about the *ancient* past's relationship to the present. As we will see when we move on to explore Procopius' explicit statements about the past in a moment, he is very much concerned with making the classical past relevant to his own day.

**Chapter Three: the Past in Procopius**

Classiczing language and gestures are not, of course the only way that Procopius weaves memories of the ancient past into the fabric of his history. We will look in this chapter at the way in which our author's attitute toward the ancient past is reflected in the explicit references to past eras that he makes, as well as at statements which illustrate his understanding of the functioning of historical change and the effects of the passage of time. These all inform our understanding of the constructed relationship between (ancient, remembered) past and remembering present that is at the heart of what is meant by "historical memory" of the ancient world in the present study. More specificly, though, historical memory is two sides of one coin, both of which can be observed in the passages studied in this chapter. First, it is contemporary cultural memory embedded in a work of history, and transmuted therby into a more lasting, but more static, form of memory. We will see an example of such transmission with the so-called "ship of Aeneas" and other memorials encountered by Procopius (8.22.8-16, pp 122ff below). Historical memory is also the memory of the genre of history-writing, an ongoing dialogue in the construction of the distant past which forms a backdrop to the events of the immediate past around which a work of historiography is structured.[205] Procopius'

[205] To return to a subject broached in the Introduction, this informs the way in which we are, in the present study, demarcating the ancient past of historical memory from the immediate past events that are the main narrative of the history, as well as the grey area of the events that are presented by Procopius as background to the events of the narrative. We do not consider those last here, as they are in that sense a part of the main narrative. (Procopius' presentation of them would of course be a worthy object of study, but one that is outside this endeavor.) In the Assmanns' terms, we are interested not the

engagement with the historiographical tradition on questions of the migration of peoples and the shifts in names and the meaning of words (pp 127-141 below) reflect just such processes of memory. Meanwhile many episodes and statements, like the stories surrounding the legendary king Abgar (2.12.6-30, pp 115 below), illustrate the interaction of these two strands of the construction of historical memory, as we will see.

This chapter aims to collect and examine statements in the *Wars* that implicate the memory of the ancient past in some way, and to consider the picture of Procopius' understanding of the ancient world that is constructed thereby, as well as its relationship to Procopius' present.[206] We will also interrogate the functioning of memory in Procopius' text, and the impact of the ways in which historical memory is deployed on that understanding of the past, and its reverse. In an attempt to be throrough while maintaining coherence of argument, the passsages considered are organized by type of reference or statement, rather than in the order they appear in the text. Thus, we will return to some passages several times as they bear on multiple themes, while the full

---

communicative memory of events in living memory, but in the cultural memory of events beyond it.

[206] In considering those instances where Procopius makes explicit reference to some element, an event or person, from the distant past, I say "past" rather than "history" for, as we will see, Procopius' references to the mythic past function in similar, if not identical, ways to those to the historic past. Whether Procopius considered the events of legend to be factually, historically true, they were undeniably a part of the classical heritage coming down to him out of the ancient past. These myths were, as it were, the history of the past: the cultural memories of the ancient Greeks and Romans, located by them in their own past, and so inescapably a part of Procopius' as well. What is more, Procopius occasionally pauses to meditate on the place of mythology in history-writing, and the complexities and uncertainties involved in dealing with the *longe durée* of the classical past. The comments he makes on this score complicate the very inclusion of mythological material in his own text, and ought to be considered fully to better understand Procopius' use of historical and mythological references throughout the work.

discussion of a selection of others will best be postponed until they can be discussed in their full context, in the next chapter.

To proceed, we will look first at references to an element of the historic past, comparing references to ancient Greek history to those to elements of Roman history, for these are some of the most obvious ways in which Procopius works the memory of the ancient world into the fabric of his narrative. We will then turn to Procopius' references to the pre-historic, that is, the mythic past, examining first those occasions where he uses the reference as a jumping-off point for an extended meditation or argument on the place of myth in history. We will pause there to consider a related set of statements which consider the nature of historical change, many but not all of which also deal with the mythological past, before turning to the full list of mythological references. Next, a collection of comparisons Procopius makes between the ancient past and the present continues our investigation of his depiction of historical change, begun in the midst of discussing the mythological references. Finally, we will consider occasions when Procopius meditates on what is lost with the passage of time, and what survives.

As we study the historical memory presented by Procopius, and especially those cultural memories preserved by means of his text, we should be mindful of the dynamic nature of the construction of social memory, and consider how Procopius' history reflects the processes, and not simply the static fact, of historical memory.[207] If any individual's,

---

[207] An emphasis on social memory as a collection of dynamic processes is found in the work of a number of recent social memory theorists including Jeffrey Olick and Geoffrey Cubitt. See this Introduction, pp __, and further Olick, "Introduction" in J. Olick (ed.), *States of Memory: Continuities, Conflicts and Transformations in National Retrospection.* Durham, 2003 pp 6-7; and Cubitt 14-16, 199-203 for concise overviews.

and any generation's, social memory is constructed and influenced by those of preceeding generations, then Procopius, standing as he does at the end of a long line of classical historians remembering a classical past, presents an invaluable example for the study of how these remembrances evolve over the long stretch of time.[208] What is more, a given representation of the past is not necessarily simply built on the shoulders of a preceeding one, but "forged in tension with possible alternative conceptions," whether earlier or contemporary.[209] It will prove enlightening, as we proceed, to analyze the ways in which Procopius' picture of the past might be responding to, and competing with, other possible understandings of the ancient past of which he was aware.

## Part I: References to the Historic Past

To begin with, we will consider those instances where Procopius makes explicit reference to some person or event associated with a particular historical period.[210] These can be divided into two broad categories: those to Greek and those to Roman history.[211]

---

[208] A common starting-point for memory theorists, cf Halbwachs (1980) 45-49, Cubitt 199-203

[209] Cubitt 201

[210] As with the exlanatory asides collected in Chapter Two, I have endeavored to make the lists of these references (collected in Tables 3.1-3) exhaustive, but I cannot imagine I have succeeded in making them complete.

[211] Those few anecdotes which implicate other historical periods and cultures tend to bring the story back through Greco-Roman history in some way. We will discuss below the digression into Carthaginian history at 4.10.13-29. There are a few references to Judeo-Christian history as well: the treasures of Solomon are followed from the sack the temple of Jerusalem to Rome and then the hoards of the Visigoths (5.12.41-42); a lengthy

For all that the classical tradition of Greek historiography, as we have seen, is central to Procopius' history; classical Greek history itself, and indeed Greek history generally, plays a relatively small part in Procopius' actual narrative and his constellation of historic references. Reckoning generously, one might count as many as seven, but five passages stand out as clearly referencing classical and Hellenistic figures (Table 3.1).[212] At 8.6.9-12, discussed in the last chapter, Procopius explicitly names Herodotus and Aeschylus as sources in his discussion of the true boundary between Asia and Europe, even as he ridicules other authors for their appeals to classical sources for their authority. Later in the same book, he notes that statues by "Pheidias the Athenian" and Lysippus, as well as "the calf of Myron" decorate the Forum of Peace in Rome; they were brought there because "the ancient Romans took great pains to make all the finest things of Greece adornments of Rome" (8.21.10-17).[213] As we will discuss further below, their presence

---

digression about the Edessan king Abgar is made up of both an episode involving the Emperor Augustus (2.12.6-19) and a popular tale of a letter from Christ, promising health to the king and (possibly) protection for the city from barbarians (2.12.20-30). On Procopius' interest in Christian religion and history, or lack therof, see Cameron (1985) 113-133.

[212] The tables at the end of the chapter provide the Greek quotation and English translation for the most relevant selection of each passage. I have included a fuller quoation for some passages in the footnotes, where such context may be relevant.

[213] ἔστι δέ τις ἀρχαία πρὸ ταὐτης δὴ τῆς ἀργορᾶς κρήνη, καὶ βοῦς ἐπὶ ταύτης χαλκοῦς ἕστηκε, Φειδίου, οἶμαι, τοῦ Ἀθηναίου ἢ Λυσίππου ἔργον. ἀγάλματα γὰρ ἐν χώρῳ τούτῳ πολλὰ τούτοιν δὴ τοῖν ἀνδροῖν ποιήματά ἐστιν. οὗ δὴ καὶ Φειδίου ἔργον ἕτερον· τοῦτο γὰρ λέγει τὰ ἐν τῷ ἀγάλματι γράμματα. ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὸ τοῦ Μύρωνος βοΐδιον. ἐπιμελὲς γὰρ ἐγεόνει τοῖς πάλαι Ῥωμαίοις τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὰ κάλλιστα πάντα ἐγκαλλωπίσματα Ῥώμης ποιήσασθαι.
And there is a certain ancient fountain before this forum, and a bronze bull stands by it, the work, I think, of Pheidias the Athenian or of Lysippus. For there are many statues in this quarter which are the work of these two men. Here, for example, is another statue which is certainly the work of Pheidias; for the inscription on the statue says this. There

in this passage both makes a case for continuity over the long period between classical Athens and 6th century Rome and highlights the current threats to that continuity.

Two references in the *Persian Wars* connect locations in the narrative to Alexander the Great and his successors: first, Procopius notes that the Caspian Gates were fortified by Alexander:[214]

> ὅπερ ἐπειδὴ ὁ Φιλίπου Ἀλέξανδρος κατενόησε, πύλας τε ἐν χώρῳ ἐτεκτήνατο τῷ εἰρημένῳ καὶ φυλακτήριον κατεστήσατο.(1.10.8-10)
>
> When this [the ease with which invaders could enter through the pass] was observed by Alexander, the son of Philip, he constructed gates in the aforesaid place and established a fortress there.

Later, he informs us that the cities of Selucia and Ctesiphon were built by the Macedonians after Alexander:

> οἱ δὲ αὐτὸν καταλαμβάνουσιν ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις, οὗ δὴ πολίσματα δύο Σελεύκειά τε καὶ Κτησιφῶν ἐστι, Μακεδὀνων αὐτὰ δειμαμένων οἳ μετὰ τὸν Φιλίππου Ἀλέξανδρον Περσῶν τε ἦρξαν καὶ τῶν ταύτῃ ἐθνῶν. (2.28.4)
>
> ...And they overtook him in Assyria, at the place where there are two towns, Seleucia and Ctesiphon, built by the Macedonians who after Alexander, the son of Phillip, ruled over the Persians and the other nations there.

These passages have in common with those above the fact that the classical references are all occasioned by the geographical location of the narrative: when it is not the physical location of some portion of the Roman army, they come in the course of geographic and ethnographic background, as with the citation of the classical authors.[215]

---

too is the calf of Myron. For the ancient Romans took great pains to make all the finest things of Greece adornments of Rome.

[214] Historically inaccurate, as Greatrex (1996b) observes, n 3.

[215] cf Cubitt 204ff on spatial relationships, rather than chronological narrative, as connections between symbolic points of focus.

With the last of the Greek references this is not the case, and it is unique in other ways as well. In discussing Justinian's expansionist policies, Procopius remarks that the criticisms laid against him would seem like praise in the different context of a "worthy" monarch, such as Cyrus or Alexander. The comparison comes in the course of a good classically inspired episode of foreign court and diplomatic intrigue, and is the final element in a carefully constructed series of reversals of viewpoints that contextualizes and relativizes different interpretations of Justinian's imperialist policies. Characteristically, the thread of the narrative in the beginning of Book 2 follows Chosroes, the Persian king. Vittigis, the Gothic monarch, has sent an embassy to Chosroes, lambasting Justinian's imperialistic expansion in Europe, and urging Chosroes, for his own kingdom's sake, to break the current peace treaty and preventatively attack while the Roman forces are still engaged in Italy, so that Justinian will be obliged to fight a war on two fronts. Chosroes willingly allows himself to be convinced,

> φθόνῳ γὰρ ἐς Ἰουστινιανὸν βασιλέα ἐχόμενος, λογίζεσθαι ὡς ἥκιστα ἔγνω ὅτι δὴ πρὸς ἀνδρῶν Ἰουστινιανῷ βασιλεῖ δυσμενῶν μάλιστα οἱ λόγοι ἐς αὐτὸν γένοιτο. ἀλλὰ τῷ βούλεσθαι ἐς τὸ πεισθῆναι αὐτόμολος ἦλθεν. (2.2.12-13)

> ..for, moved as he was by envy toward the emperor Justinian, he neglected completely to consider that the words were spoken to him by men who were the bitter enemies of Justinian. But because he wished the thing he willingly consented to be persuaded.

Having "revealed," perhaps needlessly, to the audience how biased and untrustworthy the envoy's arguments are, Procopius goes on to further relativize the portrait they paint of Justinian's activities:

> καίτοι τοιαῦτα Ἰουστινιανῷ ἐπεκάλουν ἐγκλήματα, ἅπερ ἂν εἰκότως βασιλεῖ γενναίῳ ἐγκώμια εἴη, ὅτι δὴ τὴν βασιλείαν τὴν

> αὑτοῦ μείζω τε ποιῆσαι καὶ πολλῷ ἐπιφανεστέραν ἐν σπουδῇ ἔχοι. ταῦτα γὰρ καῖ Κύρῳ ἄν τις ἐπενέγκοι τῷ Περσῶν βασιλεῖ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ Μακεδόνι. ἀλλὰ γὰρ φθόνῳ τὸ δίκαιον οὐδαμῆ εἴωθε ξυνοικίζεσθαι. (2.2.14-15)
>
> And yet they were bringing as charges against Justinian the very things which would naturally be encomiums for a worthy monarch, namely that he was exerting himself to make his realm larger and much more splendid. For these accusations one might make also against Cyrus, the king of the Persians, and Alexander, the Macedonian. But justice is never accustomed to dwell together with envy.

However, this seemingly positive reappraisal of Justinian and his imperial program is not as straightforward as it might appear at first glance, but is instead in keeping with the back-and-forth relativizing of the preceding passages. As Anthony Kaldellis points out, the would-be reappraisal is weakened by being phrased in the grammatical construction optative + ἄν, giving it a potential, conditional sense and refraining from outrightly praising Justinian.[216] Additionally, the key phrase here is "for a worthy monarch," these charges *would* be encomia: it is by no means proven that Justinian *is* such a worthy. Finally, the rulers Procopius volunteers—Cyrus and Alexander—are themselves problematic as examples of that category (Kaldellis' phrase for Alexander is the very appropriate "an ambivalent moral figure"). This would appear, rather than a subtle compliment to Justinian, to be an even subtler backhanded criticism, likening him to the sometimes tyrannical, but never boring, Cyrus and Alexander the Great. Procopius uses the references to the two historical monarchs to nuance and encode his appraisal of Justinian's imperialist policies.

---

[216] Kaldellis (2007) 260-262.

We see a trend beginning in these Greek history references that we will continue to see throughout the chapter. References to a particular past era are usually occasioned by some sort of physical feature in the landscape though which Procopius' narrative moves. His inclusion of points of historical interest—who first fortified the Caspian Gates, the provenance of the statues in a forum of Rome—links the present-day landscape of his history with the millennia of history which have already played out on that same stage. It historicizes the landscape through which the narrative, and the Roman armies, move, linking past and present. These references also serve to connect the wider Mediterranean world in which the *Wars* take place with specifically Greek history. However, the fact that there are only these few references in all the eight books of the history indicates that such a project, linking classical Greek history with the events and landscape of the contemporary world, was not a project Procopius considered very important, or perhaps very feasible. It is likely significant, furthermore, that the majority of the references are not to *Classical* Greece, strictly speaking, but to Alexander the Great and his Hellenistic successors. Especially since the only non-landscape inspired reference is to Cyrus and Alexander, it would seem that monarchs and concerns about tyranny were the elements of Greek history most relevant to sixth century interests and experience.[217]

---

[217] A Byzantine disinterest in classical Greece and Republican Rome, in favor of more relatable periods featuring kings and other monarchs, was first charted as it developed from John Malalas through later Byzantine choniclers in Elizabeth Jeffreys' "The Attitudes of Byzantine Chroniclers towards Ancient History," *Byzantion* 49 (1979), 199-238 esp. 205-7, 226-9. See also R. Scott "Malalas' View of the Classical Past," in *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity,* G. Clarke, ed. Rushcutters Bay, 1990. 150; and G.

* * * *

Turning to the references to the Roman past, collected in Table 3.2, the first thing one notices is how many there are: they outnumber the Greek references approximately five to one.[218] They range in time from tales and artefacts of Aeneas to recent memories of the emperor Zeno and the Gothic Gizeric, invoked in letters of their successors Justinian and Gelimer. Some references are relatively simple, such as a mention of the goddess Hestia at 2.24.2[219] (interestingly, this comes in a book of the *Persian Wars*), or the observation that the Massagetae are now called the Huns (3.11.9) and cannot individually bear much interpretive weight beyond to say that they foster an aura of scholarly erudition and *Romanitas*. There are as well the rather subtly classical references, as when Vittigis addresses "the Senate and the people of Rome" at 5.11.26. Procopius here shows one of his actors manipulating Roman cultural memories for his own purposes, but Vittigis' particular agenda in his speech is not as important to us as to note that elements drawn from the classical past held cultural cachet for the actors in Procopius' history (Roman and non-Roman alike), and of course for his readers as well.

Roman history is sometimes involved indirectly, as when Procopius narrates the history of a particular people in a digression, as with the Moors at 4.10.12-29. Procopius first refers to the Biblical story of Moses and the coming of the Israelites into

---

Greatrex 1996b n 16. . See also pp 12-8 below on Procopius' treatment of Roman history.

[218] A different compartative approach was taken by Greatrex (1996b), see above pp 23-4, below 283-5.

[219] See Table 3.2 for quotation of this and the following.

"Phoenicia," under the command of Joshua. After relating the Phoenicians' flight from Joshua, through Egypt into Libya, he tells how they became known as the Moors: they were eventually joined, and later conquered by, Dido and the Carthaginians, who were then conquered by the Romans, and then the Vandals. While the main thrust of the story is the background history of the Moors, with an interesting involvement of biblical and classical mythology, the Romans are naturally involved somewhere along the line.

As with the references to Greek history and culture, many Roman ones are occasioned by a geographical location in the narrative, often in or proximate to the city of Rome itself. Hadrian's tomb is mentioned several times (5.22.13, 7.36.7-15, and 8.33.14); and the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (3.5.4), the "House of Sallust" (3.2.24), the Appian Way (5.14.6-8), and a bridge over the Narnus built by Augustus (5.17.11) are all landmarks that are strongly associated with Rome's classical past. They are often mentioned to note that they are either still extant, as with the House of Sallust, or have been damaged or destroyed, as was the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (by Gizeric, in 455).

The passage describing the statues in the Forum of Peace at 8.21.10-17, mentioned in the previous section, links memories of the Greek and Roman pasts of the 6th century empire in an account of the histories of the classical statues brought from Greece at the height of the empire to decorate the capital: "for the ancient Romans took great pains to make all the finest things in Greece adornments to Rome." In another passage which very purposefully connects the ancient past *through* the more recent past up to Procopius' present, Procopius lovingly describes the "Ship of Aeneas" at 8.22.8-16, supposedly painstakingly preserved in Rome through the centuries; we will look more

closely at this passage at the end of the chapter. In these passages and others,[220] the statues and other objects serve as physical encapsulations of cultural memory, which is transmuted, by way of Procopius' *ekphrasis,* into historical memory.

The inclusion of some references appears quite natural, as the army (or narrative) moves through Rome and its environs: for instance, the impressiveness of the bridge over the Narnus built by Augustus (5.17.11) is mentioned in the context of Vittigis' consideration of the difficulties of invading Narnia. In other cases, though, the inclusion of that particular nugget of Roman cultural memory is more of a stretch. At 7.18.19, Procopius mentions Cannae, "where they say the Romans in ancient times suffered their greatest disaster at the hand of Hannibal the general of the Libyans," not because the Roman army has come there, but because they have captured Canusium, which is some twenty five stades distant from Cannae. Similarly, Procopius notes at 5.14.6-8 that Belisarius was taking his troops from Rome to Naples via the *Latin* Way, leaving the Appian Way on the left, and takes the opportunity to describe the *Appian* Way at a length of some thirty lines.[221] Elsewhere, Procopius has to go to some lengths to explain to his readers the historical importance of a place, or the connection between the history and the place(-name). Led by Narses, the Romans camp

> ἐν χωρίῳ ὁμαλῷ μέν, λόφους δὲ ἄγχιστἀ πη περιβεβλημένῳ πολλούς, ἵνα δή ποτε στρατηγοῦντα Ῥωμαίων Κάμιλλον τῶω Γάλλων ὅμιλον διαφθεῖραι μάχῃ νενικηκότα φασί. φέρει δὲ καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ μαρτύριον τοῦ ἔργου τούτου τὴν προσηγορίαν ὁ χῶρος καὶ διασώζει τῇ μνήμῃ τῶν Γἀλλων τὸ πάθος, Βουσταγαλλώρων καλούμενος. βοῦστα γὰρ Λατῖνοι τὰ ἐκ τῆς πυρᾶς καλοῦσι

[220] See also below, pp 174-6, 288-90.
[221] See below, Ch 4, pp 187-8.

> λείψανα. τύμβοι τε τῇδε γεώλοφοι τῶν νεκπῶν ἐκείνων παμπληθεῖς εἰσίν. (8.29.4-6)
>
> ...in a place which is level but surrounded by many hills close by, the very place where once, they say, Camillus as general of the Romans defeated in battle and destroyed the host of the Gauls. And the place even to my day bears witness to this deed in its name and preserves the memory of the disaster which befell the Gauls, being called *Busta Gallorum*, for the Latins call the remains of a funeral pyre "busta." And there are great numbers of mounded tombs of their bodies in this place.[222]

This passage is noteable also as a rare reference to Republican history, and another instance of Procopius' text preserving the memory of a physical memorial. Indeed, Procopius' language here is strikingly relevant to our subject of memory, describing the tombs as "bearing witness" and "preserving memory." It is a passage to which we will return in the course of our investigation.

While most of the references to ancient Roman history and culture come while the narrative is in Rome itself, or, as with the *Busta Gallorum*, in Italy (which is to say, in the *Gothic Wars;* Books 5,6,7, and the Italian sections of Book 8), a few fall outside these sections. Early in Book 8, Procopius describes the area around the Euxine Sea as it was in the time of Trajan, the furthest extent of the empire's borders in the area (8.2.16). This distribution of Roman history primarily in and around Rome itself indicates how important establishing and elaborating a particular Roman identity where Rome was concerned was to Procopius; elsewhere, if classical history comes up in the course of the narrative, it is mentioned, but there does not seem to be much effort on Procopius' part to insert it in elsewhere. As this stray reference illustrates, other locations in the empire

---

[222] As Dewing observes, according to Livy, the *Busta Gallorum* were in the city of Rome itself. (Procopius vol. 5, pg 353 n.3). Whether Procopius was himself mistaken or dutifully reporting a tradition garbled over time is unclear.

obviously have ties of history and memory to the imperial Roman past, but most of the time, Procopius is content with "in ancient times" (ἐκ παλαιοῦ) if he feels the need to indicate the age of a landmark or place-name.

Interestingly, Book 5 contains three mentions of the Sibyllene Oracle. One is location-inspired, as the narrative comes to Cumae at 5.14.12, where inhabitants are fond of pointing out the cave of the Sibyl. Slightly earlier, the oracle figures in a case of mistakenly interpreted prophecy: the Romans had taken the word "mundus" in the oracle "Africa capta mundus cum nato peribit" to refer to the world, when, as Procopius tells us, it simply referred to a man named "Mundus." This story is obviously meant to fall in the same tradition as the well known "an empire will fall" episode of Herodotus 1.55-56, but the device seems strained here: perhaps Procopius was stretching his material to include more of the Sibyl (and, for that matter, the classical, Herodotean device), having the oracle already in mind because of the other proximate reference. Lastly, at 5.24.28-31 some Roman patricians consult the Sibylline Oracles and aver that the Gothic siege of Rome, just begun, will last only to the month of July.[223]

As with the tale of the "Mundus" oracle, there are a handful of references to ancient Roman history that are occasioned by events in the narrative, rather than a geographical location. In these cases, Procopius gives ancient history as background to historical events in the narrative. There are two noteworthy examples of this. First, the triumph awarded to Belisarius for his victories in North Africa (4.9.1-14) is portrayed by Procopius as of great historical significance. Procopius provides information on ancient

---

[223] Procopius' quotation of the exact text of the oracle is difficult to decipher, Dewing v 3 p 234 n 3.

Roman triumphs to provide the appropriate context, to convey the magnitude of the event:

> Βελισάριος δὲ ἅμα Γελίμερερί τε καὶ Βανδίλοις ἐς Βυζάντιον ἀφικόμενος γερῶν ἠξιώθη ἃ δὴ ἐν τοῖς ἄνω χρόνοις Ῥωμαίων στρατηγοῖς τοῖς νίκας τὰς μεγίστας καὶ λόγου πολλοῦ ἀξίας ἀναδησαμένοις διετετάχατο. χρόνος δὲ ἀμφὶ ἐνιαυτοὺς ἑξακοσίους παρῳχήκει ἤδη ἐξ ὅτου ἐς ταῦτα τὰ γέρα οὐδεὶς ἐληλύθει, ὅτι μὴ Τίτοω τε καὶ Τραϊανός, καὶ ὅσοι ἄλλοι αὐτοκράτορες στρατηγήσαντες ἐπί τι βαρβαρικὸν ἔθνος ἐνίκησαν. τά τε γὰρ λάφυρα ἐνδεικνύμενος καὶ τὰ τοῦ πολέμου ἀνδράποδα ἐν μέσῃ πόλει ἐπόμπευσεν, ὃν δὴ θρίαμβον καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι... (4.9.1-3)
>
> Belisarius, upon reaching Byzantium with Gelimer and the Vandals, was counted worthy to receive such honors, as in former times were assigned to those generals of the Romans who had won the greatest and most noteworthy victories. And a period of about six hundred years had now passed since anyone had attained these honors, except, indeed, Titus and Trajan, and such other emperors as had led armies against some barbarian nation and had been victorious. For he displayed the spoils and slaves from the war in the midst of the city and led a procession which the Romans call a "triumph"...

In reckoning the 600 years since the last triumph, and only then excepting those emperors who have celebrated one, he not-so-subtly discounts the validity of those triumphs, adding all the more to the magnitude of Belisarius' accomplishment.

As we have seen, there are many more references to Roman than to Greek history, and a greater variety of Roman references as well. This suggests that engaging with Roman history and memory was a more interesting project to Procopius. Roman identity was evidently some combination of more important, and more at stake, in Procopius' history and understanding. Beyond this, it is interesting to note that, while the Greek references tend toward the monarchical, the Roman ones do not show such a pronounced

tendency. There are, to be sure, quite a few to the long imperial period,[224] but there are also a number to the Republic, as well as to matters of general Roman culture, such as the Senate and the Sibyllene Oracle. This suggests that it is not merely the good and useful parallel of a similar political situation that moves Procopius to mention Roman history so many times, but that it is rather a purposeful move to engage with the memory of the empire's specifically Roman past.

Beyond considering the particular period of Roman history to which they refer, we can also observe in these references a number of themes which are suggestive of the importance of ancient history generally, and Roman history specifically, to Procopius. A concern for victory and defeat, as reflected in the anecdotes about Cannae, the "*busta Gallorum,"* and the conquest of Carthage, is unsurprising in a work of classical historiography entitled *History of the Wars*. These are all quite spectacular victories and defeats, reflective perhaps of Procopius' hopes or perceptions about the wars of his own time. The frequent mentions of ancient buildings, monuments, and memorials, while certainly well-occasioned by Procopius' narrative, nonetheless points toward an enduring, pervasive interest in the physical presence of these survivals from out of the ancient past, the relevance they still had, and the impact they could have on the experience of living in a post-Classical landscape. This interest is, of course, given far greater reign in Procopius' *Buildings*, a panegyric of Justinian's building activity throughout the empire, which often of necessity discusses the ancient structures which

[224] We might also note the specific emperors named by Procopius: Augustus, Titus, Trajan, Hadrian, Constantine, Zeno. These are, for the most part, unsurprising: a combination of well-known, influential emperors from the more distant past, and those of more recent history who played a role in the loss of the western empire to the barbarians.

are being preserved, repaired, rebuilt or replaced by the emperor.[225] Finally, there are the numerous references to what we might call the cultural side of Roman religion: names of gods, the Sibyl; which speak to an enduring relevance of these: to Procopius at least, and surely he hoped to his audience as well. These Roman references are, when taken together, evocative of a certain image of *Romanitas*: military impressiveness in victory and defeat; an extensive, longlasting impact on the territory and landscape of the empire, and a cultural heritage that transcends the religious practices which once gave rise to it.

## Part II: References to the Mythic Past, Part One

Procopius' frequent references to myth speak to the continued relevance of this key feature of classical cultural heritage, but Procopius' style of incorporating them into the narrative belies the problematic place of myth in his modern world. As with the references to the historical past, those to the mythological past are for the most part connected to a physical location mentioned in the narrative. With the mythological material, though, Procopius actually uses this similarity to distinguish the one type of reference from the other. He shows his concern to distinguish the mythological material from the historiographical thrust of the work quite clearly at 8.1.12-13. He declares that his interest is in questions of the migration of people and the changing of names, "not

[225] A study of memory in the *Buildings* originally formed the greater part of an additional chapter of the present work; but this was cut, for a number of reasons, before the final draft. I hope to include some version of this in a future project with a somewhat broader scope.

relating the mythological tales about them nor other antiquated material, nor even telling in what part of the Euxine Sea the poets say Prometheus was bound" (οὐ τὰ μυθώδη περὶ αὐτῶν ἀπαγγέλοντι ἢ ἄλλως ἀρχαῖα, οὐδὲ ὅπη ποτὲ Πόντου τοῦ Εὐξείνου δεθῆναι τὸν Προμηθέα ποιηταὶ λέγουσι). Procopius problematizes the connection of locations to mythic stories by repeatedly raising objections to a particular form of that connection, one which can be argued against logically, from evidence that Procopius has at hand: mythologically-derived place-names. He then uses this problem as a springboard for discussing issues related to the long stretch of time between the pre-history of classical myth and his own day, and the possibility of preserving or communicating knowledge over so long a span of years. While the age of myth is the period explicitly discussed in these passages, in many of them the distant past of ancient history is inextricably implicated in the truth-obscuring sweep of time. Procopius' musings on the continued presence and relevance of mythic stories in the tradition of classical historiography (as well as in the sixth century) belie thoughtful consideration of the processes of remembering and forgetting.

As is plain from Table 3.3, Procopius makes numerous references to classical mythology in the course of his history, almost as many as to Roman history. Before we turn to the full list of references, let us take some time to consider in some detail those passages in which Procopius uses the opportunity afforded by the mythic connection to comment more directly on the relationship of myth, particularly of mythologically-derived place-names, to contemporary history. At 7.27.17-20, he states that Scylaeum, which Belisarius is sailing past on his way from Sicily to Tarentum, is named, not as the

poets say after the Homeric monster Scylla ("not because there really existed there the woman in the form of a beast," οὐχ ὅτι ταύτῃ πη τὸ θηριῶδες γύναιον) but rather for the much more pedestrian Scylax or Cyniscus, a type of fish, which inhabits the strait from ancient times down to Procopius' own day (ἐνταῦθα τοῦ πορθμοῦ ἐκ παλαιοῦ τε καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ξυμβαίνει εἶναι):

> τὰ γὰρ ὀνόματα τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀρχὴν μὲν εἰκότα ἐς ἀεὶ γίνεται, ἡ δὲ φήμη αὐτὰ περιαγαγοῦσα ἐς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους τινὰς δόξας οὐκ ὀρθὰς ἀγνοίᾳ τῶν ἀληθινῶν ἐνταῦθα ποιεῖται. καὶ προϊὼν οὕτως ὁ χρόνος ἰσχυρὸς μέν τις δημιουργὸς αὐτίκα τοῦ μύθον καθίσταται, μάρτυρας δὲ τῶν οὐ γεγονότων τοὺς ποιητὰς ἐξουσίᾳ τῆς τέχνης, ὡς τὸ εἰκός, ἑταιρίζεται. (7.27.18-19)
>
> For names in the beginning are always appropriate to the things they describe, but rumor, carrying these names to other peoples, engenders there false opinion through ignorance of the facts. And as time goes on with this process, it immediately becomes a powerful builder, as it were, of the story and allies itself with the poets, presumably because of the license of their art, as witnesses of things that never happened.

Procopius then proceeds to give more examples of this process: geographical features named for their shape (Dog's Head in Cercyra and Wolf-Helmet in Psidia) which gave rise to the natives being known as dog-headed and "Wolf-Skulls," though some would have it that the people there have the heads of animals (7.27.19-20). He concludes with the Herodotean invitation for each one to think as he pleases (ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὅπη ἑκάστῳ βουλομένῳ εἴη ταύτῃ δοκείτω τε καὶ λεγέσθω) (7.27.20).

Several things are important to note in this passage, in addition to the core skepticism of an actual mythological origin for the place-name. First, Procopius pins the origins of this process on rumor (φήμη) and ignorance (ἀγνοίᾳ), as names are carried to other peoples. The spread of information across boundaries of language and culture,

an unreliable process, is the apparatus by which misinformation is also spread. Moreover, time is implicated in this regrettable process secondarily, as the geographic spread of information necessarily takes place over time. Thus it "allies itself with the poets," allowing them to be the deplorable "witnesses of things that never happened," the exact opposite of the goals of history. The progress of time is here depicted as regrettable, bringing misinformation and forgetfulness of true facts in favor of the fanciful lies of poetic license. Cultural memory, as we might call it, is not to be trusted.

Procopius goes on to use logical reasoning and knowledge of geography to debunk a mythicization at 8.2.12-14. In telling of a city named Apsarus he questions the popular belief that it is so called after Apsyartus, killed by Jason and Medea on that spot:

> ἀλλὰ πολὺς ἄγαν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιρρεύσας ὁ χρόνος καὶ ἀνθρὼπων ἀναρίθμοις διαδοχαῖς ἐνακμάσας αὐτὸς διαφθεῖραι μὲν τὴν τῶν πραγμὰτων ἐπιβολὴν ἴσχυσεν ἐξ ὧν τὸ ὄνομα ξύγκειται τοῦτο, ἐς δὲ τὸν νῦν φιανόμενον τρόπον μεταρρυθμῆσαι τὴν ποσηγορίαν τῷ τόπῳ (8.2.13)
>
> But an extremely long time has elapsed since these events, while countless generations of men have flourished, and the mere passage of time has thus availed to efface from memory the succession of incidents from which this name arose and to transform the name of the place to the for which it appears at present.[226]

Procopius does not know, he cannot even guess, what the original name of the place was, but he can theorize from experience that whatever its original form was, it has changed over the long time since then.

Procopius introduces doubt that the true origins of the name can be known, after such a long stretch of time. Moreover, he continues by disputing with those who say that

---

[226] Of the material remains of this place, in contrast to the previous passage, nothing is left but "the foundations of the buildings."

the present day Trapezuntines are nearby the Colchians of legend, for in that case Jason and Medea would have been fleeing, not towards Greece, but backward toward the Phasis River and "the barbarians of the most remote interior." (ταύτῃ μὲν γὰρ καὶ τὸ δέρας ξὺν τῇ Μηδείᾳ συλήσας Ἰασων οὐκ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐλλάδα καὶ τὰ πάτρια ἤθη φυγὼν φαίνοιτο, ἀλλ᾽ ἔμπαλιν ἐπὶ Φᾶσίν τε ποταμού καὶ τοὺς ἐνδοτάτω βαρβάρους (8.2.15)). As with his engagement with the Herodotean debate over which river is the boundary between the continents of Asia and Europe, Procopius seems to take pride in being as well-informed in matters of geography as he is in ancient authorities, and more so than his contemporaries are.

Finally, at 8.5.23, Procopius ventures another possible explanation for the proliferation of mythic or legendary place names, beyond confusion and poetic license. He describes the city of Taurica in Scythia, where, they say, Agamemnon's daughter Iphegenia presided over the Temple of Artemis there. Meanwhile, the Armenians say that this temple was in Celesene, "citing as evidence the story of Orestes and the city of Comona related by me at that part of my narrative," (1.17.13-20). Procopius' citation of the two competing claims calls both into doubt:

> ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων λεγέτω ἕκαστος ὥς πη αὐτῷ βουλομένῳ ἐστί· πολλὰ γὰρ τῶν ἑτέρωθι γεγενημένων, ἴσως δὲ καὶ οὐδαμῇ ξυμπεπτωκότων, ἄνθρωποι προσποιεῖσθαι φιλοῦσιν ὥς πάτρια ἤθη, ἀγανακτοῦντες, ἢν μὴ τῇ δοκήσει τῇ αὐτῶν ἅπαντες ἕπωνται. (8.5.25)
>
> But as regards these matters, let each one speak according to his wish; for many things which happened elsewhere, or which, perhaps, never really happened at all, men are wont to appropriate to their own country, being indignant if all do not follow their opinion.

Procopius suggests that it is local pride that motivates people to (presumably deliberately) make these claims of mythic origin on the basis of little or no evidence. He is scornful both of their license and the unjust indignation they show if anyone should doubt their fabricated claims.

Hoewever, despite his objections, Procopius hardly allows them to stop him from including these appellations. Indeed sometimes, as seen above, he seems to go out of his way to include them. While he is scornful of the place that myth has traditionally been given in history-telling, and expresses it in careful and well-supported comments, he nevertheless, in so doing, bows to tradition and lets it have its place in his history just the same.

## Part III: (Myth,) History and Change

This is an ideal place to consider a related group of Procopius' comments, many but not all of which are also occasioned by a mythological association, before we return to the mythological references. These are passages in which Procopius comments on the functioning of human history, and the changes that the passage of time can bring in language and culture. We see in these passages similar themes as in those dealing with mythology and place-names: laments for the confusion and loss of accurate knowledge that comes over the course of time and blame for the human actors who aid and abet the regrettable processes.

We should consider first of all the fuller context of one of the periphrases discussed at the end of the last chapter. At 3.11.2-4, Procopius is describing the Roman forces readied for the expedition against Carthage: “ten thousand foot-soldiers, and five thousand horsemen, gathered from the regular troops and from the ‘foederati.’” As we saw, he proceeds to explain the Latin origins of the term:

> ἐν δὲ δὴ φοιδεράτοις πρότερον μὲν μόνοι βάρβαροι κατελέγοντο, ὅσοι οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ δοῦλοι εἶναι, ἅτε μὴ πρὸς Ῥωμαίων ἡσσημένοι, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ τῇ ἴσῃ καὶ ὁμοίᾳ ἐς τὴν πολιτείαν ἀφίκοντο· φοίδερα γὰρ τὰς πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους σπονδὰς καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι. (3.11.2-3)
>
> Now, at an earlier time only barbarians were enlisted among the foederati, those, namely, who had come into the Roman political system, not in the condition of slaves, since they had not been conquered by the Romans, but on the basis of complete equality. For the Romans call treaties with their enemies ‘foedera.’

But, Procopius laments, this description is no longer accurate:

> τὸ δὲ νῦν ἅπασι τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτου ἐπιβατεύειν οὐκ ἐν κωλύμῃ ἐστί, τοῦ χρόνου τὰς προσηγορίας ἐφ᾽ ὧν τέθεινται ἥκιστα ἀξιοῦντος τηρεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀεὶ περιφερομένων, ᾗ ταῦτα ἄγειν ἐθέλουσιν ἄνθρωποι, τῶν πρόσθεν αὐτοῖς ὠνομασμένων ὀλιγωροῦντες. (3.11.3-4)
>
> But at the present time there is nothing to prevent anyone from assuming this name, since time will by no means consent to keep names attached to the things to which they were formerly applied, but conditions are ever changing about according to the desire of men who control them, and men pay little heed to the meaning which they originally attached to the name.

Procopius’ statement initially blames the faceless “Time” for this regrettable disconnect, but as he goes on, we see that the agents of change are men. Those in power, Procopius asserts, can manipulate words and their meanings as it suits them, with little regard for historical accuracy.

We could then point to two interrelated changes here: first, formerly there was a clear distinction between the regular army and the foederati, and "only barbarians were enlisted among the foederati." Second, the use of the term "foederati" has changed, as indeed it fails to keep pace with the changes in the composition of the army. It is this loss of the original sense of the term that seems to bother Procopius the more, that out of willful ignorance of the Latin language, those responsible for the Roman army corrupted such a key term. (As we will see, Procopius is most often motivated to comment on and lament shifts in language and nomenclature, especially in cases where some historical insight is in danger of being lost due to such changes.)

Procopius also sees this corruption of names by uninformed speakers in the barbarian world. In describing a fortress of the Colchians (which they have since razed), he comments:

> Κοτιάϊον δὲ τότε τὸ φρούριον ὠνομάζετο τῇ Ἑλλήνων φωνῇ, νῦν μέντοι Κόταϊς αὐτὸ καλοῦσι Λαζοὶ τῇ τῆς φωνῆς ἀγνοίᾳ τὴν τοῦ ὀνόματος διαφθείροντες ἁρμονίαν. ταῦτα μὲν Ἀριανὸς οὕτως ἱστόρησεν. (8.14.48)
>
> In those times the fortress was named Cotiaion, in the Greek language, but now the Lazi call it Cotais, having corrupted the true sound of the name because of their ignorance of the language. Such is the account given by Arrian.[227]

This alteration would seem to bother Procopius less than some others, because it is merely the sound of the name that has been changed rather than any meaning that has been lost. It is, additionally, woth noting the irony (perhaps intended by the author) of accusing the native Lazi of ignorance of the Greek name of a fortress that was originally built, not by the Greeks, but by the Colchians, their supposed ancestors.

[227] This passage is not in the extant works of Arrian: Dewing, Loeb v 5, p 205, n 2.

In another passage, Procopius again blames the long period of elapsed time, and the changes and movement of peoples and regimes, for the confusion and false information introduced into historical knowledge. However, his discussion of change is here complicated by his insistence that one particular factor has remained constant, that the Colchians of myth, or rather their descendants, still live in the same area as in ancient times, along the Phasis River, as the modern-day Lazi:

> Κόλχους δὲ οὐχ οἷόν τέ ἐστι μὴ τοὺς Λαζοὺς εἶναι, ἐπεὶ παρὰ Φᾶσιν ποταμὸν ᾤκηνται· τὸ δὲ ὄνομα μόνον οἱ Κόλχοι, ὥσπερ ἀνθρώπων ἔθνη καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα, τανῦν ἐς τὸ Λαζῶν μεταβέβληνται. χωρὶς δὲ τούτων καὶ μέγας αἰὼν μετὰ τοὺς ἐκεῖνα ἀναγραψαμένους ἐπιγενόμενος ἀεί τε συννεωτερίζων τοῖς πράγμασι τὰ πολλὰ τῶν καθεστώτων τὰ πρότερα νεοχμῶσαι ἴσχυσεν, ἐθνῶν τε μεταστάσεσι καὶ ἀρχόντων καὶ ὀνομάτων διαδοχαῖς. (8.1.10-12)
>
> In the second place, it is impossible that the Lazi should not be the Colchians, because they inhabit the banks of the Phasis River; and the Colchians have merely changed their name at the present time to Lazi, just as nations of men and many other things do. But apart from this, a long period has elapsed since these accounts were written, and has brought about constant changes along with the march of events, with the result that many of the conditions which formerly obtained have been replaced by new conditions, because of the migration of nations and successive changes of rulers and of names.

It is odd that Procopius lists "the migration of nations" among the ethnographic conditions between the distant past and his own time, in forming an argument that a particular nation, the Lazi/Colchians, have remained in the same place, while only their name has changed. This may of course be mere carelessness on his part, but perhaps Procopius is here putting forth a deliberately flawed argument in order to highlight the

absurdity or unknowability of such matters.[228] Certainly, he continues by disparaging the deference shown to myth and the solicitous care often taken by historians to incorporate mythologically-derived information:

> ἅπερ μοι διαμετρήσασθαι ἀναγκαιότατον ἔδοξεν εἶναι, οὐ τὰ μυθώδη περὶ αὐτῶν ἀπαγγέλοντι ἢ ἄλλως ἀρχαῖα, οὐδὲ ὅπη ποτὲ Πόντου τοῦ Εὐξείνου δεθῆναι τὸν Προμηθέα ποιηταὶ λέγουσι· μύθου γὰρ ἱστορίαν παρὰ πολὺ κεχωρίσθαι οἶμαι· ἀλλ᾽ ἐς τὸ ἀκριβὲς διεξιόντι τά τε ὀνόματα καὶ τὰ πράγματα, ὅσα δὴ τανῦν ἐπιχωριάζει τῶν τόπων ἐκείνων ἑκάστῳ. (8.1.12-13)
>
> These things it has seemed to me very necessary to investigate, not relating the mythological tales about them nor other antiquated material, nor even telling in what part of the Euxine Sea the poets say Prometheus was bound (for I consider that history is very widely separated from mythology), but stating accurately and in order both the names of each of these places and the facts that apply to them at the present day.

And yet, for all that, Procopius' approach is not simply to omit mythical connections in the geographic landscape or in place-names. Rather, Procopius brings up mythological connections to his history with some frequency, but tends to keep them at arms' length, as it were, periodically re-affirming and developing his philosophical stance towards the place of myth in history.

Also in the early chapters of Book 8, we have one final passage to consider: Procpoius' comments on the Amazons at 8.3.5-11. As happens elsewhere, a discussion of a particular geographic area leads him to remark on the mythological associations sometimes ascribed to it, only to then distance himself from them.

> Οὖννοι δέ, οἱ Σάβειροι ἐπικαλούμενοι, ἐνταῦθα ᾤκηνται καὶ ἄλλα ἄττα Οὐννικὰ ἔθνη. ἐνθένδε μὲν τὰς Ἀμαζόνας ὡρμῆσθαί φασιν, ἀμφὶ δὲ τὸ Θεμίσκουρον καὶ ποταμὸν τὸν Θερμώδοντα

[228] As Kaldellis argues Procopius does in his preface, in the comparison between Homeric Bowmen and modern archers (Kaldellis (2004) 17-24); but see above pp 45-9

> ἐνστρατοπεδεύσασθαι, ᾗπέρ μοι ἔναγχος εἴρηται, οὗ δὴ πόλις ἐν τῷ παρόντι Ἀμισός ἐστι. τανῦν δὲ οὐδαμῆ τῶν ἀμφὶ τὸ Καυκάσιον ὄρος χωρίων Ἀμαζόνων τις μνήμη ἢ ὄνομα διασώζεται, καίτοι καὶ Στράβωνι καὶ ἄλλοις τισὶ λόγοι ἀμφ᾿ αὐταῖς πολλοὶ εἴρηνται.
>
> The Huns who are called Sabiri dwell in that region, as well as certain other Hunnic tribes. And they say that the Amazons really originated here and afterwards established their camp near Themiscryra on the Thermodon River, as I have stated above, at the place where the city of Amisus is at the present time. But today nowhere in the vicinity of the Caucus range is any memory of the Amazons preserved or any name connected with them, although much has been written about them both by Strabo[229] and by some others (8.3.5-6)

Procopius then introduces a rationalizing explanation, brought forward not as his own original idea, but an extant one which he thinks best accounts for the legend of the Amazons:

> ἀλλά μοι δοκοῦσι μάλιστα πάντων τά γε κατὰ τὰς Ἀμαζόνας ξὺν τῷ ἀληθεῖ λόγῳ εἰπεῖν, ὅσοι ἔφασαν οὐ πώποτε γένος γυναικῶν ἀνδρείων γεγονέναι, οὐδ᾿ ἐν ὄρει μόνῳ τῷ Καυκασίῳ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων φύσιν θεσμῶν τῶν οἰκείων ἐξίστασθαι, ἀλλὰ βαρβάρους ἐκ τῶνδε τῶν χωρίων στρατῷ μεγάλῳ ξὺν γυναιξὶ ταῖς αὐτῶν ἰδίαις ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν στρατεῦσαι, στρατόπεδόν τε ἀμφὶ ποταμὸν Θερμώδοντα ποιησαμένους ἐνθαῦθα μὲν τὰς γυναῖκας ἀπολιπεῖν, αὐτοὺς δὲ γῆν τῆς Ἀσίας τὴν πολλὴν καταθέοντας, ὑπαντιασάντων σφίσι τῶν τῇδε ᾠκημένων, ἅπαντας ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀφανισθῆναι, οὐδένα τε αὐτῶν τὸ παράπαν ἐπανήκειν ἐς τῶν γυναικῶν τὸ χαράκωμα, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ταύτας δὴ τὰς γυναῖκας, δέει τῶν περιοίκων καὶ ἀπορίᾳ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἀναγκασθείσας, τό τε ἀρρενωπὸν ἀμφιέσασθαι οὔτι ἐθελουσίας καὶ ἀνελομένας τὴν πρὸς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ ἀπολελειμμένην τῶν ὅπλων σκευήν, καὶ ταύτῃ ἐξοπλισαμένας ὡς ἄριστα ἔργα ἀνδρεῖα ξὺν ἀρετῇ ἐπιδείξασθαι, διωθουμένης ἐς τοῦτο αὐτὰς τῆς ἀνάγκης, ἕως δὴ ἁπάσαις διαφθαρῆναι ξυνέπεσε.
>
> But it seems to me that those have spoken the truth about the Amazons at any rate better than any others, who have stated that there never was a race of women

[229] Dewing, Loeb vol 5, pg 75: Strabo Book XI. 5, XII.3,21

> endowed with the qualities of men and that human nature did not depart from its established norm in the mountains of the Caucasus alone; but the fact was that the barbarians from these regions together with their own women made an invasion of Asia with a great army, established a camp at the river Thermodon, and left their women there; then, while they themselves were overrunning the greater part of the land of Asia, they were encountered by the inhabitants of the land and utterly destroyed, and not a man of them returned to the women's encampment; and thereafter these women, through fear of the people dwelling round about and constrained by the failure of their supplies, put on manly valour, not at all of their own will, and, taking up the equipment of arms and armour left by the men in the camp and arming themselves in excellent fashion with this, they made a display of manly valour, being driven to do so by sheer necessity, until they were all destroyed. (8.3.7)

Thus far, the passage is quite similar to those examined above. Next, however, Procopius introduces a second, competing (though not necessarily mutually exclusive) explanation, based on contemporary practice:

> ταῦτα δὲ ὧδέ πη γεγονέναι καὶ ξὺν τοῖς ἀνδάσι τὰς Ἀμαζόνας στρατεύσασθαι καὶ αὐτὸς οἴομαι, τεκμηριούμενος οἷς δὴ καὶ χρόνῳ τῷ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ ξυνηνέχθην γενέσθαι. τὰ γὰρ ἐπιτηδεύματα μέχρι ἐς τοὺς ἀπογόνους παραπεμπόμενα τῶν προγεγενημέων τῆς φύσεως ἴνδαλμα γίνεται. Οὔννων τοίνυν καταδραμόντων πολλάκις τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἀρχήν, τοῖς τε ὑπαντιάσασιν ἐς χεῖρας ἐλθόντων, τινὰς μὲν αὐτῶν πεσεῖν ἐνταῦθα τετύχηκε, μετὰ δὲ τῶν βαρβάρων τὴν ἀναχώρησιν Ῥωμαῖοι διερευνώμενοι τῶν πεπτωκότων τὰ σώματα καὶ γυναῖκας ἐν αὐτοῖς εὗρον. ἄλλο μέντοι γυναικῶν στράτευμα οὐδαμῆ τῆς Ἀσίας ἢ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐπιχωριάζον ἐφάνη. οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τὰ Καυκάσια ὄρη ἀνδρῶν ἔρημα γεγενῆσθαι πώποτε ἀκοῇ ἴσμεν. περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν Ἀμαζόνων τοσαῦτα εἰρησθω.
>
> That this is about what happened and that the Amazons did make an expedition with their husbands, I too believe, basing my judgment on what has actually taken place in my time. For customs which are handed down to remote descendants give a picture of the character of former generations. I mean this, that on many occasions when Huns have made raids into the Roman domain and have engaged in battle with those who encountered them, some, of course, have fallen there, and after the departure of the barbarians the Romans, in searching the bodies of the fallen have actually found women among them. No other army of women, however, has made its appearance in any locality of Asia or Europe. On the other

> hand, we have no tradition that the mountains of the Caucasus were ever devoid of men. Concerning the Amazons then let this suffice. (8.3.8-11)

Of the existing historiographical opinions, then, Procopius favors a rationalizing view of the Amazons, but his preferred approach applies the evidence of his own present day to better understand and account for the stories of the distant past. For all that Procopius bemoans the changes in languages, names, customs, and peoples that have taken place over such a long stretch of history, he is still able to believe in some continuity of customs, a certain longevity and tenacity of the character of a given people, across such a wide gulf of time.[230]

Procopius was particularly situated to be well aware of the long stretch of years intervening between his own day and the ancient past, and the many and significant changes that had taken place, and this consciousness certainly comes across occasionally in his works. For all that, however, he is very interested in applying contemporary knowledge (and sometimes autopsical evidence) to answer questions and solve problems related to ancient history. We can also see, perhaps, Procopius the historian seeking to make a contribution to ancient history; not just by the content of his history, but by weighing in again on questions debated by the great historiographers of ancient and recent years.

Of course, we have little more reason to believe Procopius' account of the widows' last defence of their camp than we do the myths of actual Amazons. What is notable is the way Procopius depicts forgetting, the other side of the coin of

---

[230] We will examine further the shape of the past in in Procopius' history-telling, especially in light of the work of Eviatar Zerubavel, in the section on "Past and Present," pp 149-161 below.

remembering, in this and similar statements. In these passages, Procopius depicts the processes of remembering and forgetting in ways that have something in common with those elucidated by Aleida Assmann and other cultural memory theorists.[231] In his explanations of the loss of acurate knowledge of the names and customs of the past, he depicts what is termed passive forgetting in portraying such loss as a inevitable consequence of the long sweep of Time, and the communication of knowledge among diverse peoples. Procopius also depicts "active forgetting" when he attributes loss and confusion to the active agencies of those in power, as when he claims that, "conditions are ever changing about according to the desire of men who control them" (3.11.3-4) or to the invention of the poets (see above, section II). As we will study in more detail in the conclusion, while Procopius seems to observe and depict the process of forgetting, he himself takes part in a scheme of remembering also much like Assmann's "canon and archive."[232]

## Part IV: References to the Mythic Past, Part Two

We are now prepared to return to Procopius' references to the mythic past, for considering the full collection and context of these passages sheds light on the questions

[231] Aleida Assmann "Canon and Archive," " *Cultural Memory Studies: an Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. 97-107. See also Harald Weinrich, *Lethe: The Art and Critique of Forgetting*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004 and David Gross, *Lost Time: On Remembering and Forgetting in Late Modern Culture*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000.
[232] See below, pp 278-282.

about the inclusion of the mythic material raised in the preceeding sections. These are collected in Table 3.3. Several trends emerge immediately. In many of these, as with the longer passages discussed above, the mythical connection is brought up only to be dismissed. Also, and unsurprisingly, Procopius' most common referent is Homeric legend, or the Trojan saga more broadly. Indeed, the first explicit reference of any kind to the past is to the Homeric bowmen in the introduction, already discussed. Next most common are references to the story of Jason and Medea. The remaining few references are to the Amazons (8.22 and 8.5.11, discussed above), and a stray remark that a battle resulted in a "Cadmean victory" for the Romans (5.7.5).[233] Certainly, the legends of the Trojan cycle were foundational and omnipresent in the ancient worl, and it does not necessarily need explanation that a majority of Procopius' mythic references would be to them. However, the popularity of references to the flight of Jason and Medea is more curious, and, moreover, the larger questions remain: why does Procopius choose to incorporate so many mythological references at all, given his clearly stated objections to their usual place in historiography? Additionally, given this, what is Procopius' intent in including them?

A careful examination of the context of each "set" of references begins to give us an answer. References to Jason and Medea are notably to be found in Book 2 and the beginning of Book 8; that is, those sections that deal with the wars on the Eastern front. Looking more closely, we find unsurprisingly that these references come either when

[233] I leave out of the present consideration, though they remain in the table, instances of proper names where no further comment on the mythic or historical namesake is given, such as the "Baths of Achilles" at Constantinople (3.13.16) or the Pillars of Hercules.

Procopius is dealing with the region associated with ancient Colchis, or cities or natural features otherwise associated with Jason and Medea's travels. The first, at 2.17.2, is quite straightforward: Chosroes' army is marching through Lazica, "And when they arrived in the centre of Colchis (the place where the tales of the poets say that the adventure of Medea and Jason took place)..."(ἀφικομένοις τε αὐτοῖς ἐς μέσην Κολχίδα (οὗ δὴ τά τε ἀμφὶ Μήδειαν καὶ Ἰάσονα οἱ ποιηταὶ γεγενῆσθαι μυθολογοῦσιν)...). We have already discussed the digression at 8.2.12-15 about whether the city of Apsarus is named after the Aspyartus of the legend, and whether ancient Colchis was in that region.[234] A little farther along, Procopius is describing the course of the Phasis River through Lazica, and comments:

> κατὰ ταύτην δέ που τὴν Λαζικῆς μοῖραν ἀπέκειτο, ὥσπερ οἱ ἐπιχώριοι λέγουσι, καὶ τὸ δέρας ἐκεῖνο, οὗπερ ἕνεκα οἱ ποιηταὶ τὴν Ἀργὼ ἀποτετορνεῦσθαι μυθολογοῦσι. λέγουσι δὲ ταῦτα, ἐμὴν γνώμην, ἀληθιζόμενοι ἥκιστα. οὐ γὰρ ἄν, οἶμαι, λαθὼν τὸν Αἰήτην Ἰάσων ἐνθένδε ἀπηλλάσσετο ξὺν τῇ Μηδείᾳ τὰ δέρας ἔχων, εἰ μὴ τά τε βασίλεια καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τῶν Κόλχων οἰκία τοῦ χωρίου διείργετο Φάσιδι ποταμῷ, ἵνα δὴ τὸ δέρας ἐκεῖνο κεῖσθαι ξυνέβαινεν, ὃ δὴ καὶ οἱ ποιηταὶ παραδηλοῦσιν οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀναγραψάμενοι.
>
> It was somewhere in this part of Lazica, as the inhabitants say, that the famous fleece was placed for safekeeping, that fleece on account of which, as the poets tell the tale, the Argo was fashioned. But in saying this they are, in my opinion, not telling the truth at all. For I think that Jason would not have eluded Aeetes and got away from there with that fleece in company with Medea, unless both the palace and the other dwellings of the Colchians had been separated by the Phasis River from the place in which that fleece was lying; indeed the poets who have recorded the story imply that this was the case. (8.2.30-31)

[234] pp 130-1 above

Finally, in the passage discussed above in which Procopius laments the corruption of the name of a fortress from Cotiaion to Cotais, he reports that some say Aeetes, the father of Medea, was born there, "and as a result of this the poets both called him a Coetaean and applied the same name to the land of Colchis" (καὶ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ τοὺς ποιητὰς αὐτόν τε Κοιταϊέα καὶ γῆν τὴν Κολχίδα Κοιταΐδα καλεῖν) (8.14.49). These are, like the references to the historical past considered above, geographically inspired: as Procopius' narrative reaches a relevant location, he provides the mythic association.[235] This is, of course, very much like what he claims at 8.1.12-13 he will not do: in discussing the Euxine Sea, tell "where Prometheus was bound." On the one hand, there is perhaps a distinction to be made between the creation myths of the god Prometheus and the more legendary, and largely human, Argonauts. Moreover, the tales of Jason and Medea "get" Procopius something that the story of Prometheus does not. In mentioning this particular myth at various points as the history travels along the Persian front, Procopius not only associates this distant terrain with the ancient stories, and so historicizes it, but also does so by means of a myth that involves journey from, and ultimately return to, the familiar world of classical mythic Greece, and so familiarizes it as readers are reminded of the ancient connections between themselves, as Greek-speaking heirs of classical culture, and these distant lands that Greeks have long adventured in.

[235] The exception to this is a mention of "what the Greeks call 'Medea's oil' and the Persians 'napthali,'" pots of sulphur and bitumen (8.11.35); it is interesting that this passage, while not directly inspired by any particular geographical feature, still occurs in the 'Persian front' chapters at the beginning of Book 8.

The same rules of usage are true for the two references to the Amazons at 8.2.2 and 8.3.5-11: they are occasioned by two places where the race of female warriors was said to have originated. Moreover, when we turn to the Homeric references, we can see that they also follow a similar logic: they occur for the most part when a physical place, usually a natural feature or a city, which is supposed to have Homeric connections or history, is mentioned in the narrative (again, either as some part of the Roman army physically comes there, or else as it occurs in a geographical digression). They fall primarily in Book 5, with a few in Books 7 and 8, which are, of course, sections dealing with the war in Italy. As discussed above, several of these mentions are made only so that Procopius can promptly "debunk" the popular association, as with "Scylaeum" at 7.27.17-20, quoted above. Just so, Procopius would seem to have doubts about the stories that Mt. Circaeum is so called because it is the place where Odyseus met Circe (5.11.2)[236], or that Rhegium was the location of Scylla and Charybdis "where the myths

---

[236] ἧς ἄγχιστα ὄρος τὸ Κίρκαιόν ἐστιν, οὗ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα τῇ Κίρκῃ ξυγγενέσθαι φασίν, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, ἐπεὶ ἐν νήσῳ Ὅμηρος τὰ τῆς Κίρκης οἰκία ἰσχυρίζεται εἶναι. ἐκεῖνο μέντοι ἔχω εἰπεῖν, ὡς τὸ Κίρκαιον τοῦτο, ἐπὶ πολὺ τῆς θαλάσσης διῆκον, νήσῳ ἐμφερές ἐστι, καὶ τοῖς τε πλέουσιν ἄγχιστα τοῖς τε ἐς τὴν ἐκείνῃ ἠϊόνα βαδίζουσι νῆσος δοκεῖ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον εἶωαι. καὶ ἐπειδάν τις ἐν αὐτῷ γένηται, τότε δὴ μεταμανθάνει ψευσθῆναι τῆς δόξης τὰ πρότερα. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Ὅμηρος .ισως νῆσον τὸ χωρίον ὠνόμασεν. (5.11.2)
...and very near that place is Mt. Circaeum, where they say Odysseus met Circe, though the story seems to me untrustworthy, for Homer declares that the habitation of Circe was on an island. This, however, I am able to say, that this Mt. Circaeum, extending as it does far into the sea, resembles an island, so that both to those who sail close to it and to those who walk to the shore in the neighborhood it has every appearance of being an island. And only when a man gets on it does he realize that he was deceived in his former opinion. And for this reason Homer perhaps called this place an island.

of the poets say" it was (5.8.1).[237] In fact, he returns to the subject much later, in Book 8, to comment explicitly that it is the unique formation of the straits which caused the whirlpools and sank ships, and caused people attribute these to Charybdis (8.6.22-24).[238] It is notable that these references are all to the *Odyssey*.

Like the Jason and Medea references, the Homeric ones occur almost exclusively on the fronts associated with those stories; unlike the legend of the Argonauts, however, there is much more Homeric and Trojan cycle material that Procopius might have included, but evidently chose not to. It is particularly in the Italian landscape that he sought to utilize the journeys of Odysseus. Each set of stories connects a distant landscape with the more familiar world of the Eastern Mediterranean, and of Greek myth and legend. Rather than exoticizing the landscape, as once these stories did, here they rather familiarize it, associating the foreign land with a well-known common cultural heritage, for of course Procopius habitually dismisses the factual claims of the mythic connection: that is not his reason for including them. Just as the historic references discussed above serve to establish for these sections of the narrative a particular Roman

[237]...ἐς Ῥήγιον (ἔνθα δὴ οἱ ποιηταὶ τήν τε Σκύλλαν γεγονέναι μυθοποιοῦσι καὶ Χάρυβδισ). (5.8.1)

[238] δοκεῖ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀδριατικοῦ καλουμένου πελάγους τὸ ῥεῦμα ἐκεῖσε ἰέναι. καίτοι έξ Ώκεανοῦ καὶ Γαδείρων ἡ τῆς θαλάσσης πρόοδος γίνεται. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἴλιγγοι ἐξαπιναίως ἐνταῦθα συχνοὶ ἀπ᾽ οὐδεμιᾶς ἡμῖν φαινομένης αἰτίας τὰς ναῦς διαχρῶνται. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οἱ ποιηταὶ λέγουσι πρὸς τῆψ Χαρύβδεως ῥοφεῖσθαι τὰ πλοῖα, ὅσα ἂν τύχῃ τηνικάδε ὄντα ἐν τῷ πορθμῷ τούτῷ. (8.6.22-24)
For it appears that the current runs into this strait from the sea called the Adriatic, and this in spite of the fact that the forward movement of the sea takes place from the ocean and Gadira. But there are also numerous whirlpools which appear there suddenly from no cause apparent to us ad destroy ships. It is on account of this that the poets say that the boats are gulped down by Charybdis, when any chance to be in this strait at such a time.

identity, these references point even further back, to a past which transcends Rome, encompassing the broader Hellenic world and the depths of ancient history, encouraging a sense of shared identity and common cultural heritage. Through these familiar cultural memories Procopius makes the quasi-foreign Italian landscape more accessible to his Byzantine readers, invoking the shared heritage which Romans both East and West can look back to.

One final passage illustrates excellently Procopius' program of mythic and historical references. Also in Book Five, the book most concerned with Rome and Romanness,[239] Procopius dwells at some length on the town of Beneventum (or 'Beneventus,' as he prefers). After describing the adverse winds that gave it its old name 'Maleventus,' (5.15.5-7), he describes the city's founding by the Homeric hero Diomedes:

> ταύτην Διομήδης ποτὲ ὁ Τυδέως ἐδείματο, μετὰ Ἰλίου ἅλωσιν ἐκ τοῦ Ἄργους ἀποκρουσθείς. καὶ γνώρισμα τῇ πόλει τοὺς ὀδόντας συὸς τοῦ Καλυδωνίου ἐλείπετο, οὓς οἱ θεῖος Μελέαγρος ἆθλα τοῦ κυνηγεσίου λαβὼν ἔτυχεν, οἳ καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ ἐνταῦθά εἰσι, θέαμα λόγου πολλοῦ ἰδεῖν ἄξιον, περίμετρον οὐχ ἧσσον ἢ τρισπίθαμον ἐν μηνοειδεῖ σχήματι ἔχοντες.
>
> This city was built of old by Diomedes, the son of Tydeus, when after the capture of Troy he was repulsed from Argos. And he left to the city as a token the tusks of the Caledonian boar, which his uncle Meleager had received as a prize of the hunt, and they are there even up to my time, a noteworthy sight and well worth seeing, measuring not less than three spans around a having the form of a crescent. (5.15.8)

We might note, among other things, that Procopius reports this part of the story in an unusually direct and neutral manner: there is no "they say" or "so the natives say,"

[239] See above pp 120-7 on the density of Roman memories in Book Five, and pp 181-192 below the capture of Rome by Belisarius at 5.11.14.

perhaps because it is supported by the physical evidence of the tusks. Next, Procopius recounts Diomedes' encounter with Aeneas and the transfer of the palladium:

> ἐνταῦθα καὶ ξυγγενέσθαι τὸν Διομήδην Αἰνείᾳ τῷ Ἀγχίσου ἥκοντι ἐξ Ἰλίου φασὶ καὶ κατὰ τὸ λόγιον τὸ τῆς Ἀθήνης ἄγαλμα δοῦναι ὃ ξὺν τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ ἀποσυλήσας ἔτυχεν, ὅτε κατασκόπω ἐς τὴν Ἴλιον ἠλθέτην ἄμφω πρότερον ἢ τήνδε ἁλώσιμον γενέσθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησι. λέγουσι γὰρ αὐτῷ νοσήσαντί τε ὕστερον καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς νόσου πυνθανομένῳ χρῆσαι τὸ μαντεῖον οὔ ποτέ οἱ τοῦ κακοῦ ἀπαλλαγὴν ἔσεσθαι πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἀνδρὶ Τρωῒ τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦτο διδοίη.
>
> There, too, they say that Diomedes met Aeneas, the son of Anchises, when he was coming from Illium, and in obedience to the oracle gave him the statue of Athena which he had seized as plunder in company with Odysseus, when the two went into Troy as spies before the city was captured by the Greeks. For they tell the story that when he fell sick at a later time, and made enquiry concerning the disease, the oracle responded that he would never be freed from his malady unless he should give the statue to a man of Troy. (5.15.9-10)

Finally, Procopius carries the story through the ancient and recent past down to his own present, but raises some doubts as to the historical reliability of the tale, and more generally to the possibility of reliable knowledge of such elements of the past. He provides, side-by-side, two differing accounts of the ultimate fate of the Palladium:

> καὶ αὐτὸ μὲν ὅπου γῆς ἐστιν, οὔ φασι Ῥωμαῖοι εἰδέναι, εἰκόνα δὲ αὐτοῦ λίθῳ τινὶ ἐγκεκολαμμένην δεικνύουσι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἐν τῷ τῆς Τύχης ἱερῷ, οὗ δὴ πρὸ τοῦ χαλκοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἀγάλματος κεῖται, ὅπερ αἴθριον ἐς τὰ πρὸς ἕω τοῦ νεὼ ἵδρυται. αὕτη δὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ λίθῳ εἰκὼν πολεμούσῃ τε καὶ τὸ δόρυ ἀνατεινούσῃ ἅτε ἐς ξυμβολὴν ἔοικε· ποδήρη δὲ καὶ ὣς τὸν χιτῶνα εἶχε. τὸ δὲ πρόσωπον οὐ τοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς ἀγάλμασι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐμφερές ἐστιν, ἀλλ᾽ οἷα παντάπασι τὸ παλαιὸν Αἰγύπτιοι ἐποίουν. Βυζάντιοι δέ φασι τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦτο Κωνσταντῖνον βασιλέα ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἣ αὐτοῦ ἐπώνυμός ἐστι κατορύξαντα θέσθαι. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ὧδέ πη ἔσχεν.
>
> And as to where in the world the statue itself is, the Romans say they do not know, but even up to my time they show a copy of it chiseled on a certain stone in

> the temple of Fortune, where it lies before the bronze statue of Athena, which is set up under the open sky in the eastern part of the temple. And this copy on the stone represents a female figure in the pose of a warrior and extending her spear as if for combat; but in spite of this she has a chiton reaching to the feet. But the face does not resemble the Greek statues of Athena, but is altogether like the work of the ancient Egyptians. The Byzantines, however, say that the emperor Constantine dug up this statue in the forum which bears his name and set it there. So much, then, for this. (8.15.11-14)

Once again, Procopius provides very Homeric, very ancient associations for the landscape of Italy. More than just the very ancient past, though, this set of stories implicates multiple layers of time: the legendary and even pre-Homeric past (the Palladium was already old before its removal from Troy); the post-Homeric foundation of cities; the Roman era, which encompasses in itself change over time (the remainder of Aeneas' wanderings, the installation of the palladium in Rome upon the city's foundation, the whole history of the city, Constantine's removal of it signaling a shift in focus and power from west to east); and finally Procopius' present day, where the location of and claims to the palladium are still a matter of interest. Perhaps even more importantly, the story emphasizes the geographical, as well as temporal, element of continuity and common cultural heritage and memory. The palladium and its transfer was for the Romans a claim to ancient status and parity with the Greek world, though their connections with Troy. Just so, the Byzantine Romans, the Constantinopolitans, had their claim to Roman identity and to ancient heritage increased by the story that Constantine transferred the statue a second time, back east to his new capital and indeed not far from the site of Troy. Programmatically speaking, though, after all this Procopius undermines the story by raising the uncertainty as to the statue's true present location, and perhaps to the veracity of the tale itself: he narrates the two groups' stories, but offers

no opinion of his own. Furthermore, he omits that part of the story where the palladium actually arrives in Rome, the lynchpin of the whole tale and system of conferred status.

Part V: Past and Present

For the rest of this chapter, we will look at several collections of longer passages where Procopius pauses in his narrative to meditate on the relationships between the past and the present in a variety of ways. As we examine the content and context of such statements, we should note how these statements reflect on his views of his present in relation to and comparison with its ancient, and specifically classical, past. We can divide these statements into several sub-categories, each of which we will consider in turn: there are those already discussed above, on the course of history and change; explicit comparisons between past and present, which we will turn to momentarily; passages which comment upon the loss that occurs over the course of time; and those that focus rather on what is preserved. We can then consider in conclusion what *kind* of a victory that preservation is.

When Procopius wants to place emphasis on and make more impressive a particular event or person, he might comment on its historical notability. Such comments naturally tend to reflect well on Procopius' contemporary world: it is, after all, the events of his own history he is seeking to highlight. In some cases, the unique event is a natural

phenomenon. Such events include some rumblings of Vesuvius at 6.4.21-30;[240] the Po sinking so low as to be unnavigable at 6.28.4;[241] earthquakes, a high Nile, and a famous beached whale at 7.29.4-16;[242] and an unusual Indian summer, as we call it, such that

---

[240] Τότε γὰρ τὸ ὄρος ὁ Βέβιος ἐμυκήσατο μέν, οὐ μέντοι ἠρεύξατο, καίτοι γε καὶ λίαν ἐπίδοξας ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγεγόνει ὅτι ἐρεύξεται...καὶ πρότερον μὲν ἐνιαυτῶν ἑκατὸν ἢ καὶ πλειόνων τὸν μυκηθμὸν τοῦτόν φασι γενέσθαι, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ πολλῷ ἔτι θᾶσσον ξυμβῆναι.
At that time the mountain of Vesuvius rumbled, and though it did not break forth in eruption, still because of the rumbling it led people to expect with great certainty that there would be an eruption...[a description of Vesuvius follows]...Formerly this rumbling took place, they say, once in a hundred years or more, but in later times it has happened much more frequently. (6.4.21, 6.4.28)
[241] οὕτω δὲ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τούτο τὸ ὕδωρ ἐκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ὑπέληγεν ὥστε αὐτοῦ ναυτίλλεσθαι τὸ παράπαν ἀδύνατα ἦν, ἕως ἐπελθόντες Ῥωμαῖοι τὰς ἀκάτους σὺν τοῖς φορτίοις ἅπασιν εἷλον. ὅ τε ποταμὸς οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον ἐς ῥοῦν ἐπανιὼν τὸν καθήκοντα ναυσίπορος τὸ λοιπὸν ἐγεγόνει. τοῦτο δὲ ἀυτῷ ξυμβῆναι οὐ πώποτε πρότερον ἀκοῇ ἴσμεν.
But the water in this river [the Po] fell so low at that time that it was altogether impossible to navigate upon it, until the Romans came up and seized the boats [of the Goths] with all their cargoes. Then the river not long afterward returned to its proper volume and became navigable thereafter. And as far as we know from tradition, this had never happened to the river before.
[242] Τότε δὲ καὶ σεισμοὶ πολλάκις χειμῶνος ὥρᾳ σκληροί τε λίαν καὶ ὑπερφυεῖς ἔν τε Βυζαντίῳ καὶ χωρίοις ἄλλοις ἐγένοντο, νύκτωρ ἅπαντες...Τότε καὶ Νεῖλος ὁ ποταμὸς ὑπὲρ ὀκτωκαίδεκα πήχυς ἀναβὰς ἐπέκλυσε μὲν τὴν Αἴγυπτον καὶ ἤρδευσε πᾶσαν...χώρας δὲ τῆς ἔνερθεν ἐπειδὴ πρῶτον ἐπεπόλασεν, οὐκέτι ἀπέβη, ἀλλ᾽ ἐνοχλῶν αὐτῇ ξύμπαντα διαγέγονε τὸν τοῦ σπείρειν καιρόν, οὐ ξυμπεσὸν τοῦτό γε πρότερον ἐκ τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος...Τότε καὶ τὸ κῆτος, ὃ δὴ Βυζάντιοι Πορφύριον ἐκάλουν, ἑάλω... At that time also, earthquakes of extraordinary severity occurred many times during the winter season, both in Byzantium and in other places, always at night... Then it was, too, that the river Nile rose above eighteen cubits and flooded all Egypt with water... But as for the country below [Thebes], after the water had first covered the surface, it did not recede, but remained in the way throughout the time of sowing, a thing which had never happened before in all time... It was at that time also that the whale, which the Byzantines called Porphyrius, was caught...

roses and grapes grew as if it were spring at 8.15.21-25.[243] [244] These statements do not necessarily encode a value judgment, where the present is in some way better or worse than the past; rather, they work to qualify Procopius' own time as worthy of historical attention, just as much as the ancient precedents to which these events are compared.

When comparative statements are applied to persons or events, the way the passage reflects on the contemporary world depends on the subject in question. Most frequently, Procopius uses these remarks to emphasize the singularity of Belisarius' accomplishments. When Belisarius captures Naples at 5.10, he claims that Naples is a city that has never been captured before (Ἐπειδὴ νενικηκέναι τε ἡμῖν δέδωκεν ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον εὐδοξίας ἀφῖχθαι, πόλιν ἀνάλωτον πρότερον οὖσαν ὑποχειρίαν ἡμῖν ποιησάμενος...(5.10.30)), which makes Belisarius' and his army's achievement all the more impressive. At 1.14.54, the Romans beat the Persian forces in battle, "a thing which had not happened for a long time," (μακροῦ γὰρ χρόνου Ῥωμαίων τῇ μάχῃ ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρα ἡσσήθησαν Πέρσαι). This sentiment is ambiguously positive: certainly it reflects well on these particular Roman forces under Belisarius, and it marks this instance as a turning-point in the war on the Persian front, but it also prominently recalls the long slump in the Romans' fortunes

---

[243] Ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ τετύχηκέ τι τῶν οὔπω πρότερον, ὅσα γε ἡμᾶς εἰδέναι, γεγονότων ξυνενεχθῆναι. τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἔτους μετόπωρον ἦν, αὐχμὸς δὲ καὶ πνιγμὸς ὥσπερ θέρους μέσου ἐγένετο θαυμαστὸν ὅσον... At this time an event occurred which has never happened before, as far at least as we know. For though the season of the year was late autumn, there was a very remarkable period of drought and hot weather as in the middle of summer... [P describes roses blooming, trees bearing fruit, and vines bearing grapes as if it were spring]

[244] A claim at 4.8.13 that a group of Moorish women have the gift of prophecy "no less than any of the ancient oracles" has a similar function.

preceding this. On the other hand, when Procopius extols the North African invasion fleet as of a size "such as the Romans were said never to have seen before" (οἷος οὐδείς πω ἐλέγετο Ῥωμαίοις πρότερον γεγενήσθαι) (3.6.11), the passage fairly drips with pride as it highlights the achievement and power of Belisarius. In an interesting variation on this type, Procopius compares a figure of relatively recent history to the classical past. He praises the emperor Majorian in his recap of history in the Western empire at the beginning of Book 3 by saying that he "surpassed in virtue all who have ever been emperors of the Romans." (οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μαϊορῖνος, ξύμπαντας τοὺς πώποτε Ῥωμαίων Βεβασιλευκότας ὑπεραίρων ἀρετῇ πάσῃ…(3.7.4)). Majorian earned this high praise of Procopius through his efforts to recapture the lost territory of the Western Empire in the 470s, particularly Libya; making him the predecessor to Belisarius' efforts, and offering a barbed comparison with Justinian, who sent a general rather than lead his forces himself, as a truly virtuous emperor might. It is notable that these comments all fall relatively early in Procopius' history, the latest coming in Book 5. As we shall see, in the later books, particularly Book 8, Procopius' comparisons of the present to the past are of a decidedly more pessimistic nature.

While the foregoing might be dismissed as formulaic praise, in another passage Procopius offers a detailed example of an instance where contemporary invention creates a situation where the present is demonstrably better than the way things were done previously. At 8.11.27, the Roman army is besieging Petra, and the steeply hilled approach to the high walls makes traditional rams impossible to use. The Huns in the

Roman army devise a new type of ram made with "thick wands" rather than beams, with iron barbs, which are light and maneuverable enough to allow them to use it on the hilly ground. Procopius expounds upon the complete novelty and utility of the device:

> ...οἵα οὔτε Ῥωμαίων οὔτε Περσῶν τινί, ἐξ οὗ γεγόνασιν ἄνθρωποι, ἐς ἔννοιαν ἦλθε· καίτοι τεχνιτῶν μὲν πολὺς ὅμιλος ἐν ἑκαστέρᾳ πολιτείᾳ γέγονέ τε ἀεί καὶ τανῦν ἔστιν. ἐς χρείαν δὲ πολλάκις ἐς τὸν πάντα αἰῶνα κατέστησαν τῆς μηχανῆς ἑκάτεροι ταύτης, ἐς ἐρύματα τειχομαχοῦντες ἐν χωρίοις σκληροῖς καὶ δυσβάτοις τισὶ κείμενα· ἀλλ᾽ αὐτῶν οὐδενὶ τὸ ἐνθύμημα τοῦτο γεγένηται ὅπερ τούτοις δὴ τοῖς βαρβάροις τᾶνυν γέγονεν. οὕτως ἀεὶ προϊόντι τῷ χρόνῳ συννεωτερίζειν τῶν πραγμάτων τὰς ἐπινοίας φιλεῖ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ φύσις.
>
> ...such as had never been conceived by anyone else of the Romans or of the Persians since men have existed, although there have always been and now are great numbers of engineers in both countries. And both nations have often been in need of this device throughout their histories, in storming the walls of fortresses situated on rough or difficult ground, yet not to a single one of them has come this idea which now occurred to these barbarians. Thus as time goes on human ingenuity is ever wont to keep pace with it by discovering new devices. (8.11.27)

If Procopius evinces some surprise that such a novel thing should be devised by barbarians, when no Romans or Persians had thought of it before, he is quick to give them, and the present day that they inhabit, full credit and praise for their ingenuity.

More often, however, in Procopius' comparisons of the present and the ancient past, the contemporary world comes out the worse. In several instances, Procopius makes a point of noting how structures built in years past are stronger than present ability to destroy them: at 1.7.13 Amida's ancient walls are too strong for Cabades to assail with

rams.[245] Meanwhile, the cistern of Auximus resists the attempts of the (Roman-affiliated) Isaurians to destroy it:

> οἱ γὰρ πάλαι τεχνῖται, ἀρετῆς ἐς τὰ ἔργα ἐπιμελούμενοι μάλιστα, οὕτω δὴ καὶ ταύτην τὴν οἰκοδομίαν εἰργάσαντο, ὥστε μήτε χρόνῳ μήτε ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβουλῇ εἴκειν.
>
> ...for the artisans of old, who cared most of all for excellence in their work, had built this masonry in such a way as to yield neither to time nor to any attempts of men to destroy it. (6.27.19)

Procopius again allies the impersonal force of Time with the men of latter days who would function as its agents; neither is capable of the destruction, both are cast as enemies of the survival of this example of the excellent workmanship of old. As the reader sees again and again in the course of Procopius' *Wars*, destruction is all too easy, and so the resistance of these particular ancient structures is all the more remarkable. It is true that in both cases, it is barbarians (though the Isaurians are on the emperor's side) who are unable to destroy the work of ancient Roman craftsmen, and so one could argue that this merely shows that Rome's work is stronger than the barbarian ability to destroy (a hopeful message for Procopius' time). It is significant, however, that it is the *ancient* Romans who were crafted things that the barbarians cannot destroy: it still comes back to reflect poorly on contemporary Romans, that they are not as capable as their ancestors of building things that last.[246]

---

[245] πολλάκις γὰρ ἐμαλών καθελεῖν τι τοῦ περιβόλου ἢ κατασεῖσαι ἥκιστα ἴσχυσεν, οὕτως ἀσφαλῶς ἡ οἰκοδομία τοῖς δειμαμένοις τὸ παλαιὸν εἰργαστο.
For, though he battered the wall many times, he was unable to break down any portion of the defense, or even to shake it; so secure had been the work of the builders who had constructed it long before (1.7.13).

[246] For more on these passages, see also pp 167ff below.

Elsewhere, recent and contemporary neglect of construction and fortifications is a subject for lament: at 3.21.11, Procopius notes that the once-great circuit wall of Carthage is neglected and run-down. (ἦν γὰρ ὁ Καρχηδόνος περίβολος οὕτω δὴ ἀπημελημένος ὥστε ἐσβατὸς ἐν χέποις πολλοῖς τῷ βουλομένῳ καὶ εὐέφοδος ἐγεγόνει.) This, at least, does not reflect negatively solely on the Romans, though they are arguably ultimately to blame for allowing the city to fall into Vandal hands by which to be neglected. Similarly, at 5.26.4-9, Procopius muses on how Ostia was a place of great consequence in ancient times (λόγου μὲν πολλοῦ τὸ παλαιὸν ἀξία), but now is entirely without walls (νῦν δὲ ἀτείχιστος παντάπασιν οὖσα).

A number of times in the course of his narrative, Procopius is prompted to lament the state to which the Roman Empire has fallen in power and prestige, vis-à-vis its barbarian neighbors. This happens most often, unsurprisingly, in the latter books of the history, when Roman fortunes in the various wars have turned for the worse. At 7.38.8, the Sclaveni are overrunning Thrace and Illyricum, even though they had never even been into Roman territory before,[247] and at 7.40.43, they plunder Astica between Adrianople and Constantinople, "a place which had not been ravaged since ancient times." (καὶ χώραν τὴν Ἀστικὴν καλουμένη ἐληΐζοντο κατ᾽ ἐξουσίαν,

---

[247] καὶ φρούρια πολλὰ πολιορκίᾳ ἑκάτεροι εἷλον, οὔτε τειχομαχήσαντες πρότερον, οὔτε ἐς τὸ πεδίαν καταβῆναι τολμήσαντες, ἐπεὶ οὐδε γῆν τὴν Ῥωμαίων καταθεῖν ἐγκεχειρήκασι οἱ βάρβαροι οὗτοι πώποτε.
...and both armies captured many fortresses by siege, though they neither had any previous experience attacking city walls, nor had they dared to come down to the open plain, since these barbarians had never, in fact, even attempted to overrun the land of the Romans (7.38.8).

ἀδῄωτον ἐκ παλαιοῦ οὖσαν...) Similarly, when Rome concludes an unfavorable treaty with Persia, Procopius sums up public opinion about the terms thusly:

> καὶ ὅτι Πέρσαι τὸ ἐκ παλαιοῦ μὲν σφίσιν ἐν σπουδῇ γεγονός, δόξαν δὲ οὔτε πολέμῳ κρατήσειν οὔτε τῷ ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ δυνατὸν ἔσεσθαι, λέγω δέ, ὅπως ἐς δασμοῦ ἀπαγωγὴν ὑπόφοροι αὐτῶν Ῥωμαῖοι ἔσονται, ἰσχυρότατα ἐν τῷ παρόντι τῷ τῆς ἐκεχειρίας ὀνόματι ἐκρατύναντο.
>
> "They were also moved by the fact that the very thing which the Persians had been striving for from ancient times, but which had seemed impossible of achievement either by war or by any other means,--that is to say, having the Romans subject to the payment of tribute to them--- this had been most firmly achieved at the present juncture in the name of an armistice. (8.15.16)

Meanwhile, due to weakening Roman influence in Western Europe, the Franks in the city of Masila have become presumptious and start minting gold *staters* with the likeness of their own king, rather than Justinian's (7.33.4-6).[248] These passages occur fairly close together; late in Book 7 and early in Book 8 is a section in which things are going particularly badly for the Empire, and these passages throw the current weakness into sharper and more poignant relief by harkening back to the strength it once had.

Rather along the same lines as Procopius' praise of the emperor Majorian,[249] he praises a pair Roman generals around the time of the loss of North Africa in such a way as to leave no confusion as to how the great men of recent years compare to those of the distant past: "If one should call either of them 'the last of the Romans' he would not err." (εἴ τις αὐτοῖν ἑκάτερον ἄνδρα Ῥωμαίων εἴποι, οὐκ ἂν ἁμάρτοι) (3.3.15). While such a blanket generalization may suggest that this, too, is formulaic praise which

[248] νόμισμα δὲ χρυσοῦν ἐκ τῶν ἐν Γάλλοις μετάλλων πεποίηνται, οὐ τοῦ Ῥωμαίων αὐτοκράτορος, ᾗπερ εἴθισται...

[249] (3.7.4), see above p 152.

should not on its own bear too much interpretive weight, considered together with the other comparative statments of the kind that Procopius makes it suggests a pattern of historical decline for the Roman Empire with little hope of its recovery. Moreover, the "highmindedness and excellence in every respect" (μεγαλοψυχίας τε καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἀρετῆς) of Aetius and Boniface does nothing to prevent them from further damaging the Western Empire's position against the Vandals in pursuit of their rivalry and self-interest (3.3.17-36). If indeed Procopious' initial praise of the two men is not outright sarcasm, their fall into deleterious corruption and damaging defensive alliances presents a mirror in minature of the decline of the state of *Romanitas* in the Empire.[250]

A passage at 7.4.31-32 contains a somewhat similar sentiment to those above, but is even more difficult to interpret. The Romans have fled from a battle against the Goths and their standards are captured, "a thing which has never before happened to the Romans." (τὰ δὲ σημεῖα ξύμπαντα ἔλαβον, ὅπερ οὔτω πρὸτερον Ῥωμαίοις ξυνέπεσε.) Are we to interpret this as a figure of speech, a deliberate disregarding, or actual ignorance of that classic ancient example of just such a tragedy: Varus' famous defeat of 9 CE? For Procopius to deliberately ignore the debacle, perhaps for the sake of making the recent one all the more remarkable, or even simply as a figure of speech, would be odd: more consistent with his usual style of employing the past would be to reference the ancient event and the emphasize the long span of time elapsed since, as with the plundering of Astica mentioned just above (7.40.43), or the triumph of

[250] For more on Procopius' depiction of latter-day *Romanitas*, see Chapter 4 below.

Belisarius (4.9). It seems likely, then, that Procopius was either unaware of, or had forgotten, the classical precedent for his passage at 7.4.31-32.[251]

Lastly, another comparison that leaves us with a note of ambiguity: at 5.28.24, a group of Isaurians urge Belsarius not to despise infantry, although the Roman army is now mostly cavalry, for it was because of infantry troops, "as we hear, the power of the ancient Romans was brought to its *present* greatness" (emphasis mine). (δι᾽ οὗ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῖς πάλαι Ῥωμαίοις ἐς τόδε μεγέθους κεχωρηκέναι ἀκούομεν.) The Isaurians, though allied with the Romans, still hold a place in Procopius' narrative that is mostly that of the barbarian outsider, in whose perspective the Roman Empire is still much bigger and more powerful than any one other political entity or opponent. On the one hand, the empire is 'presently great;' on the other, it is understood to have that greatness due to the achievements and methods of the ancient Romans (employing mostly infantry), which are not practiced by the modern army. While the present Roman forces have at least not entirely lost that greatness built up by the Roman army of old, neither can they rightly take credit for it.

Thus in a number and variety of passages, Procopius makes statements that explicitly compare his contemporary world, or some element of it, with the ancient world. How the present "stacks up" against the (sometimes idealized) past varies with the context and type of comparison it is. He might compare an element of the present to the

---

[251] A third (fourth?) possibility is that he is winking at his readers, so to speak: expecting the highly educated among them to catch the "mistake," narrator and audience could share a private joke at the expense of those who catastrophize the current setback and feel that the problems of their age are unprecedented in Roman history. This, however, does not seem to me to be much in keeping with the pessimistic tone of most of Book 7.

past in a generalized sort of way, to comment that such a thing had never been before, or that it had been a long time since it had. In other cases, particular elements out of the past compare favorably to the contemporary world, as when the structures of the past are stronger than the present ability to destroy them, or they are much fallen from what they once were. Comparisons of the present state of the Roman empire and the Romans who inhabit it are not likely to fall on the side of the present, but occasionally Procopius' text does show or suggest ways in which the present can measure up to, or even surpass, its ancient past.

It is noteworthy that so many of Procopius' comparative statements invoke the specifically Roman past: Roman emperors and generals, Roman greatness and territorial security, Roman skill in building and waging war. Here and elsewhere, it is particularly evident that the Roman period comprised the vast bulk, as well as the most proximate era, of the ancient past to which Procopius looked. As Cubitt observes, "the past is always the past of something;" the history being constructed is that of a particular group or community, "our history."[252] This construction of a history is crucially informative of that group's construction of identity, as is the identity determinative to the structuring and demarcation of a history. For Procopius, the past by which he judges the events of his own day, the past to which he turns to inform his understanding and interpretation of them; in short, the ancient history which forms the context for his own work of history-writing, is largely, though certainly not entirely, the past of the Roman Empire.

---

[252] Cubitt 199ff not only distills, but adds to, the work of Hobsbawm, Megill, and others on the link between memory and identity, see also below, Conclusion Part IV.

As a final thought for this section, let us consider the applicability of the work of sociologist Eviatar Zerubavel to the understanding of the past and present Procopius constructs. In his book *Time Maps*, Zerubavel offers an interesting approach for analyzing a society's understanding of its own history based on the "topography" of their cultural memories.[253] He sketches numerous different shapes which cultural memory can give to the past: upward and downward slopes, peaks and valleys, straight lines and curves. Applying Zerubavel's approach to cultural memory to the concept of historical memory we are here developing allows us to consider the overall shape and character, as well as the internal consistency, of the long sweep of History in which Procopius situates the events of his history. Drawing from Zerubavel's schemata, which are intentionally drawn in very broad, general strokes, we might imagine Procopius' depiction of the topography of his past as a valley surrounded by two unequal peaks. The classical past, the height of Roman power and skill, represents a peak from which the empire has fallen, while the long downward slope (though a gentler slope, perhaps, than those of the cultures Zerubavel surveys) of forgetting and physical decay is halted by a second, though smaller peak representing Procopius' own day. For Procopius the greatness of Belisarius (5.10.30), the efforts of Justinian (3.6.11) and, of course, himself (6.23.26 on the army's trumpet-calls, see Introduction and Section VI below), provide a new high-point for the power and prestige of the Romans. Applying Zerubavels' approach to Procopius' historical memory also brings into relief the numerous places where the topography of Procopius' past does not conform to this general scheme. While

[253] Zerubavel, E. (2003). *Time maps: Collective memory and the social shape of the past.* Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Press.

Procopius' remarks on noteworthy events, his praise of Belisarius, and admiration for technical innovation (8.11.27) suggest a upward-slope shape to the long course of history, in other sections Procopius is much less optimistic (consider those passages from late in Book 7 discussed above, or pp 164-6 below). This points out not only the limitations of Zerubavel's approach, in this instance at least, but moreover the great diversity of engagement and depth of thought, on Procopius' part, about the past's relationship to the present, and the present's relationship to the past.

Part VI: Time and Loss

Of a somewhat different, more carefully developed, and more poignant character are those passages in which Procopius focuses specifically on the loss that occurs over time, that has occurred between the classical past and his own day. In some cases, what is lost is accurate knowledge of the past, as discussed in Sections II and III on the change of words and their meaning over time; or at 8.4.11, where Procopius remarks that whether the Goths were once Arian Christains, he cannot say: they themselves do not know, but as they are no longer Arian, it is of relatively little consequence.[254] As we will see, in most cases the loss, whether intellectual or physical, is more lamentable.

---

[254] εἴτε δὲ τῆς Ἀρείου δόξνς ἐγένετό ποτε οἱ Γότθοι οὗτοι, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα Γοθικὰ ἔθην, εἴτε καὶ ἄλλο τι ἀμφὶ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῖς .ησκητο, οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ ἴσασιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀφελείά τε τανῦν καὶ ἀπραγμοσύνῃ πολλῇ τιμῶσι τὴν δόξαν.

When the loss in question is physical, Procopius has imagery ready to hand to convey the starkness and poignancy of the change, as with the city of Urvisalla, which Alaric sacked:

> διὰ πόλεως Οὐβισαλίας ᾔει, ἣν δὴ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις οὕτως Ἀλάριχος καθεῖλεν ὥστε ἄλλο γε αὐτῇ οὐσ᾽ ὁτιοῦν ἀπολέλειπται τοῦ πρότερον κόσμου, ὅτι μὴ πὺλης μιᾶς καὶ τῆς κατασκευῆς τοῦ ἐδάφους λείψανόν τι βραχύ. (6.16.24)
>
> ...passing through the city of Urvisalia, which in earlier times Alaric had destroyed so comletely that nothing whatever has been left of its former grandeur, except a small remnant of a single gate and of the floor of the adjoining edifice.[255] [256]

A sense of physical loss is also present in Procopius' statement not long after, at 6.20.15, that the grain of Italy was ripening for the year, but the yield was much less than formerly because there had been no one to tend it.

> Ἡνίκα τε αὖθις ἐπανιὼν ὁ χρόνους τὴν τοῦ θέρους ὥραν ἤνεγκεν, ὁ σῖτος ἤδη ἐν τοῖς ληΐοις αὐτόματος ἤκμαζεν, οὐκὶ τοσοῦτος μέντοι ὅσος τὸ πρότερον, ἀλλὰ πολλῷ ἥσσων. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς αὔλαξιω οὐκ ἀρότροις οὐδὲ χερσὶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκέκρυπτο, ἀλλ᾽ἐπιπολῆς κείμενος ἔτυχε, μοῖραν αὐτοῦ τινα ὀλίγην ἡ γῆ

[255] This is, obviously, similar to the passages describing the dilapidation of the fortifications of Carthage and Ostia discussed in the last section. I have separated them for purposes of discussion as each conveys a somewhat different impact: with the former two, the emphasis is on the comparison between then and now, while with Urvisalla, both the melodramatic details of the gate and floor being all that remains of the city, and the fact that the whole city has been destroyed, has been lost, contribute to this passage carrying more regret and finality.

[256] Compare 3.2.11: πόλεις τε γάρ, ὅσας εἶλον, οὕτω κατειργάσαντο οὐδεν εἰς ἐμὲ αὐταῖς ἀπολέλειπται γνώρισμα, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐντὸς τοῦ Ἰονίου κόλπου, πλήν γε δὴ ὅτι πύργον ἕνα ἢ πύλην μίαν ἤ τι τοιοῦτο αὐταῖς περιεῖναι ξυνέβη· "For they [Alaric's Goths] destroyed all the cities which they captured, especially those south of the Ionian Gulf, so completely that nothing has been left to my time to know them by, unless, indeed, it might be one tower or gate or some such thing which chanced to remain."

> ἐνερυεῖν ἴσχυεν. οὐδενός τε αὐτὸν ἔπι ἀμήσαντος, πόρρω ἀκμῆς ἐλθὼν αὖθις ἔπεσε καὶ οὐδὲν τὸ λοιπὸν ἐνθένδε ἐφύη.
>
> Now as time went on and brought again the summer season, the grain was already ripening uncared for in the fields, but in no such quantities as formerly—indeed it was much less. For since it had not been covered in the furrows, either by ploughs or by the hand of man, but lay upon the surface, the earth was able to make only a small portion of it take root. And since after that no one reaped it, when it had become fully ripe it fell again to the ground and nothing grew from it thereafter.

This only worsens the troubles of the Italians by leading to a severe famine. Similarly, Procopius notes at 3.2.11-12 that because of the ravages of Alaric and the Visigoths, the cities of the Ionian Gulf were often so completely destroyed "that nothing has been left to my own time to know them by, unless indeed it might be one tower or one gate or some such thing which has chanced to remain" (πλήν γε δὴ ὅτι πύργον ἕνα ἢ πύλαν μίαν ἤ τι τοιοῦτο αὐταῖς περιεῖναι ξυνέβη), and Italy is sparsely populated up to the present day (ὅθεν εἴς ἔτι καὶ νῦν ὀλιγάνθρωπον τὴν Ἰταλίαν ξθμβαίνει εἶναι). These passages are all similar to those discussed above dealing with change over time, with the significant difference that here the physical loss or loss of prosperity is due to the destructive violence of a hostile military force. The difference among them is that the agents of destruction in the past were barbarians, while the present lean harvest can be attributed, not just to their ravages, but to the invasion of the Roman forces and their ongoing conflict with the Goths.

The decline in prosperity from the height of the Roman Empire is also reflected in two notable passages in which Procopius laments the loss, not simply of something physical, but of knowledge. The first is in fact both, for what have been lost are documents:

> ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῶν ἐπὶ Λιβύης χωρίων τοὺς φόρους οὐκετι ἦν ἐν γραμματείοις τεταγμένοις εὑρεῖν, ᾗπερ αὐτοὺς ἀπεγράψαντο ἐν τοῖς ἄνω χρόνοις Ῥωμαῖοι, ἅτε Γιζερίχου ἀναχαιτίσαντός τε καὶ διαφθείραντος κατ᾽ ἀρχὰς ἅπαντας, Τρύφων τε καὶ Εὐστράτιος πρὸς βασιλέως ἐστάλησαν, ἐφ᾽ ᾧ τοὺς φόρους αὐτοῖς τάξουσι κατὰ λόγον ἑκάστῳ.
>
> And since it was no longer possible to find the revenues of the districts of Libya set down in order in documents, as the Romans had recorded them in former times, inasmuch as Gizeric had upset and destroyed everything in the beginning, Tryphon and Eustratius were sent by the emperor in order to assess the taxes for the Libyans each according to his proportion. (4.8.25)

Here Procopius draws out in real, practical terms an effect of the Vandal possession of erstwhile Roman territory, and of the changes in the fortunes of the Roman Empire since its height. Significantly, the Romans cannot pick things up where they left off, as it were, in the Western Empire; they cannot simply begin again collecting the taxes they once did as rightful, established rulers of the land. There has been a break in continuity, and the revenue information has been lost and cannot be recovered. Instead, Justinian's administration must begin again from scratch instituting a wholly new system in its place. On the one hand, the loss of the tax information is real and practical, and carries with it overtones of failure in the basic functions of governance, of empire; but on the other hand, it is also data, rather than any higher form of knowledge: rather mundane and ultimately, replaceable.

Finally, let us return to the passage with which we began the present study, on Procopius' timely suggestion of an ancient technique of trumpet-calls which proves of such great use to Belisarius. In contrast to those just discussed, it deals with a loss that is not just of information, but of knowledge and ability, and is, moreover, something that strikes nearer to the heart of a certain ideal of *Romanitas*: a martial skill. Procopius has

been narrating the story of the Roman siege of the town of Auximus, where the problem has arisen that an attacking party of Roman soldiers does not know when to retreat, because owing to the lay of the land they can see neither the ambushes of the Goths nor their compatriots in the camp (who can see the ambush) trying to warn them. Making one of his infrequent appearances in the narrative, Procopius, acting as Belisarius' aide, tells him that the trumpeters in the Roman army in ancient times (τὸ παλαιὸν ἐν τῷ Ῥωμαίων στρατῷ χρώμενοι) blew two distinct strains, one to signal advance, and one retreat:

> ἐπεὶ δὲ τανῦν ἅμαθῖᾳ τε ἡ τοιαύτη τέχνη ἐξώλισθε καὶ μιᾷ σάλπιγγι ἄμφω δηλῶσαι ἀμήχανον, αὐτὸς οὕτω τὸ λοιπὸν ποίει. (6.23.26)
>
> But since at the present time such skill has become obsolete through ignorance and it is impossible to express both commands by one trumpet, do you adopt the following course hereafter...

Procopius then suggests that instead Belisarius use the fact that the army has two very different types of trumpet to achieve the same effect: use the cavalry trumpet to signal advance, and the infantry trumpet to signal retreat. Belisarius approves of this idea and does so.

Certainly there is here, as we have seen in the other passages in this section, regret at the loss of ancient knowledge, and knowledge of a skill (τέχνη) that would be presently useful, at that. Procopius rues that the memory of the different calls has been allowed to become obsolete through negligence and "ignorance." However, neither Procopius—the narrator or the historical actor—can be said to dwell on that loss. Rather, this episode is so wonderful because it shows Procopius as an actor in his own history,

doing in real life a thing very similar to what Procopius the narrator does with his history. As a classically-inclined historian, Procopius is more aware than most of the change and loss that has occurred over the intervening time, but his work is a history of his own day, and rather than allow it to become mired in the ancient past, he crafts into it, and crafts it into, a persuasive and practically-minded argument for the relevance and importance of memory out of the ancient world to the present. Procopius-the-character urges Belisarius to take the *idea* of the different trumpet-calls, the memory of which is still preserved (though himself) and recreate it using the materials he has to hand: the two different types of trumpets. He draws information and inspiration from the past, understanding and making note of but taking in stride the historical change that has taken place, and adapting the idea to the contemporary reality as best he can.

Procopius' depiction of the loss of knowledge and skill, as well as of physical structures, that occurs over the long course of time reminds us how much forgetting, the other side of the coin to memory, is a crucial element to understand in studying its counterpart. As Procopius' depiction of the inevitable effects of the long sweep of Time and the work of Hawlbachs, Assmann, Weinrich, and others aver, remembering is the exception, and not the norm.[257] And while forgetting is most often characterized by Procopius as a natural occurrence as knowledge is communicated (or not) across wide gulfs of time, physical space, and culture (Assmann's "passive forgetting"), he also suggests the ways in which human actors can have a hand, not only in remembering, but

[257] Assmann, Aleida. "Canon and Archive" *Cultural Memory Studies: an Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. 97-107. Weinrich, H. *Lethe: The Art and Critique of Forgetting*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004

in forgetting ("active forgetting").[258] The craft of the poets causes the fanciful mythic explanation of a place-name or cultural phenomenon to be remembered, at the expense of the pedestrian one. More troubling is the influence of those in power who have caused the shift in the concept of *foederati* (8.5.12-14).

Procopius puts forward the idea that survival out of the ancient past is possible, in some form, if effort is put into its preservation. When considering the loss of knowledge and skill as compared to physical loss, the mental effort of preserving memory, of remembering, is paralleled by the physical effort of preserving the embodiments of that memory: fortifications, buildings and monuments like the "ship of Aeneas" that the Romans have put so much effort into preserving, and take such apparent pride in. For the final section of this chapter, we will look at this and other instances of survival over time.

## Part VII: Memory Preserved (Remembrance of Things Past)

Aw we saw above, a number of times Procopius notes the impressive survival of physical structures built by the ancient Romans: at 1.7.13 Amida's ancient walls are too strong for Cabades to assail with rams, while at 6.27.19, the cistern of Auximus resists the attempts of the Isaurians to destroy it.[259] While these fairly pedestrian buildings do not do much in the way of carrying cultural memory, other physical objects on which

---

[258] A. Assmann 98. On the relevance of Assmann's ideas of *canon* and *archive* to understanding Procopius' project of history-writing, see below, Conclusion, pp 278-285.
[259] In Procopius' *Buildings*, by contrast, the emphasis is naturally on the deterioration of ancient structures (hence the need of their refurbishment by Justinian).

Procopius dwells do. Most obvious is the story of the Palladium (5.15.5-14),[260] which highlights the historical and cultural continuity from the very ancient (Eastern Mediterranean) past through the height of Rome to Procopius' own day. The theme of survival and continuity of memory, however, is troubled by the uncertainty Procopius introduces about the current whereabouts of the relic. While the "Byzantines" claim that Constantine took it to his new foundation, the Romans will not confirm that, and say they do not know where it is, but point to a replica with an unexpectedly Egyptian appearance.

Similarly ambiguous is the passage in which Procopius describes the "ship of Aeneas" (8.22.4-16).[261] Procopius describes the ship in some detail, making much of its size and the excellence of its construction. More interesting for us here, though, is Procopius' introduction to this digression. He has been describing the destruction in the city of Rome and the sad plight of the Roman senators, instructed by Totilla to take care of the city as best they can. "But these Romans, being reduced to the state of slaves and stripped of all their money, were not only unable to lay claim to the public funds, but could not even secure those which belonged to them personally" (οἱ δὲ καθεστῶτες ἐν αἰχμαλώτων λόγῳ καὶ περιῃρημένοι χρήματα πάντα, μὴ ὅτι τῶν κοινῶν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ τῶν ἰδίᾳ σφίσι προσηκόντων δυνατοὶ ἦσαν (8.22.4)). Procopius then goes on to describe the Romans' efforts toward preservation, made all the more admirable by their difficult plight:

> καίτοι ἀνθρώπων μάλιστα πάντων ὧν ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν φιλοπόλιδες Ῥωμαῖοι τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες, περιστέλλειν τε τὰ πάτρια πάντα καὶ διασώζεσθαι ἐν σπουδῇ ἔχουσιν, ὅπως δὴ μηδὲν ἀφανίζηται

---

[260] see pp 146-9 above

[261] For more on the ship of Aeneas, see above pp 122, and below pp 260-1, 278-82

> Ῥώμη τοῦ παλαιοῦ κόσμου. οἵ γε καὶ πολύν τινα βεβαρβαρωμένοι αἰῶνα τάς τε πόλεως διεσώσαντο οἰκοδομίας καὶ τῶν ἐγκαλλωπισμάτων τὰ πλεῖστα, ὅσα οἷόν τε ἦν χρόνῳ τε τοσούτῳ τὸ μῆκος καὶ τῷ ἀπαμελεῖσθαι δι᾽ ἀρετὴν τῶν πεποιημένων ἀντέχειν. ἔτι μέντοι καὶ ὅσα μνημεῖα τοῦ γένους ἐλέλειπτο ἔτι, ἐν τοῖς καὶ ἡ ναῦς Αἰνείου, τοῦ τῆς πόλεως οἰκιστοῦ, καὶ εἰς τόδε κεῖται, θέαμα παντελῶς ἄπιστον. νεώσοικον γὰρ ποιησάμενοι ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει, παρὰ τὴν τοῦ Τιβέριδος ὄχθην, ἐνταῦθά τε αὐτὴν καταθέμενοι, ἐξ ἐκείνου τηροῦσιν (8.22.5-8).
>
> Yet the Romans love their city above all the men we know, and they are eager to protect all their ancestral treasures and to preserve them, **so that nothing of the ancient glory of Rome may be obliterated**. For even though they were for a long period under barbarian sway, they preserved the buildings of the city and most of its adornments, such as could **through the excellence of their workmanship withstand so long a lapse of time and such neglect**. Furthermore, all such memorials of the race as were still left are preserved even to this day, and among them the ship of Aeneas, the founder of the city, an altogether incredible sight. For they built a ship-house in the middle of the city on the bank of the Tiber, and depositing in there, they have preserved it from that time."

The Roman senators here are models, paragons of good curator-ship of classical heritage. Procopius enumerates the dangers to the memory of "the ancient glory of Rome": the physical wear of centuries, the neglect of the barbarian rulers, and now, the current destruction of so many sieges and captures of Rome and the deprivation of its dedicated caretakers. He evidently considers the fact that the Romans have preserved the physical memories of their city through the last few years to be as impressive as their preservation through all the long centuries before ("all such memorials... as were still left are preserved even to my day.") Even among such danger and destruction as the city has faced, Procopius finds a hopeful message: amid the loss, all one can do is work to preserve what remains, motivated by an appreciation of its value. Procopius then seems to be making his own contribution by spreading knowledge and appreciation of these

artefacts of cultural heritage, seeking perhaps to assist in the preservation efforts by recording these things in writing, fearful that, despite the Romans' efforts up to this time, the destruction and hardship in Rome that is a central theme of Book 8 will at last get the better of them and swallow the ship and the other memorials of "the ancient glory of Rome." The tone of this section is optimistic, but guardedly so: preservation out of the past is possible, but only with constant vigilance, and even then can still be endangered.

Procopius in fact gives another specific example of such a survival out of the classical past much earlier in his history, when he describes how "the house of Sallust" barely escaped destruction during Alaric's 410 sack of Rome:

> οἱ δὲ τάς τε οἰκίας ἐνέπρησαν αἳ τῆς πύλης ἄγχιστα ἦσαν, ἐν αἷς ἦν καὶ ἡ Σαλουστίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίοις τὸ παλαιὸν τὴν ἱστορίαν γράψαντος, ἧς δὴ τὰ πλεῖστα ἡμίκαυτα καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἕστηκε... (3.2.24)
>
> And they set fire to the houses which were next to the gate, among which was also the house of Sallust, who in ancient times wrote the history of the Romans, and the greater part of this house has stood half-burned up to my time....

As a historian Sallust is of obvious interest to Procopius, and memory of him is particularly poignant in a history that is also, in a sense, a history of the Romans. Sallust's house standing half-burned is a compelling image for the state of ancient Roman heritage in Procopius' day: still extant in spite of past threats, but, already damaged and weakened, all the more in danger of falling victim to the next threat, or the next, if more care is not taken to preserve it.

The same dilemma on a much larger scale is the fate of that encompassing locus of Roman cultural memory in the post-classical world: the city of Rome itself. The city's fortunes go though many ups and downs over the course of Procopius' history, and its

singular cultural value is evident on every page it appears. We will discuss at some length in the next chapter the importance of the city of Rome to sixth century Roman identity, and the problems posed by that importance. For now, let us consider a final passage, in which Procopius works into the weft of his narrative a passionate argument for how vital Rome is as an embodiment of ancient memory. Totilla, having re-captured Rome, is poised to raze it to the ground: he tore down one-third of the fortifications, "And he was on the point also of burning the finest and most noteworthy of the buildings and making Rome a sheep-pasture..." (ἐμπιπρᾶν δὲ καὶ τῶν οἰκοδομιῶν τὰ κάλλιστά τε καὶ ἀξιολογώτατα ἔμελλε, Ῥώμην τε μηλόβοτον καταστήσεσθαι (7.22.7)). Just then he is swayed by an impassioned plea from Belisarius, into whose mouth Procopius puts a historian's eulogy for the eternal city.

> Ῥώμη μέντοι πόλεων ἁπασῶν, ὅσαι ὑφ᾽ ἡλίῳ τυγχάωουσιν οὖσαι, μεγίστη τε καὶ ἀξιολογωτάτη ὡμολόγηται εἶναι. οὐ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς ἑνὸς ἀρετῇ εἴργασται οὐδὲ χρόνου βραχέος δυνάμει ἐς τόσον μεγέθους τε καὶ κάλλους ἀφῖκται, ἀλλὰ βασιλέων μὲν πλῆθος, ἀνδρῶν δὲ ἀρίστων συμμορίαι πολλαί, χρόνου τε μῆκος καὶ πλούτου ἐξουσίας ὑπερβολὴ τὰ τε ἄλλα πάντα ἐκ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ τεχνίτας ἀνθρώπους ἀνταύθα ξυναγαγειν ἴσχυσαν. οὕτω τε τὴν πόλιν τοιαύτην, οἵανπερ ὁρᾷς, κατὰ βραχὺ τετκηνάμενοι, μνημεῖα τῆς πάντων ἀρετῆς τοῖς ἐπιγενησομένοις ἀπέλιπον, ὥστε ἡ ἐς ταῦτα ἐπήρεια εἰκότως ἂν ἀδίκημα μέγα ἐς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος δόξειεν εἶναι· ἀφαιρεῖται γὰρ τοὺς μὲν προγεγενημένους τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς μνήμην, τοὺς δὲ ὕστερον ἐπιγενησομένους τῶν ἔργων τὴν θέαν (7.22.9-12).
>
> Now among all the cities under the sun Rome is agreed to be the greatest and most noteworthy. **For it has not been created by the ability of one man, nor has it attained such greatness and beauty by a power of short duration**, but a multitude of monarchs, many companies of the best men, a great lapse of time, and an extraordinary abundance of wealth have availed to bring together in that city all other things that are in the whole world, and skilled workers besides. Thus, little by little, have they built the city, such as you behold it, thereby leaving

> to future generations memorials of the ability of them all, so that insult to these monuments would properly be considered a great crime against the men of all time; **for by such action the men of former generations are robbed of the memorials of their ability, and future generations of the sight of their works**.

Belisarius goes on to make an argument structured around Rome's timelessness: disregarding Totilla's immediate concerns for Rome's strategic value in the war, he argues that should Totilla destroy Rome and win the war, he will be destroying his own possession rather than another man's; and should he loose, he will at least have a victory in being remembered as the man who saved Rome (7.22.13-16).

Certainly there is much to unpack, to say nothing of much to appreciate, in this passage. Belisarius' words emphasize the great stretch of time that went in to the creation of such a gem of cultural heritage as Rome, and the vulnerability that so many centuries of achievement could be destroyed at once, by one man.[262] Procopius, arguing through Belisarius, states clearly here the reasons *why* Rome, and ancient heritage in general, ought to be preserved, and they are, notably, a historian's reasons. The importance of preserving memorials of the past both for the sake of the memory of those who left them and in order to bequeath them to future generations closely parallels the reasons for writing history found in the introductions of classical historiographers from Herodotus

[262] Procopius' praise of the city as the result of work of many generations expands on a long-established trope commenting on the city's incorporation of the labor, art, and culture of the whole empire, a group widely dispersed in terms of geography, rather than time. See, for example, Aelius Aristides' *Roman Oration* 4-13: Aristides, Aelius, and James Henry Oliver. (1953) *The ruling power: a study of the Roman Empire in the second century after Christ through the Roman oration of Aelius Aristides*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 43:4. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

and Thucydides down to Procopius himself. Preserving Rome is preserving history: Rome is History, embodied.

Though this episode ends on a hopeful note, with Totilla recognizing the historical value of Rome and preserving it (mostly) unscathed, over the long course of the war the city does not fare well, either as a physical entity, or as an institution—the living, functioning community that is the heir of a continuous tradition stretching back to the earliest roots of the monarchy and the active preservers of that tradition. After the ravages of the constant warfare, destruction of property, deprivation, famine, economic upset, loss of population though death and relocation, including the better part of the senatorial class; Rome at the end of the history is deprivered of its community of rememberers, and left a shell of what it once was. Rather than the physical city existing as a locus of living cultural memory, the idea of Rome becomes a site of memory as Procopius' text translates the traditions the author has encountered into historical memory.[263]

## Conclusions

In our survey of the past in Procopius' *Wars*, we have seen that our author engages with the memory of the ancient past in a great variety of ways, resulting in a historical memory that is studied and thoughtful; multilayered; and by turns hopeful,

---

[263] See Conclusion pp 285-291 below for more on Nora's *Lieux de mémoire.*

passionate, pessimistic, and obstinate. We have observed Procopius' interest in the preservation of the cultural memory of the Romans, as well as in the particular role of history-writing in preserving and transmitting memory. He is both eager to preserve the memory of such cultural artifacts and memorials as the "ship of Aeneas" and the house of Sallust, and laud the achievement of the people of Rome who have carried out the work of that preservation for so many centuries. He also shows commitment to the projects of historiographical memory, the careful study and comparison of ancient texts and contemporary evidence, in order to further augment and refine the store of knowledge about the geography and long sweep of history of the ancient world.

Procopius has been seen to be particularly interested in Roman history, as well as in the place of mythical history in modern historiography. As is natural in a work built around military campaigns, memories of great victories and defeats are in evidence, but even more noticeable are memories intimately tied to the landscape. Cities, monuments, and the like serve to tie the contemporary Roman army's journey, as well as the reader's, through the Roman world to the many layers of the past which have left their mark on that landscape.

The relationship between the physically-rooted world of cultural memory and the textual nature of historical memory constitutes an important dimension of Procopius' treatment of memory and the ancient world. His observation of, and participation in, this process of transformation is deeply ambiguous. On the one hand, the preservation of the memory of these memorials of the classical world, just as with other, less physically-rooted memories, is treated as needful and beneficial, both for the sake of those whose

work is being preserved in memory, and to those in the future who remember. On the other hand, Procopius's text evinces a sense of disappointment and despair at the projected destruction of these monuments themselves (as why should it not?), suggesting a thoughtful awareness of what is loss in the transmission of the memory of the classical world from one form of remembering to the other. In this, Procopius' treatment reflects the work of the twentieth-century social theorist Pierra Nora. As will be discussed in more detail in the conclusion below, Nora's work on "sites of memory" differentiated living *milleux de mémoire* from the *lieux de mémoire* of static, self-conscious and artificial memory.[264]

Procopius' interest in the physicality of ancient memory also leads us back to another aspect of historical memory in Procopius: its Roman-ness. The stage on which Procopius' history plays out is of course the whole of the Roman Empire, and it is particularly in the erstwhile Western Empire that Procopius does the bulk of his remembering of the ancient world. We can see in Procopius' numerous engagements with Roman memory in the those books of the *Wars* set in the western theaters a studied interest in memory in and of the ancient Western Empire. His work serves not only to preserve western Roman cultural memory endangered by the ravages of both war and time, but also to convey these memories to the Eastern Romans of Constantinople, his primary contemporary audience. His interest in such cross-Mediterranean strands of memory as the Greek statues in the Roman Forum of Peace, the story of the Palladium, and the myths of the journeys of Odysseus and Jason and Medea, suggests an sense of, or

---

[264] Nora, Pierre. (1996-8) *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past.* Columbia University Press: New York.

a hope for, the ultimate unity and possibility of continuity of these strains of cultural memory. Additionally, though, a sense of Procopius' authority on matters of *Romanitas*, derived from his experience of the western Roman world and experiences with western Romans, and particularly Romans of the city of Rome, pervades the Italian books of Procopius' history, and suggests the indispensable importance, even the primacy, of western Roman cultural memory and remembering in Procopius' mind.

**Chapter Four: Rome and the Romans**

Memory and Rome, then, were a powerful combination. Belisarius' arguments at 7.22.9-12 highlight, and Procopius' narrative investigates, the connection between the city of Rome and cultural and historical memory, as well as the connection, through memory, of Rome and contemporary *Romanitas*. As part of the broad spectrum of the ancient past with which Procopius chose to engage throughout the course of his history, he seems to have taken a special interest in particularly Roman memory, as well as interrogating the importance of ancient memory generally to specifically Roman concerns, questions, and identity. Here, we will consider several different facets of Procopius' concern with Roman memory and identity, exploring in the process the reasons why cultural memory, and Roman memory in particular, might have been so important to Procopius.

This chapter explores the intersection of social memory and identity in Procopius' work, with particular focus on the Roman brand of each. It treats both cultural memory, narrowly defined, as well as more process-focused theories of social memory.[265] The concept of cultural memory envisioned by Maurice Halbwachs, Jan Assmann, and others is useful here for understanding the value and power of the storehouse of memories of the Roman and ancient past from which Procopius draws. These memories speak to what it means and has meant to be Roman, and in Procopius' work they continue to function as the "fixed points" to which cultural formations and communications refer and reify in so

---

[265] see Introduction, pp 29-40 above

doing.[266] However, Assmann's envisioning and study of memory phenomena deal primarily with relatively stable societies, in which the identity being defined by memory is static and its limits well-defined.[267] The Roman world in the sixth century, though, was a battleground of memory as surely as it was a literal battleground. Here Roman identity was contested on numerous fronts: there was the tension between the competing claims of the Romans of the Eastern and Western empires as to whose *Romanitas* was the more legitimate. The traditional means of defining civilized identity (be it Roman or Greek) in opposition to the uncivilized barbarian was made problematic by the many individuals of barbarian descent within the borders, administration, and army of the Empire, and the ever-shifting network of allies and enemies that the Romans navigated. There were also the efforts of Justinian and his administration, in consolidating imperial power, to define and use Roman history and cultural memory in such a way so as to be of the greatest advantage to himself and themselves. It is in this context that Procopius, as well as his contemporaries like Tribonian and John the Lydian, sought to articulate a conception of what it meant to be Roman in the sixth century, and to define the limits of that identity. Roman cultural memory is the currency that Procopius, his actors, and his contemporaries drew on, but to understand the dynamic process of memory in the sixth century, we must look to the theorists of social memory.

---

[266] J. Assmann (1995) 125-133.

[267] "The objective manifestations of cultural memory are defined through a kind of identificatory determination in a positive ("We are this") of in a negative ("That's our opposite") sense. Through such a concretion identity evolves what Nietzsche has called the "constitution of horizons." The supply of knowledge in the cultural memory is characterized by sharp distinctions made between those who belong and those who do not, i.e., between what appertains to oneself and what is foreign." (J. Assmann (1995) 127). Cf also Megill 42-44, Cubitt 222-4

Particularly useful to us will be the observations of historian Allan Megill: "when identity becomes uncertain, memory rises in value."[268] We will seek to understand the functions of Roman and ancient memory in the struggle to define contemporary *Romanitas*: its elevated importance, but also the ways in which it is deployed by Procopius and his characters. How is Procopius responding to the tensions in the use and ownership of Roman memories and identity? Thus the processes of change in memory and its relationship to identity to be observed are twofold: first, in the world represented in the history, as the fortunes of war shift and change, but also in Procopius' own mind as, based on the former, his opinions and understanding of what has happened in the Roman world evolve.

We will begin by examining more closely the variety of ways in which Procopius invests the city of Rome with cultural and historical memory in the Wars. The passages surrounding Belisarius' first entry into the city of Rome in Book 5 are particularly rich ground for Procopius to weave together many evocations of Roman and ancient memory. This section of the *Wars*, in addition, is just one of several in which the occasion of Rome changing hands presents an opportunity for Procopius to turn the (im)penetrability of the city into a reflective commentary on the strengths and weaknesses afforded by her great size.

---

[268]Megill's description of the contemporary instabilities in identity, leading to the "memory wave" of recent decades (see Introduction, pp 29-30 above), could easily describe sixth century Italy, as well: "In a world in which opposing certainties constantly come into conflict with each other and in which a multitude of possible identities are put on display, insecurity about identity may be an inevitable byproduct... the most characteristic feature of the contemporary scene is a lack of fixity at the level of identity, leading to the project of constructing memory with a view to constructing identity itself..." Megill 41, 55

Rome is a fitting setting for a group of passages in which the two contending sides, the Goths and the imperial Romans, articulate their claims to rightful rule of Italy. These arguments, often phrased in terms of the city of Rome in particular, mobilize different interpretations of recent historical memory to argue their cases. In the process, each plays on different formulations of the ethnic identities of the various groups whose historical interpretations are in play. Both for the Goths and for the Romans, the interlocutors' self-image and understanding of their place in the ever-changing contemporary world is presented as directly related to their ethnic group's role in recent history. These passages provide a wonderful illustration of the importance of memory to identity, and of identity to memory, in Procopius.

Coming out of this, and occupying the lion's share of the chapter, we will study in detail how Procopius, over the course of his work, interrogates the intersection of a variety of ethic identifiers and the applicability of the term "Roman" to the various groups who could lay claim to that identity.[269] We will move (roughly) chronologically through the *Wars*, examining Procopius' use of the term "Roman" and various other ethnic identifiers briefly in the *Persian* and *Vandal Wars*, and then in more detail as the army moves into Italy in the *Gothic Wars*, arrives and defends Rome, and finally becomes mired in a long and bloody territorial conflict. Here we will see the conflict in identity, Roman and otherwise, play out through the long course of the wars, and analyze

---

[269] This will result, incidentally, in our discussing some passages more than once, as with the momentous event of Belisarius' army's entry into Rome twice: once from the perspective of Procopius' signposting of memory (pp 181-192), and once from the perspective of his manipulation of ethnic, including Roman, identities (pp 225-6).

the effects of unstable and contested identity on memory, as well as the effects of respect or disregard for Roman memory on Procopius' conferral of the identity "Roman."

Finally, we will end the chapter with the end of both these stories, Rome and memory on the one hand and memory and *Romanitas* on the other, tangled together in the devastation of the city of Rome and its people. Procopius' growing disillusionment with the war is reflected in, and surely stems in part from, the wreck and ruin of the city of Rome and its people, and he uses his historian's power to ensure that it is remembered.

## **Part I: The City of Rome**

There are quite a number of avenues from which one could approach a study of Procopius' depiction of the city of Rome and historical memory. We have already seen some suggested in the passages we discussed in the last chapters. In addition, we will pursue some of these further when we come to the end of the chapter, on the events of Book 8 of the *Wars*. Here, though, we will focus on two particular angles from which to explore Procopius' treatment of the city of Rome and his manipulation of historical memory as it intersects with historical events, in order to investigate in some depth the ways memory can function in Procopius' text. First, we will look collectively at the many evocations of memory Procopius inserts into the chapters surrounding an important moment, the imperial forces' first triumphant re-entry into the city of Rome. He diffuses the historical potential of that moment outward into the surrounding text, as he conveys

to the reader the great historical footprint of the city, and thus the historic significance of its reincorporation into the empire. Second, we will examine Procopius' treatment of other instances of Rome changing hands, when it is besieged or taken by trickery. Focusing on Rome as a second Troy allows Procopius turns these moments of weakness and instability into suggestive commentary on Rome's place in the grand sweep of history.

In the preceding chapters, we observed many instances in which Procopius engaged with Roman cultural memory and highlighted Rome-specific historical memory. We remarked on how many of these memory-laden passages were concentrated in Book 5. They are especially dense in the section between Belisarius' violent capture of Naples and just after the imperial army's peaceful entry into Rome itself. These passages are for the most part discussed above according to their respective type, but let us now consider them in the detail of their context, how the aggregation of so many layers of cultural memory affects the passage narrating the entry of the imperial army into Rome. In this section, as Belisarius and the imperial Roman army are poised on the brink of reclaiming Rome for the Roman Empire and the Roman Emperor, Procopius embroiders his narrative with many comments, digressions, and rhetorical asides that in some way implicate the ancient, often Roman, past. These invocations of historical and cultural memory draw attention to and serve to manipulate the reader's attitude toward the momentous historical event taking place.

Procopius makes the reader's journey from Naples to Rome as rife with reminders of the ancient past as it must have been for the soldiers and himself, traveling through the

historical landscape. There are numerous evocations of the ancient and Roman past in the language Procopius uses, such as explanatory asides or archaic vocabulary. At 5.11.26, the pope Silverius is called "the priest of the city"[270] and Vittigis reminds "the senate and people of the Romans" of Theoderic's just rule. Procopius describes a town "which the Romans call Regata" at 5.11.1, and a river "which the inhabitants call Decenovium in the Latin tongue" just after at 5.11.2.[271] The river empties into the sea at Taracina, and Procopius uses this opportunity to describe Mt. Circaeum, nearby, and how "they say" this is where Odysseus met Circe, although it is actually an island, rather than a peninsula.[272][273]

Just before Procopius narrates Belisarius' entrance into Rome, he departs on a two-chapter long digression on the history of the relationship between the Goths and the Franks (5.12-13). This ethnographic-historical digression is rife with associations to the ancient past, and provides Procopius with a wealth of opportunities to use evocations of historical memory: overt, intertextual, and otherwise, to set the stage for the army's imminent arrival in the eternal city. In particular, it provides a strongly classical, Herodotean feature to his history, and in addition recalls specific Roman memories. Procopius mentions Egypt and the Nile with no particular need to do so, only to remark

---

[270] see above, Ch p 98 2 n 201
[271] see above, Table 2.2 for the text
[272] see above, Ch 3 pp 140-5
[273] There are, in addition, quite a number of possible, even likely, inttertextual references waiting to be investigated, such as those involving the Gothic king Vittigis: at 5.11.7-9 he hires someone to assassinate Theodatus, and his speech to the Goths advocating a strategic retreat immiediately following, at 5.11.12-25 is very classical in form. At 5.13.25 Vittigis has a Thucydidean allusion (*Th* 1.35), as wells as a possible reference to Horace (*Od.* 3.29.32) (Dewing vol. 3 p. 141, n. 1).

that he can say nothing of the land beyond (5.12.2), a flourish that feels particularly Herodotean. Procopius informs us that the Franks were called "Germani" in ancient times, and this is the label he applies to them through the rest of the digression (5.11.29ff). The story involves the "ancient" Romans at several points: subjugating areas of Gaul and Spain (5.12.9), making alliances with various nations like the Aborychi (5.12.12-19), and eventually loosing power to them (5.12.41-42ff). Moreover, Procopius makes a point of mentioning several specific historical figures in the course of the tale. East of the Aborychi dwell the Thuringian barbarians (who are tangential to the story at best); "Augustus, the first emperor, having given them this country." (δόντος Αυγούστου πρώτου βασιλέως) (5.12.10). More relevant to his plot is the episode wherein the Germans besiege the Gothic Carcasina,

> ἐπεὶ τὸν βασιλικὸν πλοῦτον ἐνταῦθα ἐπύθοντο εἶναι, ὃν δὴ ἐν τοῖς ἄνω χρόνοις Ἀλάριχος ὁ πρεσβύτατος Ῥώμην ἑλὼν ἐληίσατο. ἐν τοῖς ἦν καὶ τὰ Σολόμωνος τοῦ Ἑβραίων βασιλέως κειμήλια, ἀξιοθέτα ἐς ἄγαν ὄντα. πρασία γὰρ λίθος αὐτῶν τὰ πολλὰ ἐκαλλώπιζεν, ἅπερ ἐξ Ἱερουσολύμων Ῥωμαῖοι τὸ παλαιὸν εἷλον. (5.12.41-42)
>
> ...because they had learned that the royal treasure was there, which Alaric in earlier times had taken as booty when he captured Rome. Among these were also the treasures of Solomon, the king of the Hebrews, a most nteworthy sight. For the most of them were adorned with emeralds; and they had been taken from Jerusalem by the Romans in ancient times.

Interestingly, Procopius neglects, or is unable, to provide more specific details about Titus' 70 CE sack of Jerusalem. Instead, he uses the historical Roman memory as a bridge back to the more ancient past of Solomon. Perhaps similar to his treatment of Greco-Roman myths, Procopius seems interested in mobilizing associations of the oldest possible strain of memory available. This provides an important nuance to our focus on

Procopius' particular interest in Roman cultural memory. While we do see a proliferation of Roman memories in this section, and a ongoing thematic concern for Roman cultural memory and identity in the work, it is important to remember that historical memory for Procopius seems rarely to be a matter of nostalgia, but rather a studied concern for the relevance and utility of memory of the ancient world to his contemporary world. Here, rather than dwelling on the specifically Roman memory for *Romanitas'* sake, Procopius takes advantage of the more ancient strain of history and cultural associations for its legitimizing function and unique cultural appeal. The story creates ties from obscure happenings on the northern frontier of the (post-)Roman world that run back through the historical Roman past to a deeper, and Judeo-Christian, past. It speaks to, and unites, disparate parts of his and his audience's own identities.

Finally, the passage functions to remind the audience again of the 410 sack of Rome, a fitting theme for an army about to march on Rome, to liberate it from barbarians (5.12.41-42). With the remembered event, Procopius suggests to his audience a larger narrative structure in which to locate events. By pairing the disaster of Alaric's sack with Belisarius' imminent arrival in Rome, Procopius establishes a dyad in which the meaning and importance to cultural memory of each episode in the pair is shaped by the other.[274] The position of each in long-term historical narrative Procopius is shpaing

[274] On pairs of episodes or figures in social memory, see Cubitt 215, and particularly Y. Zerubavel 221-8.

confers meaning on the present event, the triumphant re-entry into Rome, as a conclusion to the earlier chapter, locating it in a narrative of defeat and recovery.[275]

As the narrative returns to the historical present, Procopius describes Belisarius' garrisoning of the area between Naples and Rome. He uses the opportunity of an imperial Roman detachment sent to the town of Cumae to mention the shrine of the Sibyl nearby (5.14.2-3). Procopius then reports how the *Romans* (that is, the inhabitants of the city: see below, p 225) have decided to receive the emperor's army into the city, into which passage he works both a rhetorical aside ("they sent Fidelius... a man who had been previously an advisor of Atalaric (such an official is called a "quaestor" by the Romans)" (Φιδέλιον τε πέμψαντες... ὃς δὴ Ἀταλαρίχῳ παρήδρευε πρότερον (κοιαίστρα δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ταύτα καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι) (5.14.5))[276], and an anachronistic use of an ancient title for a modern position, referring to the bishop of Rome, Silverius, as ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἀρχιέριος, "chief priest of the city" (5.14.5).[277] Theodatus, meanwhile, admonishes the Gothic notables with "an ancient saying, which

[275] While the death of Romulus Augustulus and loss of Italy to Odoacer might make a more fitting "prequel" to Belisarius' re-entry into Rome, this episode implicates the subsequent fall of Odoacer to Theoderic. As we will see, the rise to power in Italy of Theoderic and the Visigoths is a complicated one, and Procopius seems to have his reasons for not narrating it outright and only referencing it in select circumstances (see below, pp 196-207). Procopius might have felt, also, that the 410 sack of Rome was the more ignoble episode in Rome's history, and the more in need of redemption by Belisarius' triumphant entrance.

[276] See above ch 2 pp 101-4 on the rhetorical versus practical necessity of these asides. κυαίστωρ, and its variant spellings, was the common term for the magistrate in Constantinople by the 5th century, and was used by Julian (399A), Zosimus (293.12) and others. In the 6th, in addition to Procopius, it is found in John Lydus, Evagruis, and Justinian's laws (Cod. 1.15.2, 1.17.3, Novell. 7.9). Compare the earlier ταμιας in Polybius (1.52.7 ff), Diodorus (II.608.56) and Strabo (13.1.27). (Mason 6, 63; Sophocles 695, 1068)

[277] see above, Ch 2 n 194

bids us settle well the affairs of the present" (τις παλαιὸς λόγος, τὸ παρὸν εὖ τιθέναι κελεύων) (5.13.25), reminiscent of Thucydides 1.35, θέσθαι τὸ παρόν.

No sooner is Belisarius off to Rome by the *Latin* Way than Procopius launches into a lengthy description of the *Appian* Way, an account that emphasizes its great age and remarkableness (5.14.6-11).

> ὁ δὲ διὰ τῆς Λατίνης ὁδοῦ ἀπῆγε τὸ στράτευμα, τὴν Αππίαν ὁδὸν ἀφεὶς ἐν ἀριστερᾷ, ἣν Ἄππιος ὁ Ῥωμαίων ὕπατος ἐννακοσίοις ἔνιαυτοῖς πρότερον έποίησέ τε καὶ ἐπώνυμον ἔσχεν. Ἔστι δὲ ἡ Ἀππία ὁδὸς ἥμερῶν πέντε εὐζώνῳ ἀνδί· ἐκ Ῥώμης γὰρ αὕτη ἐς Καπύην διήκει. εὖρος δέ ἐστι τῆς ὁδοῦ ταύτης ὅσον ἁμάξας δύο ἀντίας ἰέναι ἀλλήλαις, καὶ ἔστιν ἀξιοθεατος πάντων μάλιστα.
>
> So Belisarius led his army from Naples by the Latin Way, leaving on the left the Appian Way, which Appius, the consul of the Romans, had made nine hundred years before and to which he had given his name. Now the Appian Way is in length a journey of five days for an unencumbered traveler; for it extends from Rome to Capua. And the breadth of this road is such that two wagons going in opposite directions can pass one another, and it is one of the noteworthy sights of the world (5.14.6-7)

Again Procopius goes out of his way to provide historical information on a Roman landmark that is, quite literally, tangential to the events of his narrative. He goes into further detail, describing the road's construction: the type of stone, the quality of craftsmanship, and a curious intertextual remark on its impressive width.[278] He makes a

[278] Procopius comments that the road is so wide two chariots may pass one another going in oppostie directions (εὖρος δέ ἐστι τῆς ὁδοῦ ταύτης ὅσον ἁμάξας δύο ἀντίας ἰέναι ἀλλήλαις, καὶ ἔστιν ἀξιοθεατος πάντων μάλιστα.), hardly an exceptional feat for a major thoroughfare. The comment would seem to be drawn from Thucydides 1.93.5, on the Themistocles' completion of the walls of the Piraeus (καὶ ὠκοδόμησαν τῇ ἐκείνου γνώμῃ τὸ πάχος τοῦ τείχους, ὅπερ νῦν ἔτι δηλόν ἐστι περὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ. δύο γὰρ ἅμαξαι ἐνταντίαι ἀλλήλαις τοὺς λίθους ἐπῆγον...). Why Procopius would select such a moderately inappropriate passage to reference is unclear. For more, see Braun (1885) 173-4.

point of saying, finally, that the quality of its construction is such that it hasn't degraded over time: the stones still fit together perfectly, the road is still smooth. (5.14.11). The mention of the censor, Appius Claudius, who is credited with the construction of the road in 312 CE, is one of Procopius' oldest references to Roman history.

In the chapter following the entrance of Belisarius' army into Rome, Procopius inserts a description of how and why the "ancient Romans" called the town of Beneventum "Maleventus" because of the violent winds (5.15.4-6), which leads into his lengthy recounting of the legends of Diomedes, Aeneas, and the Palladium, quoted and discussed above (5.15.7-14; Ch 3, pp 146-9). This passage wonderfully encapsulates the careful game Procopius plays with cultural memory of the ancient past. On the one hand, the tale provides an opportuntiy to emphasize the great age and legendary pedigree of the city of Rome. In focusing our attention on the city's origins, Procopius sets up the two historical moments, the foundation and the re-entry, as a signifying pair of episodes. In establishing a dyad as an element of narrative structure, the remembered episode serves to create and nuance the symbolic importance of the subsequent one, though the dynamic can work in both directions, as well.[279] Procopius can cast Belisarius' re-incorporation of the city to its empire as a second foundation, its re-establishment as the Roman heart of the Roman Empire. The extent to which this potential characterization will hold true as the war goes on is a central theme Procopius will continue to explore as the narrative progresses.

[279] see n 273 above.

On the other hand, the digression on the Palladium does more than recall to memory the ancient history of Rome. It also works to characterize it in a particular way. Like the other mythic references, the passage provides a familiar context for the Procopius' Greek-speaking readers. It grounds a city with immense cultural and historic importance but separated from sixth-century Constantinople by significant geographical, cultural, and historic divides in a solidly Homeric legendary past. A curious passage in a complex work, the "message" of the story of the Palladium can naturally be interpreted along a number of different lines. One can read the focus of the story as on the Palladium's, and so Rome's, origins in the Greek world; characterizing this locus of cultural memory as originally, and so in some sense essentially, Greek; and reducing the comlex history of the Palladium to its Greek origins. As we have observed, however, Procopius' interests in Greek history and cultural memory as such are generally fairly limited, with the majority of his references being to the distant mythic past, as this one of course is, and those to specifically Greek history are dwarfed by those to Roman history, ancient and recent.[280] The alternative, as we explored above, is to see Procopius' evocations of the legendary past as meant to have, in some sense, a pan-Mediterranean appeal. Many feature, as this one does, locations and travel across the Mediterranean world, and while the origins of these myths and their voyages are undeniably Greek, their ends and their functions are usually more multicultural. The passage on the Palladium starts from a legendary past context that both Eastern and Western Romans have in common, and in its course draws attention to the intertangled nature of the histories of

[280] Ch 3 pp 114-119

Eastern and Western Mediterranean, as the Palladium in transferred back and forth and its ultimate resting place is left uncertain amid competing claims. Certainly one can say that the kind of ancient Roman history that Procopius evokes here is one with a pan-Mediterranean origin story, and in which both East and West have a claim to that heritage, and neither is unproblematic.

Finally, Procopius returns to his main narrative for a short time only to launch from it again into a digression on the historical geography and ethnicity of Italy: "In this way Belisarius won over the whole of that part of Italy which is South of the Ionian Gulf... But I shall now explain how Italy is divided among the inhabitants of the land..." (Ἰταλίαν δὲ οὕτω ξύμπασαν ἣ ἐντὸς κόλπου τοῦ Ἰονίου έστιν ... ὅντινα δὲ τρὸπον Ἰταλίαν οἰκοῦσιν οἱ ταύτῃ ἄνθρωποι ἐρῶν ἔρχομαι.) (5.15.15-16). This explanation then takes up the rest of the chapter (5.15.16-30.) ταῦτα μὲν δη, Procopius concludes in classic Herodotean fashion, ὧδέ πη ἔχει (5.15.30).[281]

Thus Procopius surrounds this momentous point in his history with many layers of ancient memory, for the most part of the specifically Roman past. These references and evocations of historical memory stretch out the dramatic tension of Belisarius' triumphant entry into Rome, and one could choose to view them as inserted primarily for this purpose. Perhaps Procopius felt that the re-taking of Rome was not sufficiently dramatic in and of itself, and lacking an exciting siege or perilous exploits, he sought to make his account weightier and more arresting by recalling to readers' minds the importance of the city through a variety of means of invoking memory. Certainly, he

[281] Cf Chapter 2 pp 83-4, and Braun (1894) pp 9-11.

makes much of the subsequent defense of the city against the Gothic siege (5.18-22), as well as the eventual re-captures of the city by both sides (see below).

The mantle of memories surrounding the moment of the Romans' re-entrance into Rome should not been seen as merely decorative, however. Rather, it directs the readers' attention to the deep symbolic and thematic importance of what is taking place. Procopius' technique of signaling the narrative's engagement with themes of historical memory by the deployment of intertextual and other references functions in a way similar to the poetic technique of "signposting" allusions exlpored by Stephen Hinds, among others. In his examples drawn from Latin poetry, the poet singals the presence of an intertextual allusion by means of references to memory in the narrative, playing with the thematics of memory while drawing the reader's attention to the reference.[282] Rather than employing the thematic language to signal the allusion, however, Procopius uses the allusive language and associated evocations of the past to "signpost" and nuance the thematic significance of the elements of the narrative. These elements, though varied in type and the historical periods they reference, are unified by the themes Procopius seeks to embue this section of the narrative with. The memories and the stories here invoked emphasize the great age of Rome (the 900 years since the Appian Way's construction). They highlight the age and importance of its culture (the language, the Sibyl), and the links back to the heroic, mythological past (Diomedes and Aeneas). They speak especially of foundation and construction (again, the Palladium, the Appian Way), of origins.

---

[282] Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and intertext: Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Procopius does not try to state explicitly the importance of the city of Rome, or explain the significance of its reincorporation into the Roman Empire in straightforward terms. Perhaps the implication is that any attempt to do so would necessarily fall short. We should consider also, though, the dangers inherent in trying to state such a case. While downplaying the significance of the event would minimize Belisarius' accomplishment and the success of the wars thus far, emphasizing the importance of Rome to the empire to too great a degree raises existential questions about the Roman-ness of that empire without it. The way in which Belisarius, within the narrative, and Procopius, in constructing it, put such effort into holding Rome and characterizing its *Romanitas* belies the danger of lacking it.

* * * *

It is, of course, not only in the sections surrounding Belisarius' first entry into Rome that Procopius uses literary devices to characterize the city and its importance. The occasion of the city changing hands or being in danger does, however, frequently furnish prime opportunities. Indeed, Rome under seige and Rome captured, not by force, but by trickery, were as useful as symbolic moments as they were frequent occurances in the *Wars*. For example, following the imperial army's entrance into Rome just discussed, Belisarius sets about preparing for a Gothic siege. He repairs and updates the features of the circuit-wall and has a moat dug:

> Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ τὴν μὲν πρόνοιαν τοῦ στρατηγοῦ καὶ διαφερόντως τὴν ἐς τὰς ἐπάλξεις ἀποδεδειγμένην ἐμπειρίαν ἐπῄ νουν, ἐν θαύματι δὲ μεγάλῳ ποιούμενοι ἤσχαλλον, εἴ τινα ὥς πολοιορκηθήσεται ἔννοιαν ἔχων ᾠήθη ἐσιτητά οἱ φέρειν τῶν

> ἐπιτηδείων τῇ ἀπορία, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐπιθαλάσσιος εἶναι, καὶ τείχους περιβαλλομένη τοσοῦτόν τι χρῆμα, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐν πεδίῳ κειμένη ἐς ἄγαν ὑπτίῳ τοῖς ἐπιοῦσιν εὐφοδος, ὡς τὸ εἰκός, ἔστιν. (5.14.16)

> And the Romans applauded the forethought of the general and especially the experience displayed in the matter of the battlement; but they marveled greatly and were vexed that he should have thought it possible for him to enter Rome if he had any idea that he would be besieged, for it cannot possibly endure a siege because it cannot be supplied with provisions, since it is not on the sea, is enclosed by a wall of so huge a circumference, and, above all, lying as it does in a very level plain, is naturally exceedingly easy of access for its assailants.

The Roman citizens' alarm at Belisarius' unfamiliarity with the realities of Rome's uniquely great size reflects interestingly not only on him (see below, p 228), but on the city itself. The predicament the Romans see highlights the way in which the great size and strength of the city is also its weakness. It may not always be as easy to enter Rome as it was for Belisarius, but between the difficulties of manning and maintaining the lengthy walls and supplying its population (and the defending army), it is nearly impossible to hold onto it.

Rome's first major appearance in the *Wars* is in Procopius' "archaeology" at the start of Book 3, where he narrates, among other things, the 410 sack of Rome by Alaric and his Visigoths (3.2.14-24). In Procopius' story Alaric sends some soldiers disguised as slaves to be a "gift" to the patricians of Rome. The soldiers then open the gates to the city at midday while everyone is napping after the noon meal.[283] This familiar-sounding ploy casts Rome as a second Troy, breached only by trickery, an identification reinforced

[283] An alternative version of the story, told by Procopius immediately afterward (3.2.27), involves a rich woman named Proba who let in the Goths to end the suffering of the besieged.

again when Procopius tells the story of the Palladium at 5.15.5-14.[284] Depicting Rome as Troy relates the western city, sundered from the eastern Empire for sixty years, to the familiar, shared classical heritage of Homeric legend. It lends the breached city an air of greatness, even at this moment of weakness and crisis. When Rome is again captured by Totila and the Goths at 7.20.4-20, it is again taken by trickery: a group of Isaurian guards, betraying the Romans, show the Goths where the wall can be climbed with ropes. These men then open the gates to the rest of the army, and some kind of trickery is also involved in the subsequent captures of the city in the history, at 7.36.15 and 8.33.17. Surely this is not only a literary trope but also an indication of the strength of the Aurelian walls: that, despite their length and age, they are unlikely to be breached by a 6th-century army by conventional means. It is notable that after Belisarius has repaired the existing breaches, the Roman citizens' concerns at 5.14.16 for withstanding a siege seem to be primarily about resources: supply-lines and manpower to garrison the walls, rather than their breach by force.

The succession of later seizures of the city also creates a striking contrast with Belisarius'first entry into Rome: as opposed to the numerous times the city is betrayed to an enemy, when Belisarius leads the imperial Roman army into the city, it is a legitimate

---

[284] On the exploitation and development of the complex and useful relationship between Rome and the myth of Troy in the early imperial period, see the recent *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local tradition and imperial power*. Andrew Erskine, 2001. Oxford: Oxford University Press. For the origins of the myth, Jacques Perret argued cntorversially for tracing the association to Pyrrhus (Perret, J. (1942). Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome (281-31). Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles lettres"), but see also Arnaldo Momigliano, Review: *Les Origines de la Légende Troyenne de Rome (281-31)* by Jacques Perret Review. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 35, Parts 1 and 2 (1945), pp. 99-104.

seizure and a peaceful one. The city is not conquered and "made tributary" to the emperor, but freely re-joins her empire and invites in the imperial Romans. The (im)penetrability of the city of Rome reappears as a plot point throughout the *Wars*. Though the city is described as prohibitively difficult to defend from a siege, neither do we see Rome successfully taken by force in the course of the work: when not handed over willingly, as above, it is taken by stealth and trickery. While we certainly have every reason to believe that this reflects reality, Procopius also turns it into an opportunity for literary echoes of Troy, and in so doing to characterize Rome as strong in her weakness and weak in her strength: too strong to take by force, too big to hold for long.

We will return to the theme and story of Rome in Procopius' *Wars* in due time, for the stories of Rome and the Romans are inextricably intertwined, and before we follow the one to its sad end in the history, we must consider the other. For Rome is not to Procopius simply a prize to be won, strong old walls and ancient foundations, but a remarkable and priceless living embodiment of cultural memory. Rome as a locus of memory, though, depends on Romans, and likewise their *Romanitas* depends on Rome. We will shortly begin, then, to consider Procopius' development of the themes of *Romanitas* and cultural memory, and return at the end of the chapter to follow the story of Rome in Procopius' *Wars* to its depressing end, for the fate—the ultimate near-destruction—of the city of Rome can serve as a symbol for the memory-laden potential, the complex and troubled unraveling of events, and ultimate failure of the enterprise of re-conquest.

## Part II: Competing Memories of the Loss of the West

Rome serves as the setting (for the most part) for a group of passages that illustrate vividly the links between the city of Rome, Roman cultural memory, and the contested, fluid nature of ethnic identities in the sixth century. These passages demonstrate, moreover, the processes of social memory in action in the dynamic space of the battlefield, as the combatants in Italy (the Goths and the imperial Roman army) each articulate their claim to rightful rule of Italy. Their arguments mobilize different interpretations of recent historical memory and in the process, different formulations of the ethnic identities of the groups whose historical interpretations are in play. Each side presents their claim to legitimate power in Italy based on their own interpretation of the events of the recent past: Theoderic's arrival in Italy at the behest of the emperor Zeno in order to depose the general-usurper Odoacer, and the Goths' subsequent establishment in Italy and Theoderic's reign as tyrant. These events, some sixty years in the past, are an excellent example of Jan and Aleida Assmann's conception of communicative memory, the partner and forerunner to cultural memory proper. It is within living memory (if only just barely, in this case), particular to the culture within which the memory is transmitted, and transmitted primarily orally.[285] In the Assmanns' theorizing, true cultural memory is then the distillation and accumulation of these communicated memories, becoming "the store of knowledge from which a group derives awareness of its unity and peculiarity."[286] As the two sets of communicative memories meet, though, and the two sides argue their

[285] J. Assmann (1995) 125
[286] *ibid.* 129

cases, we can observe a struggle for each party to establish its interpretation of events as the dominant one which owes more to the process theories of Megill and Cubitt.[287] As each memory is at the point of transitioning into the realm of the collective or cultural memory (out of living memory, broadly accepted and authoritative within the culture), the two sets of memories clash, and each also vies to gain cross-cultural standing, to be transmitted in textual and authoritative sources; to become, in short, historical memory. And as, of course, the interlocutors are all characters within Procopius' history, we can envision the process on two levels: the meta-level in which Procopius engages with these ideas and uses his own history to further their ends, and the imagined historical debates, which must reflect in some manner (whether more or less well), the actual tension between the two groups' memories and interests.

Spanning a period from the eve of the invasion of Italy through the first major challenge to the emperor's possession of Rome, a period pregnant with potential for the reincorporation of the west and a re-united empire, these of speeches offer competing memories of the loss of the empire in the west. As the characters attempt to convince one another that their version of history is the correct and just one, Procopius the historian observes the question from both sides. The strength with which each argument is phrased and the identity of the speaker offer clues as to the weight of the argument in Procopius' own mind. As the war goes on, the initial balance shifts, and more is revealed about both the character of past events and the characters of those making the claims on each side.

[287] see above , pp 31-34

Toward the beginning Procopius has even Theodatus, the Gothic king at the start of the war, acquiesce to the emperor's claim to rightful rule over Italy. After the conquest of Sicily and frightened of the coming war, Theodatus agrees to a settlement wherein he rules Italy under Justinian's authority, or, failing that, retires from the kingship to a remote estate (5.6.1-13).[288] He is convinced by the ambassadors' argument that "for him [Justinian], it is not at all inappropriate to seek to acquire a land which has belonged of old to the realm which is his own" ἐκεῖνον δὲ χώρας μεταποιήσασθαι οὐδὲν ἀπεικὸς ἄνωθεν τῇ ὑπαρχούσῃ αὐτῷ προσηκούσης ἀρχῇ (5.6.10). It is notable, however, that Procopius has Theodatus merely agree to these sentiments, rather than state them himself.[289] In the event, of course, the agreement falls through and the invasion of Italy proceeds.

In a section of Procopius' narration of the Gothic siege of Rome in the middle of Book 5,[290] the first trial of the Roman army's possession of the city, it is Belisarius who once again makes a clear, strongly worded case for the Eastern Romans' right to re-possess the western territories, and specifically, the ever-symbolically important city of Rome:

---

[288] The agreement is proposed by Peter, a rhetorician in Byzantium, who had been sent to Italy to negotiate on the emperor's behalf in earlier talks with Amalasuntha, daughter of Theoderic (5.3.29-30)

[289] Theodatus' rationale in his own speeches is rather about personal preference and aptitude: he is a philosopher (he references Plato at 5.6.10) and ill-suited to rule: better that Justinian should take over those duties, allowing Theodatus to enjoy a scholarly retirement.

[290] Like the Roman re-entry into Rome that precedes it, this section is also laden with ancient memories, including Thucydidean intertexts (as at 5.20.5, see Braun (1885) 192). In a Herodotean digression on two boys, "Belisarius" and "Vittigis," the two fight, with "Belisarius" killing "Vittigis": as a portent, fairly easy to interpret (5.20.1-4).

> Ῥώμην μέντοι ἑλόντες ἡμεῖς τῶν ἀλλοτρίων οὐδὲν ἔχομεν, ἀλλ᾽ ὑμεῖς ταύτης τὰ πρότερα ἐπιβατεύσαντες, οὐδὲν ὑμῖν προσῆκον, νῦν οὐχ ἑκόντες τοῖς πάλαι κεκτημένοις ἀπέδοτε (5.20.17).
>
> As for Rome, moreover, which we have captured, in holding it we hold nothing which belongs to others, but it was you [the Goths] who trespassed upon this city in former times, though it did not belong to you at all, and now you have given it back, however unwillingly, to its ancient possessors.

He continues by pledging to defend Rome from any who would seek to take it, as long as he lives:

> ὅστις δὲ ὑμῶν Ῥώμης ἐλπίδα ἔχει ἀμαχητὶ ἐπιβήσεσθαι, γνώμης ἁμαρτάνει. ζῶντα γὰρ Βελισάριον μεθήσεσθαι ταύτης ἀδύνατον (5.20.18).
>
> And whoever of you has hopes of setting foot in Rome without a fight is mistaken in his judgment. For as long as Belisarius lives, it is impossible for him to relinquish this city.

However, immediately following this episode Procopius inserts two subtle hints that problematize Belisarius' assertions of the imperial forces' *Romanitas* and his casting as Rome's protector. Procopius tells us that, after his speech, the Romans are overcome by "a great fear" and fall silent (5.20.19), and the chapter ends with an explanatory aside on the office of praetorian prefect (5.20.20).[291]

Finally, at a low point for the Goths in their siege of Rome, their ambassadors propose a parley with Belisarius. The Gothic representatives then engage Belisarius in a classically historiographic debate over the legitimacy of Gothic rule in Italy, with each side's arguments attempting to press competing memories of Zeno and Theoderic and their agreement of 488. Both sides seek to make their interpretation into the lasting historical memory. For both sides, this is the most elaborate statement of their position,

[291] see above, Ch 2, pp 101-2

and both marshal persuasive interpretations in their favor. Here, then, is a case-study in Cubitt's insistence on the importance of contested identity in the development of social memory, and Megill's observations on the rise in the importance of memory when identity is uncertain. The answers to crcial question about each group's identity are bound up in the interpretation of these events: who are the invaders? Who are the defenders of land which is rightfully theirs? Who are the Romans, and what does it mean to be Roman in this context?

The Goths begin (with an appropriately classical allusive flourish)[292] by presenting themselves as the wronged party, offering a memory of events wherein they came into possession of Italy legitimately, just as Zeno agreed with Theoderic:

> Ἠδικήκατε ἡμᾶς, ἄνδρες Ῥωμαῖοι, ἐπὶ φίλους τε καὶ ξυμμάχους ὄντας ὅπλα οὐ δέον ἀράμενοι. ἐροῦμεν δὲ ἅπερ καὶ ὑμῶν ἕκαστον οἰόμεθα ξυνεπίστασθαι. Γότθοι γὰρ οὐ βίᾳ Ῥωμαίους ἀφελόμενοι γῆν τὴν Ἰταλίας ἐκτήσαντο, ἀλλ᾽ Ὀδόακρός ποτε τὸν αὐτοκράτορα καθελὼν ἐς τυραννίδα τὴν τῇδε πολιτείαν μεταβαλὼν εἶχε. Ζηνων δὲ τότε τῆς ἑῴας κρατῶν καὶ τιμωρεῖν μὲν τῷ ξυμβεβασιλευκότι βουλόμενος καὶ τοῦ τυράννου τήνδε τὴν χώραν ἐλευθεροῦν, Ὀδοάκρου δὲ καταλῦσαι τὴν δύναμιν οὐχ οἷός τε ὤν, Θευδέριχον ἀναπείθει τὸν ἡμῶν ἄρχοντα, καίπερ αὐτόν τε καὶ Βυζάντιον πολιορκεῖν μέλλοντα, καταλῦσαι μὲν τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔχθραν τιμῆς ἀναμνησθέντα πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἧς τετύχηκεν ἤδη, πατρίκιός τε καὶ Ῥωμαίων γεγονὼς ὕπατος, Ὀδόακρον δὲ ἀδικίας τῆς ἐς Αὐγούστουλον τίσασθαι, καὶ τῆς χώρας αὐτόν τε καὶ Γότθους τὸ λοιπὸν κρατεῖν ὀρθῶς καὶ δικαίως (6.6.14-16).
>
> You have done us an injustice, O Romans, in taking up arms wrongfully against your friends and allies. And what we shall say is, we think, well known to each one of you as well as to ourselves. For the Goths did not obtain the land of Italy by wresting it from the Romans by force, but Odoacer in former times dethroned the emperor, changed the government of Italy into a tyranny, and so held it. And Zeno, who then held the power of the East, though he wished to avenge his partner in the imperial office and to free this land from the usurper, was unable to

[292] see above, Ch 2, p 162

> destroy the authority of Odoacer. Accordingly he persuaded Theoderic, our ruler, although he was on the point of besieging him and Byzantium, not only to put an end to his hostility towards himself, in recollection of the honour which Theoderic had already received at his hands in having been made a patrician and consul of the Romans, but also to punish Odoacer for his unjust treatment of Augustulus, and thereafter, in company with the Goths, to hold sway over the land as its legitimate and rightful rulers.

The eastern empire, and Justinian as emperor, is in the wrong for disregarding the deal agreed upon by Zeno and Theoderic. The Goths proceed to bolster their case by arguing that they have, in the intervening time, carried out the responsibilities of good Roman rulers, putting particular emphasis on the traditionally important preservation of laws and customs, including religion:

> οὕτω τοίνυν παραλαβόντες τὴν τῆς Ἰταλίας ἀρχὴν τούς τε νόμους καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν διεσωσάμεθα τῶν πώποτε βεβασιλευκότων οὐδενὸς ἧσσον, καὶ Θευδερίχου μὲν ἢ ἄλλου ὁτουοῦν διαδεξαμένου τὸ Γότθων κράτος νόμος τὸ παράπαν οὐδεὶς οὐκ ἐν γράμμασιν, οὐκ ἄγραφός ἐστι. τὰ δὲ τῆς εἰς θεὸν εὐσεβείας τε καὶ πίστεως οὕτω Ῥωμαίοις ἐς τὸ ἀκριβὲς ἐφυλάξαμεν, ὥστε Ἰταλιωτῶν μὲν τὴν δόξαν οὐδεὶς οὐχ ἑκὼν οὐκ ἀκούσιος ἐς τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν μετέβαλε, Γότθων δὲ μεταβεβλημένων ἐπιστροφή τις οὐδαμῶς γέγονε. καὶ μὴν καὶ τὰ Ῥωμαίων ἱερὰ τιμῆς παρ᾽ ἡμῶν τῆς ἀνωτάτω τετύχηκεν· οὐ γὰρ οὐδεὶς εἴς τι τούτων καταφυγὼν πώποτε πρὸς οὐδενὸς ἀνθρώπων βεβίασται, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσας τὰς τῆς πολιτείας ἀρχὰς αὐτοὶ μὲν διαγεγόνασιν ἔχοντες, Γότθος δὲ αὐτῶν μετέσχεν οὐδείς. ἢ παρελθών τις ἡμᾶς ἐλεγχέτω, ἢν μὴ μετὰ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς ἡμῖν εἰρῆσθαι οἴηται. προσθείη δ᾽ ἄν τις ὡς καὶ τὸ τῶν ὑπάτων ἀξίωμα Γότθοι ξυνεχώρουν Ῥωμαίοις πρὸς τοῦ τῶν ἑῴων βασιλέως ἐς ἕκαστον ἔτος κομίζεσθαι (6.6.17-20).
>
> It was in this way, therefore, that we took over the dominion of Italy, and we have preserved both the laws and the form of government as strictly as any who have ever been Roman emperors, and there is absolutely no law, either written or unwritten, introduced by Theoderic or any of his successors on the throne of the Goths. And we have so scrupulously guarded for the Romans their practices pertaining to the worship of God and faith in him, that not one of the Italians has changed his belief, either willingly or unwillingly, up to the present day, and

> when the Goths have changed, we have taken no notice of the matter. And indeed the sanctuaries of the Romans have received from us the highest honor; for no one who has taken refuge in any of them has ever been treated with violence by any man; nay, more, the Romans themselves have continued to hold all the offices of the state, and not a single Goth has had a share in them. Let someone come forward and refute us, if he thinks that this statement of ours is not true. And one might add that the Goths have conceded that the dignity of the consulship should be conferred upon the Romans each year by the emperor of the East.

It is the Goths, and not the Eastern Empire, who have supported and protected Italy and Rome. The Goths emphasize this point one final time:

> ὑμεῖς δέ, τούτων τοιούτων ὄντων, Ἰταλίας μὲν οὐ προσεποιεῖσθε κακουμένης ὑπὸ τῶν Ὀδοάκρου βαρβάρων, καίπερ οὐ δι᾽ ὀλίγου, ἀλλ᾽ ἐς δέκα ἐνιαυτοὺς τὰ δεινὰ εἰργασμένου, νῦν δὲ τοὺς δικαίως αὐτὴν κεκτημένους, οὐδὲν ὑμῖν προσῆκον, βιάζεσθε. οὐκοῦν ἐντεῦθεν ἡμῖν ἐκποδὼν ἵστασθε, τά τε ὑμέτερα αὐτῶν ἔχοντες καὶ ὅσα ληϊσάμενοι τετυχήκατε (6.6.21-22).
>
> Such has been the course followed by us; but you, on your side, did not take the part of Italy while it was suffering at the hands of the barbarians and Odoacer, although it was not for a short time, but for ten years, that he treated the land outrageously; but now you do violence to us who have acquired it legitimately, though you have no business here. Do you therefore depart hence out of our way, keeping both that which is your own and whatever you have gained by plunder.

Belisarius and his army are cast as the unlawful invaders, and in a last insult, the Goths suggest that as they leave they take their plunder with them, as if they were no more than petty raiders.

In response to this version of events, Belisarius decries the Gothic representatives' speech as "not far from fraudulent in its pretensions" οὐ πόρρω ἀλαζονείας ὑμῖν γέγονε (6.6.22). He counters with the "official" imperial memory of the loss of the west, but in greater detail than we have heard thus far, replete with very historiographical questioning of the rational motivations of the actors involved:

> Θευδέριχον γὰρ βασιλεὺς Ζήνων Ὀδοάκρῳ πολεμήσοντα ἔπεμψεν, οὐκ ἐφ᾽ ᾧ Ἰταλίας αὐτὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχον· τί γὰρ ἂν καὶ τύραννον τυράννου διαλλάσσειν βασιλεῖ ἔμελεν; ἀλλ᾽ ἐφ᾽ ᾧ ἐλευθέρα τε καὶ βασιλεῖ κατήκοος ἔσται. ὁ δὲ τὰ περὶ τὸν τὺραννον εὖ διαθέμενος ἀγνωμοσύνῃ ἐς τἄλλα οὐκ ἐν μετρίος ἐχρήσατο· ἀποδιδόναι γὰρ τῷ κυρίῳ τὴν γῆν οὐδαμῆ ἔγνω. οἶμαι δὲ ἔγωγε τόν τε βιασάμενον καὶ ὃς ἂν τὰ τοῦ πὲλας ἑκουσίως μὴ ἀποδιδῷ ἴσον γε εἶναι. (6.6.23-25)

> For Theoderic was sent by the Emperor Zeno in order to make war on Odoacer, not in order to hold the dominion of Italy for himself. For why should the emperor have been concerned to exchange one tyrant for another? But he sent him in order that Italy might be free and obedient to the emperor. And though Theoderic disposed of the tyrant in a satisfactory manner, in everything else he showed an extraordinary lack of proper feeling; for he never thought of restoring the land to its rightful owner. But I, for my part, think that he who robs another by violence and he who of his own will does not restore his neighbor's goods are equal.

Belisarius concludes with his usual oath that he will never willingly surrender what he here calls "the emperor's country" (χώραν τὴν βασιλέως) (6.6.26).

The negotiations quickly go nowhere. Belisarius refuses to negotiate for surrender of more territory than he has been authorized to do, and the Goths conclude they must send envoys to Justinian himself to proceed. Given the debate's practical irrelevance to the unfolding of events, we have all the more reason to examine its thematic significance. There are, of course, the intertextual links to the Melian dialogue (Thuc 5.85-111).[293] It is unlikely, though, that this episode was included purely for decorative purposes or superficial similarity to Thucydides. Rather, the Thucydidean

[293] On the Thucydidean allusion in this section, see Adshead 102-3: the obvious formal similarities, the verbal echoes of unusual phrases such as μὴ ξυνεχεῖ ῥήσει (Th 8.86, *W* 6.6.11), and the humorous moment where Belisarius remarks that although the Gothic representatives promised to speak with brevity and moderation, their speech was in fact both long and immoderate.

intertexts serve to signpost and emphasize the thematic engagement with historical memory that is occurring.

Given that both sides' cases are strongly argued, how can we begin to judge between them? Or rather, how can we examine how Procopius guides his audience to do so? Unlike the standard speech-and-battle sequences, we cannot look to the unfolding of the subsequent conflict for our answers, as the debators interpret past, rather than future events. We can, however, look to other relevant memories of these persons and events within Procopius' history, and compare how the passages above compare to those references to the same persons and events that are narrated in the author's own voice. Notably, however, Procopius does not give a direct account of Theoderic's assumption of power in Italy either in the "Archaeolgy" at the start of Book 3 or in the digression on the history of the Goths and Franks in the midst of Belisarius' march toward Rome. We can, however, compare his (and other characters') appraisal of Theoderic's character and rule to those that underpin both the Goths' and Belisarius' arguments about the legitimacy of his and the Goths' subsequent rulership. In the digression on the history of the Franks and Goths, Theoderic comes off an a savvy leader, protecting his soldiers' lives and advancing his people's interests at the same time by manipulating his Frankish allies into doing most of the fighting for them (5.12). Such cunning in a general might be portrayed by the historian in a negative light, but Procopius' appraisal of Theoderic here is reservedly approving: he possesses foresight (πρόνοια) and gains territory for his people "without losing a single subject" (5.12.32).

Moreover, at the start of Book 5, Procopius praises Theoderic's conduct in ruling Italy in much the same terms that the Goths would use a book and a half later: respect for Roman institutions, justice, preservation of the laws:

> καὶ βασιλέως μὲν τοῦ Ῥωμαίων οὔτε τοῦ σχήματος οὔτε τοῦ ὀνόματος ἔπιβατεῦσαι ἠξίωσεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥὴξ διεβίου καλούμενος (οὕτω γὰρ σφῶν τοὺς ἡγεμόνας καλεῖν οἱ βάρβαροι νενομίκασι), τῶν μέντοι κατηκόων τῶν αὐτοῦ προὔστη ξύμπαντα περιβαλλόμενος ὅσα τῷ φύσει βασιλεῖ ἥρμοσται. δικαιοσύνης τε γὰρ ὑπερφυῶς ἐπεμελήσατο καὶ τοὺς νόμους ἐν τῷ βεβαίῳ διεσώσατο, ἔκ τε βαρβάρων τῶν περιοίκων τὴν χώραν ἀσφαλῶς διεφύλαξε, ξυνέσεῶς τε καὶ ἀνδρίας ἐς ἄκρον ἐληλύθει ὡς μάλιστα. καὶ ἀδίκημα σχεδόν τι οὐδὲν οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐς τοὺς ἀρχομένοθς εἰργάζετο οὔτε τῳ ̓́λλῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐγκεχειρηκότι ἐπέτρεπε, πλήν γε δὴ ὅτι τῶν χωρίαν τὴν μοῖραν ἀν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς Γότθοι ἐνείμαντο ἥνπερ Ὀδόακρος τοῖς στασιώταις τοῖς αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν. ἦν τε ὁ Θευδέριχος λόγῳ μὲν τύραννος, ἔργῳ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀληθὴς τῶν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ τιμῇ τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ηὐδοκιμηκότων οὐδενὸς ἧσσον, ἔρως τε αὐτοῦ ἔν τε Γότθοις καὶ Ἰταλιώταις πολὺς ἤκμασε, καὶ ταῦτα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου τρόπου. (5.1.26)
>
> And though he did not claim the right to assume either the garb or the name of emperor of the Romans, but was called "rex" to the end of his life (for thus the barbarians are accustomed to call their leaders), still, in governing his own subjects **he invested himself with al the qualitites which appropriately belong to one who is by birth an emperor.** For he was exceedingly careful to observe justice, he preserved the laws on a sure basis, he protected the land and kept it safe from the barbarians dwelling round about, and attained the highest possible degree of wisdom and manliness. And he himself committed scarcely a single act of injustice against his subjects, nor would he brook such conduct on the part of anyone else who attempted it, except, indeed, that the Goths distributed among themselves the portion of the lands which Odoacer had given to his own partisans. And although in name Theoderic was a usurper, **yet in fact he was truly an emperor as any who have distinguished themselves in this office from the beginning**; and love for him among both Goths and Italians grew to be great, and that too contrary to the ordinary habits of men.[294]

[294] see above Ch 2 pp 106-8 on Procopius' explanation of the term "rex" in this passage.

Procopius-as-narrator's praise for Theoderic's just and wise rule, and in particular his defense of Roman laws and land, problematizes the imperial Romans' arguments, both for the historical memory that Theoderic unjustly stole Italy from the empire, and their claims that the people of Italy were suffering under the Goths' mistreatment. It likewise bolsters the Goths' own claims to just and legitimate rulership, again placing particular emphasis on the protection not only of the land itself, but its laws.

Thus Procopius the historian intercedes in the process of memory formation and consolidation on behalf of the Goths. The Goths' memory of the events of the 470s are already in the process of becoming the historically preserved and legitimated memory, endorsed by Procopius' positive portrayal of the figure at their center, Theoderic. We should also note, before we move on from these passages, other aspects of the functioning of social memory that can be observed in this section. We witness the importance of historical memory in informing interpretations of more recent past events, as the legitimacy of the imperial Romans' invasion depends entirely on one's interpretation of the historical context for it; and in informing decisions and actions in the present. Readily observable, too, is the supreme importance of memory in establishing each group's identity as rightful rulers or brazen invaders. Finally, we see Procopius' rendition of the evolution and re-creation of social memory over time as outlined by theorists such as Michael Schudson.[295] Procopius' historical actors create pasts for themselves—establishing and refining social memory for their generation—not from scratch, as it were, or with complete freedom, but working from the versions of past

[295] Schudson, Michael. (1989) "The Past in the Present versus the Present in the Past." *Communication* 11:105-13.

events that have been handed down, and working within the confines of social conflicts of their day.[296] Both the pre-existing memories of the circumstances of the loss of the western empire (the "structure of available pasts"), and the other group's competing memories and vested interests limit each side's construction of the way they would like to understand their past, and so, their own place in recent events.

## Part III: Ethnic Identity and *Romanitas*

The passages above provide an excellent example of the way in which the negotiations of memory and identity feed into one another, but it is far from the only occasion Procopius addresses the interaction of the two. Indeed, Procopius makes a continued investigation into the way ethnic and group identities are distributed and interact with one another an ongoing thematic concern of the *Wars.* Additionally, as we will see, issues of Roman memory are at the root of the question of Roman identity for Procopius: who is and is not respecting and preserving Roman cultural memory, who is and is not acting the part of Romans.

We have observed already how Roman identity in the sixth century was unstable, contested on several different fronts: the barbarian makeup of the Roman army, the Romans of the Eastern and Western empires in close contact such as they had not

[296] "The full freedom to reconstruct the past according to one's own present interests is limited by three factors: the structure of available pasts, the structure of individual choices, and the conflicts about the past among a multitude of mutually aware individuals or groups." Schudson 107

experienced for some time, the conflicting civilian and and military interests, the ever-lengthening divide between the contemporary world and the classical past, and the efforts of the emperor and imperial administration to define *Romanitas* a certain way. We have been discussing over the course of the chapter the importance of memory to identity, and how, in Megill's terms, memory rises in value when identity is unstable. Now, we will step back from memory somewhat, in order to look more closely at Procopius' handling of identity, Roman and otherwise, in his work. The following sections will investigate how Procopius responds to these instabilities in identity by examining his treatment of Roman identity in a very simple way: by looking at who is identified, by the narrator and others, as Roman, and how who is and is not Roman changes with circumstances and evolves over the course of the narrative. We will consider as a corollary the distribution of other, related identities, such as Italian and Greek, Goth and barbarian.

The goal, of course, is to have this ultimately feed back into our discussions of memory, to look at the importance of identity to memory: how Roman and other identities are tied up with historical and cultural memory, how these play out in Procopius' history. Identity feeds back into memory, in part, as it dictates that who can lay claim to the identity, can lay claim to the memory, the heritage and its associated benefits. For Procopius, a historian, cutting off people from Roman identity and Roman cultural memory might have been one of the highest forms of censure (and conveniently, one he had readily available to him).

Let us briefly outline, then, the various terms used by Procopius and his actors to identify ethnic and cultural groups, beginning with that concept so central to Procopius

and his history, Roman. Procopius' deployment of the ethnic identifier "Roman" will be the main focus of the pages that follow, but we should note here the general outlines of his usage. For much of the work, "Roman" is applied to the troops, officers, and efforts of the imperial Roman army; and to the emperor, cities, and concerns of the eastern Roman Empire. It is also used to describe or designate the residents of the erstwhile western Roman Empire, particularly the people of Italy, and most of all, Rome itself. Therein lies one of the central tensions we will consider in the following sections, for Procopius' use of the term "Roman" to designate one or the other of the two groups for whom it might be appropriate shifts and evolves over the course of the work: subtly at first, and then with ever more forcefulness and judgment. From a clearly and straightforwardly Roman identity for the imperial army, despite its admittedly barbarian makeup, Procopius moves toward at first problematizing, and eventually denying that identity. As the army's *Romanitas* becomes more troubled, that of the people of Italy becomes more central.

There are, of course and of necessity, alternative or further means Procopius used to identify those groups who could be termed "Roman." The citizens of North Africa are usually simply "the Libyans" (Λιβύαι) and though Belisarius and other generals make a point of referring to them as former or erstwhile Roman citizens, their *Romanitas* is never a threat or a complication to the army's own. The people of Italy are occasionally termed "Italians," or further identified as "a Roman from ____" using the name of their (Italian) city to clarify the type of Roman that they are. The people of Rome are occasionally called just that, or referred to as "the private citizens," when their citizenship in Rome is

understood from context. Finally, Procopius must sometimes, either out of practical necessity or to make a thematic point, employ alternative means to identify the army of Justinian, its soldiers and generals. In these cases, some reference to the emperor or the imperial cause is most often used. All of these are terms of identity employed by the narrator, but Procopius also puts into some of his actors' mouths differing means of referring to one another. Thus, for the most part the imperial Roman actors' designations match up with Procopius' own, but those employed by the Goths in the history reflect their own cultural viewpoint. To the Goths, the people of Italy are the only "Romans," while the emperor's army are the "Greeks" who have intruded, unwelcome, into Italian affairs. For all that their role in recent history is debatable, as we have seen just above, "Gothic" is a fairly stable ethnic identity in Procopius: all parties can agree on who is and is not a Goth, and there are few alternate or competing identitfiers for the people as a group.[297] It is the larger identity that the Goths participate in, that of barbarian, that is various, fluid, unstable.

While the complex nature of the role of barbarians, and barbarian identity, in the *Wars* could fill a dissertation of its own, we will consider here a few elements of it, in order to provide an appropriate backdrop for the discussions of identity, and particularly Roman identity, that follow. Greco-Roman identity, of course, had defined itself against the construct of "barbarian" for over a milenium, and Procopius certainly participates in

---

[297] Indeed, Procopius outlines the various Gothic sub-groups at 3.2.1-6, but opines that the names are the only thing that differentiates them. It is likely that for those involved, the collapse of the distinction was not nearly so neat or complete at Procopius would have it. Nevertheless, in the historical present of the *Wars* and for Procopius, it is not a meaningful distinction.

and utilizes this technique: of the empire's several barbarian foes, the Vandals in particular are constructed as a barbarian "other,"[298] while the characterization of the Gothic king Totila participates (at times) in an age-old trope of the noble savage.[299] There are particular instances, such as the imperial Roman seizures of Corsica and Sardinia, discussed in more detail below, where Procopius seems to be deploying the identifier "Roman" in response to the presence of barbarian groups or territorial control (pp 219-220 below).

The issue regarding barbarian-ness in the *Wars* which most concerns us here is the issue of the highly barbarian makeup of the "Roman" army, both recruited into the regular army, and in allied companies.[300] Procopius charts both the highs and lows of the army's often troubled relationship with their Hunnic allies. A few examples here will illustrate the characterization of the dynamic in the *Wars*; more will follow in the analysis below. Book Four begins inauspiciously with a group of Huns planning to switch sides, but Belisarius manages to persuade them not to (4.1.5-11). Procopius mentions pointedly at 5.27.1-2 that the reinforcements brought to Belisarius by a commander Martinus were mostly "Huns, Sclaveni and Antae, who are settled above the Ister River not far from its

---

[298] The Vandals seem to me to be a more generic barbarian "other" than Chosroes and his people, for who Procopius has specific Persian and eastern tropes to play on, and the Goths and other peoples of Europe, where as we will see Procopius gives some attention to the differences among them, as well as the problems of the "Romanization" of the barbarians and the barbarization of the Romans

[299] In fact, Totila can be anaylzed as the true hero of Book 8 of the *Wars*, see further Cameron (1985) 8

[300] For recruitment of barbarians (and others) in the late Roman world, see M. Whitby "Recruitment in Byzantine Armies from Justinian to Heraclius (ca. 565-615) In *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East* vol 3, *States, Resources, and Armies,* ed. Averil Cameron, 61-124. Princeton,1995. 103-110

banks” (καὶ αὐτῶν οἱ πλεῖστοι Οὖννοί τε ἦσαν καὶ Σκλαβηνοὶ καὶ Ἄνται, οἳ ὑπὲρ ποταμὸν Ἴστρον οὐ μακρὰν τῆς ἐκείνῃ ὄχθης ἵδρυνται). Belisarius credits the Huns' skill as mounted archers in a subsequent series of victories in the ongoing defense of the city of Rome (5.27.26-9). Procopius also utilizes the Huns' presence to undermine the *Romanitas* of the army, as at 3.12.6-10, when Belisarius punishes a pair of Huns (“Massagetae”) for drunkenly killing their commander. This angers the rest of the Huns, who argue “that it was not to be punished nor to be subject to the laws of the Romans that they entered into an alliance” (οὐκ ἐπὶ τιμωρίᾳ οὐδ᾽ ἐπὶ τῷ ὑπεύθυνοι εἶναι Ρωμαίων νόμοις ἐς ξυμμαχίαν ἥκειν 3.12.10). Coming as this episode does on the eve of the armada's arrival in Libya, it problematizes the very Roman-versus-barbarian dynamic of the North African campaign that follows.

## **Part III, Section 1: Roman Identity on the Persian and North African Fronts**

That, under “normal circumstances,” Procopius considered himself, his fellow countrymen, and their empire to be “Roman” hardly needs proving.[301] The emperor's

[301] See further: Mass, Michael “Roman Questions, Byzantine Answers: Contours of the Age of Justinian” in Maas, M. *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3-27, esp. n 4; Vladimir Vavrinek “The Eastern Roman Empire or Early Byzantium? A Society in Transition” in Vavrínek, V. (1985). From late antiquity to early Byzantium: Proceedings of the Byzantinological Symposium in the 16th International Eirene Conference. Praha: Academia. 9-20.

cause and army are referred to as such from the start: Procopius describes his work as the history of "the wars which Justinian, emperor of the Romans, waged against the barbarians of the East and West..." (τοὺς πολέμους... οὓς Ἰουστινιανος ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς πρὸς βαρβάρους διήνεγκε τούς τε ἑῴους καὶ ἑστεπίους...) (1.1.1). His narrative of these events "will begin at some distance back, telling of the fortunes in war of the Romans and the Medes..." λελέξεται δὲ πρῶτον ἀρξαμένοις μικρὸν ἄνωθεν ὅσα Ῥωμαίοις ξυνηνέχθη καὶ Μήδοις πολεμοῦσι παθεῖν τε καὶ δρᾶσαι (1.1.17). And finally, when the background narrative reaches the present day of Justinian's wars, Procopius tells us, "And the Romans, under the leadership of Sittas and Belisarius, made an inroad into Persarmenia, a territory subject to the Persians..." Ῥωμαῖοι δέ, Σίττα τε καὶ Βελισαρίου ἡγουμένων σφίσιν, ἐς Περσαρμενίαν τὴν Περσῶν κατήκοον ἐσβαλόντες... (1.12.20). The matter is relatively straightforward here on the Persian front: the forces of the eastern Roman Empire are battling their Eastern neighbors, traditional enemies of the Romans and the Greeks before them. Procopius is free, as we have seen, to engage with memories of the classical Greek past. His and his audience's identity as Romans is supplemented by the more ancient associations drawn from classical Greece, but it is not challenged or complicated by other claimants.

When, in Books 3 and 4, the narrative moves into North Africa and the one-time Western Roman Empire, the situation becomes somewhat more complex. Belisarius' forces, certainly, are still identified as Roman; they are usually referred to simply as "the Romans," (Ῥωμαίοι) as at 3.25.9, or "Roman soldiers" (Ῥωμαίοις στρατιώταις)

as at 3.24.17. What complicates matters is that rather than carrying on an ages-old border war, the Roman army is now fighting on land and amid cities that were once, not so long ago, themselves Roman. They are fighting, what is more, a war ostensibly of re-conquest and liberation. Their foes are still conveniently barbarian, but there are as well the native, erstwhile Romans to consider. Their presence does not necessarily challenge the army's identity, but it does add nuance: it presents an alternate possibility of what it means to be Roman. On the soldiers' part, it also adds an additional responsibility to it, as we will see.

Procopius puts the most well-developed and explicit statements of the propagandistic imperial position on the re-conquest[302] into the mouth of Belisarius, its star player. In a series of passages at the beginning of the North African campaign, Belisarius outlines a code of behavior for the Roman soldiers. When a small group of soldiers who, upon first going ashore, raid the surrounding fields for food (3.16.1), Belisarius punishes them severely. He then admonishes them, telling the whole army that the deed is unjust enough in itself, but in this case, the greater evil is the danger they have put the army in:

> ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκείνῳ μόνῳ τὸ θαρρεῖν ἔχων εἰς τὴν γῆν ὑμᾶς ἀπεβίβασα ταύτην, ὅτι τοῖς Βανδίλοις οἱ Λίβυες, Ῥωμαῖοι τὸ ἀνέκαθεν ὄντες, ἄπιστοί τέ εἰσι καὶ χαλεπῶς ἔχουσι, καὶ διὰ

[302] The "official" imperial position as portrayed by Procopius maps closely with that found in Justinian's own laws. For example, this preface to an *Institute* links exertions in the field of law with victories in war: "The head of the Roman state can then stand victorious not only over enemies in war but also over trouble-makers, driving out their wickedness through the paths of the law, and can triumph as much by his devotion to the law as for his conquests in battle.... **Barbarian nations brought beneath our yoke know the scale of our exertions in war. Africa and countless other provinces, restored to Roman jurisdiction and brought back within our empire after so long an interval, bear witness to the victories granted to us by the will of heaven."** *Institutes,* pr., *Nov* 21, 533, trans P Birks and G McLeod.

> τοῦτο ᾤμην ὡς οὔτ᾽ ἄν τι τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἡμᾶς ἐπιλείποι οὔτε τι ἐξ ἐπιδρομῆς κακὸν ἐργάσονται ἡμᾶς οἱ πολέμιοι. ἀλλὰ νῦν αὕτη ὑμῶν ἡ ἀκράτεια ταῦτα εἰς τοὐναντίον ἡμῖν μεταβέβληκε...φύσει γὰρ πρόσεστι τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις ἡ πρὸς τοὺς βιαζομένους ἔχθρα, καὶ περιέστηκεν ὑμῖν τῆς τε ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἀσφαλείας καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀφθονίας ὀλίγα ἄττα ἀργύρια ἀνταλλάξασθαι, παρὸν ὑμῖν παρ᾽ ἑκόντων ὠνουμένοις τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τῶν κυρίων μήτε ἀδίκοις εἶναι δοκεῖν καὶ φίλοις ἐκείνοις ἐς τὰ μάλιστα χρῆσθαι...ἀλλὰ παύσασθε μὲν τοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις ἐπιπηδῶντες, κέρδος δὲ ἀποσείσασθε κινδύνων μεστόν. (3.16.3-4,5, 7)
>
> For I have disembarked you upon this land basing my confidence on this alone, **that the Libyans, being Romans from of old, are unfaithful and hostile to the Vandals**, and for this reason I thought that no necessaries would fail us and, besides, that the enemy would not do us any injury by sudden attack. But now this your lack of self-control has changed it all and made the opposite true... For by nature those who are wronged feel enmity toward those that have done them violence, and it has come round to this that you have exchanged your own safety and a bountiful supply of good things for some few pieces of silver, when it was possible for you, by purchasing provisions from willing owners, not to appear unjust and at the same time enjoy their friendship to the utmost... But do you cease trespassing wantonly upon the possessions of others, and reject a gain which is full of dangers.

The soldiers of the imperial army are instructed to treat the North African citizens and their property with respect, for they are fellow “Romans from of old.” Doing so will confirm the Roman army as liberators, reaffirm to the North Africans that the Vandals are the undesirable oppressors, and convince them to side with and identify with the imperial Roman army. Belisarius’ argument centers on the strategic benefits of such a course of action, but the moral underpinnings of the position will continue to resonnate as the cultural identities it sets up are reified and transgressed over the course of the narrative.

At 3.20.17-21, the Roman forces have entered North Africa and are preparing to march on Carthage. Belisarius again addresses the troops with an earnest and explicit injunction: they are not to pillage and despoil the countryside, they are not to antagonize

the local residents, nor take them captive. They are, essentially, to avoid treating the land as conquered territory and they are not to behave as invaders. Procopius gives Belisarius' speech as a paraphrase:

> Λίβυας γὰρ ἅπαντας Ῥωμαίους τὸ ἀνέκαθεν ὄντας γενέσθαι τε ὑπὸ Βανδίλοις οὔτι ἐθελουσίους καὶ πολλὰ πεπονθέναι πρὸς ἀνδρῶν βαρβάρων ἀνόσια. διὸ δὴ καὶ βασιλέα ἐς πόλεμον καταστῆναι Βανδίλοις, εἶναί τε οὐχ ὅσιον ξυμβῆναί τι πρὸς αὐτῶν ἄχαρι ἐς ἀνθρώπους ὧν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ὑπόθεσιν ποιησάμενοι ἐπὶ βανδίλους ἐστράτευσαν.
>
> For all the Libyans had been Romans in earlier times, and had come under the Vandals by no will of their own and had suffered many outrages at the hands of these barbarians. For this very reason the emperor had entered into war with the Vandals, and it was not holy that any harm should come from them to the people whose freedom they had made the ground for taking the field against the Vandals (3.20.19-20)

Since the North Africans are fellow Romans, they must be treated as such: to enslave them, or pillage their property, is how invaders would treat the conquered. To refrain from such is how Roman soldiers would treat fellow Romans. The principle carries weight for the identification of the North Africans, but also for the Roman soldiers, on whose actions the whole enterprise rests. Treating the North Africans as Romans, in a sense, makes the soldiers Roman, or at least, affirms their *Romanitas*.[303] Even more, this friendly treatment will prove crucial to winning "the hearts and minds" of the citizens, contributing to the success of the very enterprise that will re-establish them as Romans.

In the event, the Roman forces do indeed behave according to Belisarius' definition of Roman soldiers. At the conquest of Syllectus and of Carthage immediately

---

[303] This despite acknowledgements elsewhere of the significantly barbarian makeup of the army: see above p 212.

following Belisarius' injunction, as well as afterward (with a few close calls, see below), the Romans act as liberators, not conquerors:

> Εἰς δὲ Σύλλεκτον ἀφικόμενος Βελισάριος σώφρονάς τε τοὺς στρατιώτας παρείχετον καὶ οὔτε ἀδίκων χειρῶν ἄρχοντας οὔτε τι ἀπὸ τρόπου ἐργαζομένους, αὐτός τε πρᾳότητα καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν πολλὴν ἐνδεικνύμενος οὕτω τοὺς Λίβυας προσεποιήσατο ὥστε τοῦ λοιποῦ καθάπερ ἐν χώρᾳ οἰκείᾳ τὴν πορείαν ποιεῖσθαι... (3.17.6)
>
> And when Belisarius reached Syllectus, the soldiers behaved with moderation, and they neither began any unjust brawls nor did anything out of the way, and he himself, by displaying great gentleness and kindness, won the Libyans to his side so completely that thereafter he made the journey as if in his own land...

They thus validate not only the North African territory and citizens on the one hand, but themselves, on the other, as indeed Roman. Because of Belisarius' firm vision and the soldiers' adherence to it, the endeavor proceeds as the re-unification the (Eastern) Roman viewpoint wishes it to be. Belisarius, meanwhile, has demonstrated again his effectiveness as a military commander and as a true Roman general, and his triumph, detailed at 4.9, is truly earned.

A further, slightly different, formulation of Belisarius' articulation of the official position comes later in the history of the Vandal war. Here it is another general, Solomon, who addresses a sizeable portion of the army that is on the point of rebellion. Procopius tells how many Roman troops had taken captive Vandal wives, who then convince the soldiers that they deserve their enemies' possessions as well as their women. The soldiers threaten to rebel if they are not granted the lands and goods of the conquered Vandals. Procopius uses this opportunity in the narrative to rephrase in even stronger

terms his portrayal of the regime's position on the status of North Africa, and to add further, telling nuance. Solomon rebukes the rebellious troops and denies their claim:

> ...φάσκοντί τε ὡς τὰ μὲν ἀνδράποδα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα χρήματα τοῖς στρατιώταις ἐς λάφυρα ἰέναι οὐκ ἀπεικὸς εἶναι, γῆν μέντοι αὐτὴν βασιλεῖ τε καὶ τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῇ προσήκειν, ἥπερ αὐτοὺς ἐξέθρεψέ τε καὶ στρατιώτας καλεῖσθαί τε καὶ εἶναι πεποίηκεν, οὐκ ἐφ᾽ ᾧ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς τὰ χωρία κεκτήσονται ὅσα ἂν βαρβάρους ἐπιβατεύοντας τῆς Ῥωμαίων βασιλείας ἀφέλοιντο, ἀλλ᾽ ἐφ᾽ ᾧ ἐς τὸ δημόσιον ταῦτα ἰέναι, ὅθεν σφίσι τε ξυμβαίνει καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασι τὰς σιτήσεις κομίζεσθαι.
>
> ...while it was not unreasonable that the slaves and all the other things of value should go as booty to the soldiers, the land itself belonged to the emperor and the empire of the Romans, which had nourished them and caused them to be called soldiers, and to be such, not in order to win for themselves such land as they should wrest from the barbarians who were trespassing on the Roman empire, but that the land might come to the commonwealth, from which both they and all others secured their maintenance. (4.14.10)

There is much that could be said about this passage as regards Procopius' presentation of Justinian's ideology of re-conquest. For now, let us note that Solomon characterizes the Vandals as "trespassing on the Roman empire," claiming North Africa unambiguously as Roman. However, he presents the land as belonging ultimately not to the Roman citizens of the province, but to the emperor and the empire as a whole, so that the former can administer it for the good of the latter. The territory is being recovered for the empire, but the implication is not simply a return to the past, as was the case in Belisarius' passages above. Rather, Procopius uses Solomon to tease the possibility of a Roman Empire re-built into something new, at Justinian's direction and discretion.

While Procopius thus gives voice to the official validation for the North African campaign as a restoration of the empire, he also includes some language in these sections which hints at doubts as to whether such a thing is truly possible, or likely under

Justinian's rule. Just before the near-rebellion described above, Belisarius dispatched a force to Corsica and Sardinia, to "recover for the Roman Empire the [latter] island, which had previously been subject to the Vandals" (τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῇ τὴν νῆσον ἀνακτήσασθαι, βανδίλων κατήκοον τὰ πρότερα) (4.5.4). However, Cyril, the commander, is then described as having "won back both the islands and made them tributary to the Roman domain" (ἄμφω τὰ νήσω τῇ Ῥωμαίων βασιλείᾳ ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγὴν ἀνεσώσατο) (4.5.4). Similar wording is used at the beginning of Book 5, when Belisarius, in winning Sicily, has "recovered the whole of the island for the Romans," (πᾶσαν ἀνασωσαμένω τὴν νῆσον Ῥωμαίοις ἐκείνῃ) (5.5.19), but as a result, "the emperor held all Sicily subject and tributary to himself," βασιλεύς τε έκ τοῦδε Σικελίαν ὅλην ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγὴν κατήκουν εἶλε (5.5.17). In each instance, the report of the result (the verb ἀπαγωγὴν, "made tributary" is the same in both, cf Herodotus 1.6.27, 2.182) gives the impression that the islands were not being restored to their former place in the empire but were instead incorporated as conquered territories: the very thing the Romans were ostensibly not doing in North Africa. It suggests that the Western provinces were not being re-integrated on terms of complete equality. The passage at 4.8.25 on the re-assessment of the taxation of North Africa, discussed above in chapter three, provides something of the same sense of discontinuity with the past, and the suggestion that the new order would be less advantageous for the Libyans. Procopius quitely emphasizes the contrast, the historical

change that has taken place. While the official rhetoric might be that of reintegration, that is not how the Roman Empire operates any longer, especially under Justinian.[304]

**Part III, Section 2: Arrival in Italy and Rome**

When the narrative of the *Wars* arrives in Italy, the situation becomes progressively more complex. Procopius must deal now with the inhabitants of Italy, and, eventually, the people of Rome itself. These are populations who not only have a fair claim to be thought of as *also* Romans, but whose claim to that identity is so strong that they are most naturally referred to simply as "the Romans" and Procopius must employ additional explanation or circumlocution to avoid confusion or to make a point. While often in these early books of the *Gothic Wars* the identification of one or the other group as "Romans" are governed, on the one hand by a need for clarity, and on the other by the perspective of the speaker, there are key moments where Procopius begins to use the application or withholding of the identifier "Roman" to raise thematic questions about the unstable nature of *Romanitas* in this unique context.

When he begins to refer to them as such, it is notable that the Italians are called "Romans" not by the narrator directly, but as Procopius reports the actions, words, or

[304] On Justinian's program and ideology of restoration, see Maas (1986) and Pazdernik (2005), and for Procopius' ambiguous reaction, Kaldelis (2006) Ch 4 (pp 18-164) and Kaldelis (2010a), as well as below, pp 291-308.

viewpoints of others.[305] At 5.9.2-7, Procopius relays a story (which he for his part "does not credit," ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες) in which a frightened Theodatus, the Gothic ruler, consults "a Hebrew" on how to proceed with the war. The resulting oracle involves three groups of pigs, representing "the Goths, the Romans, and the soldiers of the emperor" (Γόθων τε καὶ Ῥωμαίων καὶ τῶν Βασιλέυς στρατιωτῶν) (5.9.4), which are observed for a set amount of time to see which group will flourish.[306] Shortly therafter Vittigis addresses "the Senate and people of the Romans," (Ῥωμαίων τοῖς τε ἐκ βουλῆς καὶ τῷ δήμῳ) (5.11.26), discussed above. In these and other instances Procopius broaches the complex issue of the plurality of *Romanitas* by allowing the alternative perspective into the narrative via a third party: the perspective is presented second-hand, as it were, that these Italians are the "real" Romans. Naturally, from the Goths' perspective, the Italians are the Romans; they are the Romans they have been living with for decades, and the emperor's army who are the foreign invaders. It is also, as we have seen above (pp 196-204) and will see below (pp 247-205), in their best interests to construct their worldview so.

In the meantime, Procopius has Belisarius once again use "Roman" in an inclusive fashion, but his actions and threats undercut this inclusivity. As he urges the

---

[305] See above, pp 209-210 on Procopius' variety of terms for the Italian Romans.

[306] In the event, the "Goth" pigs mostly die, while the animals named for the "emperor's army" survive, and of the "Roman" pigs, about half survive, although their hair falls out, indicating their suffering. The would-be accuracy of the oracle is presumably at least part of Procopius' reason for distrusting the tale, although, of course, he includes it just the same.

people of Naples to surrender, so that he need not take the city by force,[307] Belisarius emphasizes the fact that both groups have legitimate claims to Roman-ness, calling on the memory of their shared heritage:[308]

> πόλιν δὲ ἀρχαίαν καὶ οἰκήτορας Χριστιανούς τε καὶ Ῥωμαίους ἄνωθεν ἔχουσαν ἐς τοῦτο τύχης οὐκ ἂν εὐξαίμην, ἄλλως τε καὶ ὑπ᾽ ἐμοῦ Ῥωμαίων στρατηγοῦντος... (5.9.27)
>
> But I pray that an ancient city, which has for ages been inhabited by both Christians and Romans, may not meet with such a fortune, especially not at my hands as a commander of Roman troops...

Belisarius' speech, as it uses "Romans" twice in quick succession, sets up the idea that both groups are, in fact, Roman. As he continues, though, his threat of violence toward Naples if the citizens do not surrender turns on the fact that his (so-called) Roman army is largely made up of barbarians, who would act in a way very different from the way he has outlined Romans ought to behave toward fellow Romans:

> ... ὑπ᾽ ἐμοῦ Ῥωμαίων στρατηγοῦντος, ἐλθεῖν, μάλιστα ἐπεὶ βάρβαροι πολλοί μοι τὸ πλῆθος ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ εἰσίν, ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ξυγγενεῖς πρὸ τοῦδε ἀπολωλεκότες τοῦ τείχους· ὧν δὴ κατέχειν τὸν θυμόν, ἢν πολέμῳ τὴν πόλιν ἕλωσιν οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην. (5.9.27)
>
> ...especially at my hands as a commander of Roman troops, not least because in my army are a multitude of barbarians who have lost brothers or relatives before

[307] In fact, Belisarius takes Naples by finding a way to get a small force inside the city and open the city gates to the main army, as is so oftem the case in the *Wars*, and seemingly in sixth century siege warfare generally (see above, pp 192-6). An Isaurian under Belisarius' command discovers a way into the city via the aqueduct (5.9.11-21), and Belisarius sends a contingent of four hundred men thence into the city (5.10.1-26).
[308] Naples, once the quintessentially Greek city in Italy, is here characterized as straightforwardly Roman. Whether Procopius was unaware of this, or it was simply inconvenient for the point he was seeking to make, is unclear. See also Ch 2, pp 105, on Procopius explanatory aside on Naples at 5.8.5; and pp 68-70 on Pazdernik's (2000) analysis of Belisarius' behavior in this and other sieges through an intertextual lens.

> the wall of this town; for the fury of these men I should be unable to control, if they should capture the city by act of war.

Procopius again engages with the fraught subject of the largely barbarian makeup of the "Roman" army, as he does on occasion throughout the *Wars,*[309] combining it devastatingly here withwith his ongoing questioning of *Romanitas*. The "Roman" army's threatening stance toward an iconic Roman city establishes dramatic tension for the army's subsequent march on Rome, and the problematic nature of Roman identity that this belies provides further nuance for the explorations of Roman memory that inhabit the space between the two events.[310] In the event, Belisarius is proved largely correct: at 5.9.27-29 we see the soldiers pillage the town, until Belisarius is able to put a stop to it by calling upon not a common Roman identity but a universal Christian mercy (5.9.30-33).

Thus, for the most part, Procopius generously includes both the emperor's army and the inhabitants of Italy under the identifier "Romans" when he deems it appropriate. He can usually rely on context to make clear which group is meant, as at 5.14.11, when the Romans decide to hand over the city of Rome (see just below), or at 6.6.3 when the Goths send an envoy who is "a Roman of note among the Goths" (Ῥωμαῖον ἄνδρα ἐν Γότθοις δόκιμον), where the Romans of Rome and/or Italy are obviously meant.[311] Meanwhile, at 6.16.8, Narses is quoted as saying "If we fail, we shall shatter the strength of the Romans" (ὡς τὸ εἰκος σφαλέντες... τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἰσχὺν καταλύσομεν), and at 7.12.12, Sisifridus, a Goth by birth, is described as loyal to the

---

[309] pp 211-2 above
[310] pp 181-192 above
[311] In other cases, the label is applied to groups that are just Italians, and obviously do not include the citizens of Rome: at 5.26.14, the residents of Portus, killed by the Goths, are called "Romans."

Romans and the emperor's cause (εὐνοικῶς δὲ λίαν ἔς τε Ῥωμαίους καὶ τὰ βασιλέως πράγματα ἔχων).

* * * *

Procopius' habit thus far, of utilizing a third-party perspective to distance his narrator's voice from the references to the people of Rome as Romans and the army under Belisarius as the emperor's army, begins to fall away as the army and the narrative approach the city of Rome:

> ...Ῥωμαῖοι δέ, δείσαντες μὴ σφίσι ξυμβαίη ὅσα Νεαπολίταις ξυμπέπωκε, λογισάμενοι ἔγνωσαν ἄμεινον εἶναι τῇ πόλει τὸν βασιλέως στρατὸν δέξασθαι. (5.14.4)
>
> ...but the Romans, fearing lest all the calamities should befall them which had befallen the Neapolitans, decided after considering the matter that it was better to receive the emperor's army into the city.

The passage, while not a direct quote or indirect speech, is still a report of the thought process of the Romans of the city (who are referred to as such by the narrator). Thus it is from their perspective that the new arrivals are "the emperor's army," distancing the narrator from the act of not naming them as "Romans." Next the Goths, learning of their decision, choose to abandon the city:

> Γότθοι δὲ οἳ ἐν Ῥωμῃ φυλακὴν εἶχον, ἐπεὶ τούς τε πολεμίους ἄγχιστά πη εἶωαι ἐπύθοντο καὶ Ῥωμαίων τῆς γνώμης ᾔσθοντο, ἤσχαλλον τότε τῇ πόλει καὶ τοῖς ἐπειτα δὲ Ῥωμαίων σφίσιν ένδιδόντων ἐνθένδε ἀπαλλαγέντες ἐτὶ Ῥαβέννης ἐχωρησαν ἅπαντες... ξυνέπεσέ τε έκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρα κατὰ τὸν αὐτον χρόνον Βελισάριον μὲν καὶ τὸν βασιλέως στρατὸν ἐς Ῥώμην εἰσιέναι διὰ πύλης ἣν καλοῦσιω Ἀσιναρίαν, Γότθους δὲ ἀναχωρεῖν ἐνθένδε διὰ πύλησ ἑτέρας ἣ Φλαμινία ἐπικαλεῖται... (5.14.12-14)

> But as for the Goths who were keeping guard in Rome, it was not until they learned that the enemy were very near and became aware of the decision **of the Romans**, that they began to be concerned for the city, and, being unable to meet the attacking army in battle, they were at a loss; but later, with the permission of **the Romans**, then all departed thence and returned to Ravenna... And so it happened on that day that at the very same time when Belisarius and the emperor's army were entering Rome through the gate which they call the Asinarian Gate, the Goths were withdrawing from the city through another gate which bears the name Flaminian...

From the Gothic soldiers' perspective, "the Romans" are the people of Rome. When Procopius narrates the imperial Romans' entry into the city, however, he chooses this moment to identify them as "Belisarius and the emperor's army" in a straightforward, unmediated fashion.

Here, at this point of momentous potential for Rome's reincorporation into the Roman Empire, Procopius seems to have made a conscious choice to designate the inhabitants of the city simply, and absolutely, as Romans, even though this must occasionally be at the expense of the other claimants to the title. The emperor's army, for clarity's sake if nothing else, must be referred to as such, or as the Goth's enemies: Procopius yields to the people of Rome the first, highest claim on the name of "Roman." Only in one passage in this section does "the Romans" refer to the army, rather than the citizens. It comes in Procopius' solemn pronouncement of the crucial moment:

> ...Ῥώμη τε αὖθις εξήκοντα ἔτεσιν ὕστερον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις γέγονεν... (5.14.14)
>
> ...and Rome became subject to the Romans again after a space of sixty years...

Procopius draws the reader's attention to the dichotomy, that for such a length of time the city of Rome was separated from the empire of the Romans; now that situation is rectified. That the army is only referred to as Roman once in the whole episode, and that

this one instance is so particular, raises questions: does that belie the falsity or superficiality of such a statement? Is Procopius being intentionally inconsistent, setting up this statement to be jarring; to bring attention to the irony?

Additionally, Procopius almost immediately undermines his identification of "Romans" here, continuing his pronouncement with:

> ...ἐνάτῃ τοῦ τελευταίου, πρὸς δὲ Ῥωμαίων προσαγορευομένου βασιλέως τὴν αὐτοκράτορα ἀρχὴν ἔχοντος. (5.14.14)
>
> ...on the ninth day of the last month, which is called "December" by the Romans, in the eleventh year of the reign of the Emperor Justinian.

No sooner has the event occurred, than Procopius subtly reminds his audience that these Romans who now hold Rome again do not speak the language of that city, and that in that way there is a sense in which they are not Romans.

The account of the army's entry into the city is followed by a description of the measures Belisarius takes to supply and fortify Rome for the inevitable siege by the Gothic forces. He repairs and updates the features of the circuit-wall and has a moat dug.

> Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ τὴν μὲν πρόνοιαν τοῦ στρατηγοῦ καὶ διαφερόντως τὴν ἐς τὰς ἐπάλξεις ἀποδεδειγμένην ἐμπειρίαν ἐπῄ νουν, ἐν θαύματι δὲ μεγάλῳ ποιούμενοι ἤσχαλλον, εἴ τινα ὡς πολοιορκηθήσεται ἔννοιαν ἔχων ᾠήθη ἐσιτητά οἱ φέρειν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων τῇ ἀπορία, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐπιθαλάσσιος εἶναι, καὶ τείχους περιβαλλομένη τοσοῦτόν τι χρῆμα, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐν πεδίῳ κειμένη ἐς ἄγαν ὑπτίῳ τοῖς ἐπιοῦσιν εὐφοδος, ὡς τὸ εἰκός, ἔστιν. (5.14.16)
>
> And the Romans applauded the forethought of the general and especially the experience displayed in the matter of the battlement; but they marveled greatly and were vexed that he should have thought it possible for him to enter Rome if he had any idea that he would be besieged, for it cannot possibly endure a siege because it cannot be supplied with provisions, since it is not on the sea, is

> enclosed by a wall of so huge a circumference, and, above all, lying as it does in a very level plain, is naturally exceedingly easy of access for its assailants.[312]

Though Belisarius' commitment to the city of Rome and its protection is admirable, he is potentially out-of-touch with the realities of defending so large a city: the realities of how to be a Roman general in Rome. Procopius can, with the historian's benefit of hindsight, use the historical moment to epitomize his portrayal of Belisarius and the arc of the story of Belisarius' and the Romans' good intentions but ultimate failure at their mission of reincorporation. While Belisarius does (barely, at times) hold off the Goths' initial siege, the eastern Roman forces are ultimately unable to hold Rome as they lose the rest of Italy. They not only fail to protect it against the Goths, but in subjecting the city to repeated sieges and sacks, in fact open the door to its ultimate destruction.

Also of note in this section is Procopius' allocation of identity in the story of the Palladium, discussed in more detail above (pp 188-90). In his final comments on the two stories of where the Palladium is now, he says that "the Byzantines" say it was brought thither by Constantine, though "the Romans" deny this (5.15.13-14). Though the identifiers derive from the two cities, Rome and Byzantium,[313] they reinforce the duality and separation of the two groups, and grant "Roman" to the people of that city while withholding it from the citizens of Constantinople.

As we have seen, Procopius crafts the episode of Belisarius' entry into Rome into an opportunity to examine thematic concerns of *Romanitas* in his work, both in the mantle of historical memories with which he surrounds the episode, and in pointed use of

---

[312] See above pp 192-3 on Procopius' and acknowledgement and thematic use of the physical difficulties of taking, controlling, and defending the city.

[313] As Procopius names Constantinople throughout his work, in good archaizing fashion.

the identifier "Roman" to describe one or the other of the two groups to which it is applicable. At this moment of great symbolic importance (and lesser, but still significant, stategic importance) for the emperor's re-conquest of the western empire, Procopius only barely contests the ownership of the identity "Roman," reserving only the barest minimum for the emperor's army. This suggests that, for all that this tension in Roman identity is a driving force in the work and Procopius' ongoing exploration of *Romanitas*, this particular contest, between eastern and western claims to Roman identity, is not the one Procopius is most concerned about. This moment of great symbolic significance is a moment of great instability as well, as Belisarius and the army are confronted with challenges to their own *Romanitas* as they seek to establish their strategic control of the city of Rome. Even as Procopius works to define and stabilize a particular vision of sixth-century *Romanitas* with a host of cultural memory associations, he begins to destablize his own army's claim to that identity.

## Part III, Section 3: The Long War in Italy

As the war in Italy proceeds, Procopius continues to handle with subtlety and care the dynamics of *Romanitas.* Under his historian's direction, the imperial army, the Italians, and the Goths negotiate memory and identity in the constantly shifting context of the war in Italy.

In the passages following Belisarius' entrance into Rome, Procopius returns to using the term "Romans" freely to refer to either the emperor's army (as at 5.18.27) or to the city's inhabitants (as immediately thereafter, at 5.18.28), as context demands. Occasionally, the situation threatens to become confusing, as it does later in that same chapter, when Procopius discusses the actions of the *Roman* army as they attempt to return to the city following a battle, and the *Romans* within falter over whether or not to receive them (mistakenly believing that Belisarius is dead and knowing the army is hard pressed by the Goths) (5.18.20).[314] In other places, Procopius momentarily abandons the term as unhelpful, as at 5.25.11-12, when he discusses στρατιώτας τε καὶ ἰδιώτας, "the soldiers and the private citizens." Elsewhere the latter are Ῥωμαίων τοῦ δήμου, "the Roman populace" (5.28.18).

Not long after Belisarius' retaking of Rome, though, Procopius elaborates more fully the "other perspective" on the question of Roman identity. In a series of passages starting mid-way through Book 5, the point of view that the Italians are the "real" Romans, while Belisarius and his forces are intrusive interlopers, is argued forcefully by the Goths. Procopius-as-narrator, while he does not himself adopt or condone this view, does not explicitly reject it, either, but allows it to continue to gain a foothold in the narrative. Such an airing of both sides' opposing views is of course a staple of the historiographic strategy of presenting set-piece speeches arranged in pairs, but the eloquence of these arguments takes on greater significance in light of the events and

[314] Indeed, Dewing attempts to help clarify the situation by giving "the people of Rome" for Ῥωμαῖοι in his Loeb translation, vol. 3, pg 177.

behavior of the army that Procopius will narrate later. About to besiege Rome, Vittigis sends an envoy to the city:

> ὃς ἐνταῦθα ἐλθὼν καὶ Ῥωμαίους τῆς ἐς Γότθους ἀπιστίας κακίσας τὴν προδοσίαν ὠνείδιζεν ἣν αὑτοῖς ἐπί τε τῇ πατρίδι πεποιῆσθαι καὶ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν, οἳ τῆς Γότθων δυνάμεως Γραικοὺς τοὺς σφίσιν οὐχ οἵους τε ἀμύνειν ὄντας ἠλλάξαντο, ἐξ ὧν τὰ πρότερα οὐδένα ἐς Ἰταλίαν ἥκοντα εἶδον, ὅτι μὴ τραγῳδούς τε καὶ μίμους καὶ ναύτας λωποδύτας. (5.18.40)
>
> And when he arrived there he began to reproach the Romans for their faithlessness to the Goths and upbraided them for the treason which he said they had committed against both their fatherland and themselves, for they had exchanged the power of the Goths for Greeks who were not able to defend them, although they had never before seen any men of the Greek race come to Italy except actors of tragedy and mimes and thieving sailors.

Procopius boldly adopts the Gothic point of view, which identifies the emperor's army as "Greeks" while fashioning (and attempting to instill in the Romans' minds) a particular version of the memory of the recent past, in which the Goths' rule of Italy was just and secure and portraying the eastern Roman army as incompetant interlopers, associating Greekness with the unsavory likes of actors and sailors. At this point in time no one heeds the envoy's words, and he returns to the Gothic camp unanswered (5.18.42). The "Greek" epithet reappears in Vittigis' speech to his men before battle at 5.29.11, discussed below.

However, the Romans of the city are not unproblematically Roman, either. Shortly after this, these Romans begin to grumble to Belisarius about the conditions in the besieged city:

> Ῥωμαίων δὲ ὁ δῆμος, τῶν ἐν πολέμῳ τε καὶ πολιορκίᾳ κακῶν ἀήθεις παντάπασιν ὄντες, ἐπειδὴ τῇ μὲν ἀλουσίᾳ ἐπιέζοντο καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων τῇ ἀπορίᾳ, φυλάσσειν τε ἄϋπνοι τὸν περίβολον ἠναγκάζοντο, καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἁλώσεσθαι οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν

> ὑπετόπαζον, ἅμα δὲ καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους ἑώρων τούς τε ἀγροὺς καὶ τἄλλα πάντα ληιζομένους, ἤσχαλλόν τε καὶ δεινὰ ἐποιοῦντο, εἰ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν ἠδικηκότες πολιορκοῖντό τε καὶ ἐς τοσοῦτον κινδύνου μέγεθος ἥκοιεν (5.20.5).
>
> But the Roman populace were entirely unacquainted with the evils of war and siege. When, therefore, they began to be distressed by their inability to bathe and the scarcity of provisions, and found themselves obliged to forego sleep in guarding the circuit-wall, and suspected that the city would be captured at no distant date; and when, at the same time, they saw the enemy plundering their fields and other possessions, they began to be dissatisfied and indignant that they, who had done no wrong, should suffer siege and be brought into peril of such magnitude.

Procopius' language does not convey much sympathy with their plight: they dislike the loss of comforts such as bathing and show distaste for even the most basic participation in the defense of their own city as night sentry-duty. A letter from Vittigis to Belisarius shortly after emphasizes that the Romans are accustomed to a life of "soft luxury" (ἐν βίω τρυφερῷ)(5.20.11). These hardships of the Romans may not amount to much yet, but are an important foreshadowing of things to come. Compared with the death and depravation that await them, while Belisarius holds the city, the people of Rome suffer relatively little, a fact that Procopius is perhaps trying to draw his audience's attention to here. The people of the city, meanwhile, fall short of a certain ideal of Roman masculine and martial virtue (as well as a good understanding of the relative danger, or lack thereof, of the situation), which is epitomized here, of course, by Belisarius.

Shortly thereafter Procopius has Belisarius write a letter to Justinian informing him of the state of affairs in Italy, which speaks to our considerations of memory in the work on several scores. His characterization of the Romans also speaks to their weakness, but in a way which is both pragmatic and more understanding. Belisarius

reports their successes thus far, but then warns Justinian that unless he sends more troops, they will be unable to hold Italy against the Goths for long:

> ἀλλὰ σέ, ὦ βασιλεῦ, ἐκεῖνο εἰσίτω, ὡς ἢν νῦν ἡμῶν οἱ βάρβαροι περιέσονται, Ἰταλίας τε τῆς σῆς ἐκπεσούμεθα καὶ προσαποβαλοῦμεν τὸ στράτευμα, καὶ προσέσται ἡμῖν τοσαύτη τις οὖσα ἡ ὑπὲρ τῶν πεπραγμένων αἰσχύνη. ἐῶ γὰρ λέγειν ὡς καὶ Ῥωμαίους ἀπολεῖν δόξαιμεν, οἵ γε περὶ ἐλάσσονος τὴν σωτηρίαν τῆς ἐς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν πεποίηνται πίστεως (5.24.9-10).

> But do you, O Emperor, take this thought to heart, that if at this time the barbarians win the victory over us, we shall be cast out of Italy which is yours and shall lose the army in addition, and besides all this we shall have to bear the shame, however great it may be, that attaches to our conduct. For I refrain from saying that we should also be regarded as having ruined the Romans, men who have held their safety more lightly than their loyalty to your kingdom.

Even Belisarius, speaking to the Roman emperor, grants the city's inhabitants the title of "Romans." We should also note the reference to Italy as belonging to Justinian as emperor and how that feeds into our discussions above on North Africa and Sicily.[315] Most important here, though, is the suggestion that a desultory re-conquest could "ruin" the Romans, and the empire would be to blame. As the letter goes on, Belisarius describes in greater detail the difficulties of defending Rome against a siege for any lengthy stretch of time, and what he thinks will happen should conditions in the city become worse, due to a long drawn-out struggle with the Goths (the kind that would be prevented if Justinian were to send more troops):

> καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι νῦν μὲν εὐνοϊκῶς ἡμῖν ἔχουσι, τῶν δὲ κακῶν αὐτοῖς, ὡς τὸ εἰκός, μηκυνομένων, οὐδὲν μελλήσουσιν ὑπὲρ αὑτῶν ἑλέσθαι τὰ κρείσσω. οἱ γὰρ ἐξ ὑπογύου τισὶν ἐς εὔνοιαν καθιστάμενοι, οὐ κακοτυχοῦντες, ἀλλ᾽ εὖ πάσχοντες, τὸ πιστὸν

[315] pp 219-220.

> ἐς αὐτοὺς διασώζειν εἰώθασιν. ἄλλως τε καὶ λιμῷ Ῥωμαῖοι ἀναγκασθήσοναι πολλὰ ὧν οὐκ ἂν βούλοιντο πρᾶξαι (5.24.14-16).
>
> And although at the present time the Romans are well disposed towards us, yet when their troubles are prolonged, they will probably not hesitate to choose the course which is better for their own interests. For when men have entered into friendship with others on the spur of the moment, it is not while they are in evil fortune, but while they prosper, that they are accustomed to keep faith with them. Furthermore, the Romans will be compelled by hunger to do many things that they would prefer not to do.

Belisarus' argument is in essence a practical one, informing Justinian that he is certain to lose control of Italy without additional troops. He formulates this argument in terms of the historical unity of the two groups of Romans, appealing to memory and playing with the shared, but unstable Roman identity. When it comes down to it, the unity of the causes of the two sets of Romans cannot be relied upon: both have markedly different interests. Belisarius implies that, though the Romans might prefer to be part of the Roman Empire, an understandable survival instinct will lead them to make other choices. What unifies the two groups is their shared heritage, and the unity of sentiment that comes from that, rather than the present realities of survival and self-interest.

Here also it is the Romans of the city, whose loyalties to the imperial cause need to be shored up, who are granted the identity "Romans" without complication. Belisarius, elsewhere the spokescharacter for the ideals of Roman unity and re-intergration, exposes in a "private" letter to the emperor the cracks in the foundation of all they are trying to build. As Rome stands besieged by barbarian Goths, Procopius uses Beliarius to inform the emperor that should he destroy the Romans through his inaction, history will blame him for it.

* * * *

Thus Procopius embroiders his history around the time of the recapture of Rome with memories with a particularly Roman set of associations, and follows this up by lacing the subsequent defense of the city with continued questioning of the applicability of the term “Roman” to both the invaders and the inhabitants of Italy. At this point, however, nothing is decisive. Belisarius’ army and the Roman populace prevent the Goths from re-capturing the city, but fail to decisively defeat them. Procopius, meanwhile, does nothing notable with the questions of Roman memory and identity for some time following this.

As the narrative progresses into book 6, a large contingent of fresh imperial troops finally arrives under the command of the eunuch Narses, who becomes a rival to Belisarius for command of the forces in Italy. Interestingly, this marks a sharp, short-lived increase in the frequency of the qualifier “the emperor‘s” to identify the Eastern Roman, imperial cause. Narses is the first to employ it, as he and Belisarius argue over whether and how to divide their forces. Narses opines:

> πάντα δὲ τουτονὶ τὸν βασιλέως στρατὸν ἐς Μεδιόλανόν τε καὶ Αὔξιμον ἀποκεκρίσθαι μόνον ἀξύμφορον εἶναι παντελῶς...ἡμεῖς δὲ βασιλεῖ τὴν Αἰμιλίων ἐπικτησόμεθα χώραν...
>
> But that the emperor’s whole army should be divided between Milan and Auximus alone I consider to be utterly inexpedient... we, on our part, shall take possession for the emperor of the territory of Aemilia... (6.18.24-25)

Belisarius echoes him shortly thereafter with “the emperor’s cause” (6.18.27), while at 6.19.4 Belisarius urges the people of Urbinum that they should “become subjects of the emperor.” At 6.19.17, the Goths do in fact surrender the city, and become “subject to the

emperor on terms of complete equality with the Roman army." Notably, these instances do not seem to be occasioned by any necessity of avoiding confusion with the people of Rome, who are not anywhere on hand. This increased talk of the emperor seems to signal the beginning of a deliberate distancing of the imperial cause from the identity and concerns of *Romanitas* in the narrative. It is as if Narses brings with him to the fighting his own greater concern for and loyalty to the emperor rather than to the ideals of liberation and reintegration that (ostensibly) motivated the conquest. As the two leaders vie for ascendancy in Italy, their two different approaches also struggle for supremacy. As Belisarius' prestige and authority wanes, so fades something of what made the enterprise so essentially *Roman*.

## **Part III, Section 4: Problematizing "Roman"**

Thus in the first half or so of the *Gothic Wars* Procopius acknowledges the complexity of the issue of Roman identity for the eastern Romans in Italy. In a context where the two groups of successors to the once unified empire must interact heavily and officially for the first time in decades, the interests of those two groups of Romans are not always as united as Belisarius' rhetoric might wish. For the most part, though, as long as the war is going relatively well, Procopius is content to let the matter rest just below the surface. While Belisarius is quickly and easily re-conquering territory for the emperor

and defending it well, the interests of both Eastern and Italian Romans are both tolerably well served.

Eventually, however, the war begins to go badly for Belisarius and Narses. The emperor's army becomes bogged down in numerous regional conflicts throughout Italy and gradually loses more and more territory, and the Romans of Italy begin to suffer in a serious way as a result of the prolonged conflict. It is at this point that Procopius begins to seriously question and problematize the imperial forces' own identity as Roman. As the people of Rome endure greater hardship and depravation because of the presence of the army, the two groups become less and less like fellow Romans, and in action, treatment, and portrayal, more and more like conquered people and invading army. Procopius turns Belisarius' and the imperial Romans' appeals to shared Roman heritage and identity back onto themselves, showing them act in very un-Roman ways towards their would-be fellow Romans. The army's increasingly poor treatment of the Italians helps bring about in practical terms the eventual failure of the reunion of Romans that it thematically prefigures. As they are shown being less and less Roman to their would-be fellow Romans, the alienation and destruction is helping them lose "the hearts and minds," lose the war, and destroy the very Romans they supposedly want to reunite with.

To begin, Procopius has Totila, the Gothic king,[316] comment on the plight of the Italians and the imperial army's responsibility for it. In his speech to his troops leading up to a potentially decisive battle, Totila gives them several reasons that the cause of justice is on their side:

---

[316] For more on Totilla, see above pp 240-2, and below, pp 255-264.

> ἄξιον δὲ ἡμᾶς μετὰ τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἐλπίδος τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐς χεῖρας ἰέναι, τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀδικίᾳ θαρροῦντας. οὕτω γὰρ αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐς τοὺς κατηκόους βεβίωται ὥστε Ἰταλιώταις τανῦν τῆς τετολμημένης οὐ δέον αὐτοῖς ἐς Γότθους προδοσίας κολάσεως οὐδεμιᾶς ἑτέρας προσεδεῖ· οὕτω ξυλλήβδην εἰπεῖν ξύμπαντα αὐτοῖς τὰ κακὰ πρὸς τῶν ὑποδεχθέντων γενέσθαι ξυνέβη. (7.4.15-16)

> It is reasonable, furthermore, for us to grapple with the enemy with high hopes, taking courage from the unjust actions committed by them. For such has been their conduct towards their subjects that the Italians at the present time need no further punishment for the flagrant treason which they dared commit against the Goths; so true is it that every form of evil, to put all in a word, has fallen to their lot from the hands of those whom they cordially received.

The indictment here is from an enemy's mouth rather than in the narrator's own voice, but as we will see, Totila becomes a more and more sympathetic character as the *Gothic Wars* proceeds. It is interesting that here the populace is refered to as Italians, rather than Romans, which is more usual from the Gothic perspective (see above, p __). Perhaps the word choice is meant to emphasize that this is true of all Italians, not only the people of the city of Rome.

As the war progresses, Totila's arguments become more strongly worded and more to the point, and his behavior and character becomes more exemplary. Several scholars have analyzed the way in which Totila is portrayed sympathetically in the later books of the *Gothic Wars*, to the point tht he could be said to be their protagonist.[317] For our purposes a few examples will suffice. A fascinating passage at 7.8.12-25 shows Totilla not only acting the part of the just ruler (in contrast to the immediately subsequent injustices of the Romans), but also voicing very familiar sentiments. After he has

[317] Cameron (1985) 8. Procopius says in his eulogy of Totila that his ignoble death must have been a whim of fate, for "his end was not commensurate with his deeds" (8.32.28-30)

imprisoned a Goth accused of raping a Roman maiden, some Gothic soldiers beg him to release the offender, because he is such an able fighter. Totila refuses, warning them that if the Goths behave unjustly, they will reap their own rewards:

> ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν τοῦτο οἶδα, ὡς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὁ πολὺς ὅμιλος τὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ὀνόματα μεταβάλλουσιν ἐπὶ τοὐναντίον. φιλανθρωπίαν μὲν γὰρ καλεῖν τὴν παρανομίαν εἰώθασιν, ἐξ ἧς διεφθάρθαι τε τὰ τῶν χρηστὰ πάντα καὶ ξυντεταράχθαι ξυμβαίνει, σκαιὸν δὲ καὶ ἀτεχνῶς δύσκολον, ὃς ἂν τὰ νόμιμα περιστέλλειν ἐς τὸ ἀκριβὲς βούληται, ὅπως δὴ τοῖς ὀνόμασι τούτοις παραπεπτάσμασιν ἐς τὴν ἀσέλγειαν χρώμενοι ἀδεέστερον ἐξαμαρτάνειν τε ἱκανοὶ εἶεν καὶ τὴν μοχθηρίαν ἐνδείκνυσθαι. (7.8.11-16-17)
>
> Now I, for my part, know this, that the great majority of mankind twist and turn the names of things until they reverse their meaning. For, on the one hand, they are accustomed to call kindness that which is really lawlessness, the outcome of which is that everything respectable is brought to utter confusion; and, on the other hand, they call any man perverse and exceedingly difficult who wishes to preserve the lawful order with exactness—to the end, plainly, that by using these names as screens for their wanton deeds they may be able more fearlessly to do wrong and display their baseness.

Totilla's criticism of changes over time in words and their meanings echoes Procopius' own thoughts, as voiced at 3.11.2-4.[318]

Following directly after this, Procopius contrasts the far worse behavior of the Romans of the emperor's army:

> Ἐν ᾧ δὲ ταῦτα Τουτίλας ἔπρασσεν, ἐν τούτῳ οἱ τοῦ Ῥωμαίων στρατοῦ ἄρχοντες ξὺν τοῖς στρατιώταις τὰ τῶν κατηκόων χρήματα ἥρπαζον, καὶ ὕβρεώς τε καὶ ἀσελγείας οὐδ᾽ ὁτιοῦν ὑπελίποντο, ἀλλ᾽ οἱ μὲν ἄρχοντες ἐν τοῖς ὀχυρώμασιν ἔχοντες ἐρωμένας ἐκώμαζον, οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται ἀπειθεστέρους αὑτοὺς τοῖς ἄρχουσι παρεχόμενοι εἰς πᾶσαν ἰδέαν ἀτοπίας ἐνέπιπτον. (7.9.1)

[318] see above, Ch 3 pp 127-136

> While Totila was thus engaged, meantime the commanders of the Roman army, as well as the soldiers, were plundering the possessions of their subjects, and they did not shrink from any act of insolence and licentiousness whatsoever, but the commanders, for their part, were reveling with mistresses inside the fortresses, while the soldiers, showing themselves more and more insubordinate to their commanders, were falling into every form of lawlessness.

He then goes on to detail the Italians' worsening situation as a result, and expresses the Italians' own feelings that they would be better off under the Goths' rule than the Eastern Romans':

> τοῖς τε Ἰταλιώταις περιῆν ἅπασι πάσχειν τὰ χαλεπώτατα πρὸς ἑκατέρων τῶν στρατοπέδων. τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἀγροὺς ἐστέρηντο πρὸς τῶν πολεμίων, ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως στρατοῦ ἔπιπλα πάντα. καὶ προσῆν αὐτοῖς αἰκίζεσθαί τε καὶ οὐδενὶ λόγῳ διαφθείρεσθαι, τῶν ἀναγκαίων τῇ ἀπορίᾳ πιεξομένοις. οἱ γὰρ στρατιῶται ἀμύνειν σφίσι κακουμένοις πρὸς τῶν πολεμίων οὐδαμῇ ἔχοντες οὐχ ὅσον ἐρυθριᾶν ὡς ἥκιστα ἐπὶ τοῖς παροῦσιν ἐγίνωσκον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους ποθεινοὺς αὐτοῖς εἶναι οἷς ἐξημάρτανον ἀπειργάζοντο (7.9.2-5).

> As for the Italians, the result of the situation for them was that they all suffered most severely at the hands of both armies. For while, on the one hand, they were deprived of their lands by the enemy, the emperor's army, on the other hand, took all their household goods. And they were forced besides to suffer cruel torture and death for no good cause, being hard pressed as they were by the scarcity of food. For the soldiers, though utterly unable to defend them when maltreated by the enemy, not only refused to feel the least blush of shame at existing conditions, but actually made the people long for the barbarians by the wrongs they committed.

Totila naturally does not refer to the imperial forces as "Roman," but uses "emperor's army." Procopius here uses Totilla to associate the army's misconduct and denial of the term "Roman," but he will eventually step out from behind the curtain and do so himself.

Following hard upon this dispassionate assessment, Procopius allows Totila to present his interpretation of the Romans' suffering in a letter to the Senate. First he again characterizes the Italians' siding with the imperial forces as a betrayal of the Goths:

> πότερα ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν τὰς Θευδερίχου τε καὶ Ἀμαλασούνθης εὐεργεσίας τετύχηκεν, ἢ χρόνῳ τε αὐτὰς καὶ λήθῃ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξιτήλους εἶναι; καίτοι οὐκ ἔστι τούτων οὐδέτερον. οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ φαύλοις τίσιν οὐδὲ εἰς τοὺς ὑμετέρους τὰς χάριτας αὐτοὺς, κατὰ δὴ τὸν παλαιὸν χρόνον, ἐπιδεδεῖχθαι ξυνέβη, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τοῖς ἀναγκαιοτάτοις ἔς γε ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἔναγχός τε καὶ ἐξ ὑπογυίου, ὦ φίλοι Ῥωμαῖοι (7.9.10-11).

> Has it really come to pass that you are ignorant of the good deeds of Theoderic and Amalasuntha, or have they been blotted from your minds with the lapse of time and forgetfulness? No, indeed; neither one of these is true. For it was not in some small matter, nor toward your ancestors in olden times that their kindness was displayed, but it was in matters of vital importance, dear Romans, toward your very selves, recently and in days that are close at hand.

Totila's words emphasize the way that the deeds of Theoderic are on the cusp of living memory, what is at stake as it is being translated into cultural memory, and the key role that forgetting, of one kind or another, can play in this process. Totila then once more seeks to de-Romanizes the enemy by referring to them as "Greeks":

> ἀλλὰ τὴν Γραικῶν ἐς τὸ ὑπήκοον ἀρετὴν ἢ ἀκοῇ λαβόντες ἢ πείρᾳ μαθόντες οὕτω δὴ προήσεσθαι αὐτοῖς τὰ Γότθων τε καὶ Ἰταλιωτῶν πράγματα ἔγνωτε; καίτοι ἐξεναγεῖσθε μὲν ὑμεῖς αὐτοὺς, οἶμαι, ἄριστα, ὁποίων δὲν αὐτῶν ἐτύχετε ξένων καὶ φίλων ἐπίστασθε δή που... (7.9.12-13)

> But was it because you had been informed by hearsay or learned by experience the righteousness of the Greeks toward their subjects that you decided to abandon to them as you did the cause of the Goths and the Italians? At any rate, you for your part have, I think, entertained them royally, but you know full well what sort of guests and friends you have found them...

Totila uses the Eastern army's own Greekness against them, as it were, turning the ancient associations of ξένων καὶ φίλων against them, indicating what bad guest-friends the eastern Romans have been. He then describes the Romans' recent setbacks, and deftly turns an appeal to God and justice into an argument for his cause:

> ...ἀλλὰ τίσιν τινὰ ἰσχυρίζομαι τῆς εἰς ὕμᾶς ἀδικίας αὐτοὺς μετελθεῖν. καίτοι πῶς οὐκ ἂν τῶν ἀτοπωτάτων δόξειεν εἶναι τὸν μὲν θεὸν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν αὐτοὺς τίννυσθαι, ὑμᾶς δὲ τῇ τούτων ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν ἀπηλλάχξαι κακῶν; (7.9.16-17)
>
> ...but I confidently maintain that a sort of vengeance has overtaken them [the emperor's army] for the wrongs you have suffered at their hands. How then could it fail to appear a most atrocious act on your part, that you, while God is exacting vengeance from them on your behalf, should cling fondly to that atrocity of theirs and be unwillingly to be rid of the ills arising therefrom?

Several factors here contribute to the strength of Totila's arguments. Procopius has the Goth use as evidence in his case the same sufferings of the Italians that he himself has just reported. By having Totila recall once more the memory of the much-admired Theoderic, Procopius manoeuvers our sympathies in his direction. Indeed, Totila's very appeals to memory, denouncing forgetfulness or a willful ignorance of the past, sound rather like the sentiments of a historian. At the same time, by putting such strongly worded and argued points in the mouth of one who also refers to the emperor's army as "Greeks" and traitorous guests and friends, he begins to put his own authorial weight behind these slurs. Finally, giving to Totila two strong appeals to memory—the mention of Theoderic and the traditional concepts of ξένων καὶ φίλων --Procopius casts him as the commander most concerned, not only with the welfare of the present-day Romans, but with memory, heritage, and thoughtful engagement with the past.

* * * *

As conditions worsen in the city of Rome, Procopius presents an episode between the Roman populace and the imperial Roman commanders which functions as a breaking point, narratively and thematically, between the two groups. At a junction of memory

and forgeting, the imperial commanders choose forgetfulness of their common *Romanitas*, and are denied their Roman identity. The suffering of the people of Rome reaches a new level when a severe famine hits the city.[319] The citizens bear the brunt of it, as the soldiers garrisoning the city still have some supplies. The Roman populace's plea to the imperial officers for humane treatment begins from an appeal to the shared Roman identity of the two groups, and the officers' present failure to meet even the barest minimum of the obligations it lays on them.[320] In desperation the people beg the commanders for mercy in terms which suggest just how bad their current treatment has been:

> ἡμᾶς, ὦ στρατηγοί, μήτε Ῥωμαίους μήτε ξυγγενεῖς ὑμῖν νομίζετε εἶναι, μήτε ὁμοτρόπους τοῖς τῆς πολιτεῖας ἤθεσι γεγονέναι, μήτε ἀρχῆς ὄντας καὶ ὅπλα ἐφ᾽ὑμῖν ἀραμένους, εἶτα ἡσσηθέντας τῇ μάχῃ, ἀνδράποδα δορυάλωτα ὑμῶν αὐτων κατά γε τὸν τοῦ πολέμου γενέσθαι νόμον. καὶ χορηγεῖτε τοῖς ὑμετέροις αἰχμαλώτοις τροφήν οὐ κατὰ τὴν χρείαν ἡμῖν ἀποχρῶσαν, ἀλλ᾽ὥστε ἀποζῆν διαρκῶς ἔχουσαν, ὅπως δὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς περιόντες ἀνθυπουργήσωμεν ὑμῖν ὅσα τοὺς οἰκέτας τοῖς κεκτημένος ὑπηρετεῖν ἄξιον. (7.17.5-6)
>
> As for us, generals,[321] do not consider us to be either Romans or fellow countrymen of yours, or even to have assimilated our ways of government to yours, and do not suppose that in the beginning we received the emperor's army into the city willingly, but regard us as enemies from the first and as men who have taken up arms against you, and later, when defeated in battle, have become your captive slaves simply in accordance with the customs of war. And do you furnish sustenance to these your captives, if not in quantities sufficient for our needs, at least in such measure as to make life possible, that by your so doing we

[319] Here and elsewhere (see 7.16.2-5, also 6.20.15), Procopius participtes in another staple of classical historiography: the suffering of a city under siege.
[320] It is notable that Belisarius, the champion of the unity of the Roman cause, is not present for this episode. The Roman commanders are "Bessas and the officers," see below.
[321] The strongly classical στρατηγοί is perhaps intended to emphasize the commanders' Greekness and foreigness.

> too may survive and render you such service in return as it is fitting that slaves should render their masters.

The Romans' requests become even darker and more desparate from there:

> εἰ δὲ τοῦτο οὐ ῥᾴδιον ἢ βουλομένοις ὑμῖν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀφεῖναι ἡμὰς τῆς ὑμετέρας δικαιοῦτε χειρός, ἐκεῖνο κερδανοῦντες, τὸ μὴ περὶ τὰς τῶν δούλων πονεῖσθαι ταφάς· ἢν δὲ μηδὲ τοῦτο ἡμῖν ἀπολέλειπται, ἀποκτιννύναι ἡμᾶς ἀξιοῦτε καὶ μὴ ἀποστερήσητε τελευτῆς σώφπονος μηδὲ θανάτου φθονήσητε τοῦ πάντων ἡδίστου, ἀλλὰ πράξει μιᾷ μυρίων ἀπαλλάξατε Ῥωμαίους δυσκόλων. (7.17.7-8)
>
> But if you find this difficult or contrary to your wish, then at least consent to release us from your hands, by which action you will gain this advantage, that you will not be troubled by the burial of your slaves. And if even this favor is not left us, deign to put us to death and do not deprive us of an honorable end nor begrudge us death, which to us is the sweetest of all things, but by a single act free the Romans from ten thousand troubles.

The people put it to the commanders very starkly: to be treated as fellow countrymen, as *Romans*, is so far from likely and, it is implied, so far from the treatment they are currently receiving, that they do not even ask it, nor anything like it. Instead, they ask that the commanders treat them as their slaves and either feed them enough to keep them alive, or allow for them to leave or at least die quickly. The implication is twofold: first, that they are currently being treated as worse than slaves by the army, and second, that the commanders have in fact "forgotten," in the sense of disregarded, the past circumstances, in which the people of Rome treated the imperial forces as fellow Romans, recieving them into the city willingly, only to fail to receive like treatment in return.

Significantly, "Bessas and the officers" ("Roman" is noteably withheld) refuse to grant any of the Roman representatives' requests, but send them away with promises of

reinforcements and provisions soon (7.17.8). Their response does nothing to address or dispel the people's characterization of them and their actions. Instead, Procopius follows this incident with descriptions of the officers and soldiers getting rich by hoarding grain from the military's provisions and selling it off to wealthy Romans at extravagant prices, and soldiers selling oxen captured in sallies against the besiegers (7.17.9-11). The people of the city, meanwhile, are depicted in their suffering as a particularly Roman kind of noble. At 7.17.20-22, a Roman father commits suicide because he cannot feed his children.

Finally, Bessas and the officers relent and allow some of the people to leave, seemingly only after they have been bribed to do so, and only after the people of the city have suffered much. Procopius' phrasing is all-important:

> Καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν οἱ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀρχοντες λαμβάνοντες χρήματα ἕτερα μεθῆκαν Ῥωμαίους ὅσιος ἐνθένδε βουλομένοις ἦν ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι. ὀλίγων τε ἀπολελειμμένων ἐνταῦθα οἱ ἄλλοι ἅπαντες ὤχοντο φεύγοντες ὥς πη ἕκαστος δυνατὸς ἐγεγόνει. καὶ ἀυτῶν ὁι πλεῖστοι τῆς δυνάμεως καταμανθεῖσης αὐτοῖς τῷ λιμῷ ἤδῃ πλέοντες ἢ ὁδῷ ἰόντες ἄπέθανον. πολλοί δὲ καὶ καταληφθέντες πρὸς τῶν πολεμίων ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ διεφθάρησαν. Ῥωμαίων μὲν τῇ τε βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ ἐκεχωρήκει ἐς τοῦτο ἡ τύχη. (7.17.23-25)
>
> From that time on the imperial commanders, upon receiving further money, released such of the Romans as desired to depart from the city. And only a few were left in the city; for all the rest made their escape by flight in whatever manner proved possible for each one. But the most of these, since their strength had been utterly wasted away by the famine, perished as soon as they had begun their journey, whether by water or by land. Many too were caught on the road by the enemy and destroyed. To such a pass had come the fortune of the senate and people of Rome.

Here we see Procopius decisively deploying the identifier "Roman" to make a clear thematic statement. At a point where the Roman people's very existence seems at stake,

and they seem to have given up on any chance of ebing treated as fellow Romans by the imperial commanders, Procopius withholds the title "Roman" from the soldiers and officers in judgment for their very un-Roman behavior toward the Romans of Rome, who are identified either as simply "Romans" or by the traditional "senate and people of Rome." This passage is particularly poignant because it deals not simply with the suffering of the Roman people, but with death and departure, with endings. As the fleeing Romans are so weakened by the famine that they perish while fleeing, the "imperial commanders" are fast approaching a point where the damage they will have done to Rome and the Romans is irreparable.

We should also note the way in which Procopius plays on the lack of reciprocity in the imperial commanders' treatment of the Romans. For the most part, the imperial army's many appeals to common Roman identity and heritage (mostly made by Belisarius, and embedded in the text by Procopius' many evocations of Roman cultural memory) made to the Italian and Roman populace were met with willing acquiesence, or at worst refusal that did not reject the premise of shared Roman heritage. However, the Roman people's appeal and the officers' refusal of it highlights the fact that the soldiers, so far from treating them as fellow Romans, will not even consent to fufill the obligations of captors of war-prisoners or owners of slaves.

* * * *

After this episode Procopius relaxes his harsh judgment and occasionally slips back into his former habits of using "Roman" for either group as appropriate, perhaps out

of habit or for the sake of convenience, but a telling withholding the identifier is noticeable on more frequent occasions. Moreover, from this point something has broken—both in the narrative, between the emperor's army and the Italians, and in Procopius' narration, in his sympathies and outlook. No more do we hear about "fellow Romans" or imperial concern for Rome for anything other than its current strategic importance, with the important exception of Belisarius' letter to Totila, discussed above in Chapter Three (pp 171-3) and below (this chapter, pp 255-6). Instead, and increasingly following that letter, it is Totila whom we see showing concern for the city of Rome, both for its present importance and as an embodiment of Roman cultural memory.

At 7.18.20-23, a Roman man from Canusium pleads with the emperor's army for better treatment.[322] Procopius still seems to be disassociating the latter from Roman-ness, as the envoy, and not the army, is identified as "Roman" by the narrator. However, the man then offers to hand over the whole territory to "the Romans," that is, the imperial forces, if they will only treat the "Italians" well. The implication in the man's speech is obviously that they have not been treating the populace of Italy well up to this point, and the man's own identification of the group to which he belongs as "Italians" recalls the Roman citizens' abnegation of their claim to "Roman" status/identity as they plead to be treated as slaves or captives at 7.17.5. Moreover, the envoy then promises that the country will then be "again subject and tributary to the emperor no less truly than they had been before," (κατηκόους βασιλεῖ αὖθις ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγὴν

[322] The army's arrival in Canusium is Procopius' opportunity to reference Cannae and Hannibal, see p 122 above.

ἐσομένους οὐδέν τι ἧσσον ἢ πρότερον ἦσαν) (7.18.21) a statement that has much more of the sound of conquest to it than liberation or re-integration, recalling the questionable phrasing applied to the conquests of Corsica and Sardinia (4.5.4, 5.5.17-19). The phrasing underlines how the imperial army are behaving as conquerors, how terms of any equality are no longer something the people of Italy dare to hope for, and how from their perspective, these terms of conquest are the only kind of *Romanitas* open to them. Even as the envoy forsakes any claim a *Romanitas* shared with the soldiers, however, Procopius in his narration grants the appelation to him and denies it to the soldiers.

As Book 7 progresses, the Goths' fortunes in the wars improve under Totila's leadership, but the ravages of the prolonged warfare weigh increasingly heavily on the Italians. In a pair of back-to-back speeches Totila manipulates the memory of Gothic rule in Italy to different effect, tailored to his two audiences. In a speech of exhortation to his own soldiers, he ascribes the imperial Romans' early successes to divine punishment for the Goths' mistreatment of their Italian subjects.

> ὅτι Γότθοι μὲν πρότερον τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων περὶ ἐλάσσονος πεποιημένοι τὸ δίκαιον, ἔπρασσον ἔς τε ἀλλήλους καὶ τοὺς κατηκόυς Ῥωμαίους ἀνόσια ἔργα, οἷς δή, ὡς τὸ εἰκος, ἠγμένος ὁ θεὸς ἐπ᾽αὐτοὺς τότε ξὺν τοῖς πολεμίος ἐστράτευσε. (7.21.6)
>
> The Goths in earlier times paid less heed to justice than to any other thing, and treated each other and their Roman subjects as well in an unholy manner; wherefore God was then moved to take the field against them on the side of their enemies.

This is, of course, a departure from the Goths' usual line regarding Gothic rule in Italy, restated again just below. How are we to take this re-reinterpretation of the memory of the Goths' conduct while masters of Italy? Is this a rare *entre-nous* insight into what

(Procopius imagines) the Goths *really* think about their behavior as rulers of Italy, or does it simply show that Totila, a skilled leader and orator, can suit his invocation and interpretation of memory to his immediate rhetorical needs (in this case, to reassure the Goths that their early losses to the Greeks were not due to lack of martial skill, but divine intervention, and that, as long as they continue to behave justly in the future, they can expect continuation of their current successes)?

Totila immediately afterwards has the Roman senators whom he had captured brought to him and chastises them for their behavior, returning to his usual interpretation of the recent past, where the Italian Romans wronged the Goths, who had been treating them well, by inviting in and siding with the invading imperial forces. Both speeches, it should be noted, are not obviously necessary to the advancement of the plot; rather, Procopius seems to have found this an opportune moment to examine Totila's varied perspectives on memory, causation, and (Roman) identity.

> Τοσῦτα ὁ Τουτίλας ἐς τοὺς Γότθους εἰπὼν καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ῥωμαίων βουλῆς ξυγκαλέσας πολλὰ ὠνείδισέ τε καὶ ἐκάισεν, οἳ δὴ πολλὰ πρός τε Θευδερίχου καὶ Ἀταλαρίχου ἀγαθὰ πεπονθότες, ἐπὶ τε τῆς ἀρχῆς ἁπάσης αὐτοὶ ἐς ἀεὶ καταστάντες καὶ τήν τε πολιτείαν διοικησάμενοι, πλούτο τε περιβεβλημένοι μέγα τι χρήμα, εἶτα ἐς Γότθους τοὺς εὐργέτας πολλῇ ἀγνωμοσύνῃ ἐχόμενοι, ἐς ἀπόστασίν τε οὐ δέον ἐπὶ τῷ σφετέρῳ πονηρῷ ἴδοιεν καὶ τοὺς Γραικοῦς ἐπὶ τῇ πατρίδι έπαγάγοιντο, προδόται σφῶν αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ αἰφνιδίου γεγενημένοι. (7.21.12)
>
> After Totila had made this speech before the Goths, he likewise called together the members of the Roman Senate, and reproached them and abused them at length, saying that, although they had received many benefits from both Theoderic and Atalaric, in that they themselves had always had always been appointed to the chief offices throughout the kingdom and had thus administered the government, and had, furthermore, amassed vast wealth, still they had acted with such ingratitude towards the Goths, their benefactors, that, regardless of their obligations, they had planned a revolt to their own harm, and brought in Greeks to

> attack their fatherland, thus turning traitors to themselves on the impulse of the moment.

Although he begins his speech by accusing the senators of betraying the Goths, Totila spends more time enumerating the ways in which the Romans' decision has hurt themselves; that is, the wrongs "the Greeks" have done to them:

> καὶ ἀνεπυνθάνετο μὲν εἴ τι πρὸς Γότθων πάθοιεν αὐτοὶ κακὸν πώποτε. λέγειν δὲ ἠνάγκαζεν, εἴ τι ἀγαθὸν σφίσι πρὸς Ἰουστινιανοῦ βασιλέως ξυμπβαίνοι, καταλέγων ἐφεξῆς ἅπαντα, ὅτι δὴ τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς ἀφῄρηντο σχεδόν τι ἁπάσας, πρὸς δὲ τῶν καλουμένων λογοθετῶν αἰκιζόμενοι λογισμοὺς ἐκτίνειν τῶν σφίσιν ἐς Γότθους πεπολιτευμένων ἀναγκασθεῖεν καὶ τῷ πολέμῳ κεκακωμένοι φόρους τοὺς δημοσίους οὐδέν τι ἐνδεέστερον ἢ ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ τοῖς Γραικοῖς φέροιεν· ἄλλα τε πολλὰ ἐνετίθει τῷ λόγῳ, ὅσα δεσπότην δυμενῆ τοὺς δεδουλωμένους ὀνειδίζειν εἰκός (7.21.13-14)
>
> Then, after enquiring whether they had ever suffered any personal harm at the hands of the Goths, he compelled them to state whether any good thing came to them from the emperor Justinian, reviewing all that had happened in order: first, they had, he said, been stripped of practically all the offices; second, they had been maltreated by the logothetes, as they were called, in that they had been compelled to settle accounts for their treatment of Goths during their official careers; and third, although they were in dire straits on account of the war, they were paying the Greeks not a whit less in public taxes than in times of peace. And he included many other things too in his speech, such things as an angry master might be expected to say in upbraiding men who have become his slaves.

We might note, first of all, that the details of imperial treatment of the Italians are something that Totila would not necessarily have known, but Procopius certainly would have. Totila again calls on the memory of Theoderic, adding in his grandson Atalaric as well. He reminds the Italians of one of the ways in which the Goths treated them better than the imperial Romans did, that they let them hold all the important bureaucratic offices. This is, significantly, not just a way in which the Goths treated them better, but a way in which the Goths treated them as more Roman than the imperial Romans have

been. The barbarian Goths are no threat to the Italians' own identity as Roman, while the emperor's army, those "Greeks," are doing practically all they can to strip them of rights and privileges of that identity, to say nothing of the basic necessities of life. Totila acts as a useful mouthpiece, perhaps, for Procopius to express some of his own frustration at the way the war has gone for the Italian Romans. Finally, the comparison to slaves at the end of Totila's speech is rather striking, and a little odd. Perhaps it is meant to spark a comparison with the Romans' speech above at 7.17.5-8 to the imperial commanders. Even while Totila is upbraiding his captives, he is at least affording them the basic dignities and concern he would his slaves, which is more than the imperial commanders did when the two groups of "Romans" were in Rome together. The situation with Totilla casts an interesting interpretive light back on the one in beseiged Rome, as well, as the Romans of Rome could be said to have been the captives of the imperial Romans no less truly than they are now Totilla's captives.

Finally, Totila sends a letter to Justinian urging him to make peace, once again invoking the memory of Theoderic:

> ὧνπερ μνημεῖά τε καὶ παραδείγματα κάλλιστα ἔχομεν Ἀναστάσιόν τε καὶ Θευδέριχον, οἳ βεβασιλεύκασι μὲν οὐ πολλῷ πρότερον, εἰρήνης δὲ καὶ ἀγαθῶν πραγμάτων ἅπαντα ἐνεπλήσαντο τὸν κατ᾽ αὐτοὺς χρόνον (7.21.23).
>
> These advantages are recalled and exemplified most admirably in the lives of Anastasius and Theoderic, who ruled as kings not long ago and filled their whole reigns with peace and prosperity.

Here Totila again subtly manipulates memory of the recent Roman past, putting both Theoderic and Anastasius not only in a good light but on an equal footing. Rather than focusing on how Theoderic was sent to Italy at Anastasius' behest, to rule Italy under the

emperor's aegis, he Totilla instead portrays them as colleagues and equals, naming them together as ones who ruled as kings (οἳ βεβασιλεύκασι). Totila is certainly portrayed as skilled in manipulating memory to serve his own rhetorical ends. He is, however, also able to marshal an impressive array of detailed arguments to his cause. His interpretations of history are the more thorough and reflect better the reality presented in the larger narrative: are they not then also the more convincing?

Finally, as we move into Book 8, the nature of Procopius' narrative changes. After covering events on the Persian and North African fronts in the intervening years, Procopius returns to the Gothic War, but the reporting of these tends to be more perfunctory, with longer geographic and ethnographic digressions, as if Procopius would rather not focus on events in Italy. What focus there is, especially that is of interest to us, is often on Totila, as discussed above, or on the city of Rome itself, to which we will turn momentarily. There is, however, one final passage to consider on the construction and apportioning of Roman identity and the competing historical memories. On the eve of one of the final battles of the *Wars*, the Battle of Taginae, each commander naturally delivers a speech of exhortation to his troops. Analyzing these speeches along the lines of de Romily's Thucydidean approach, and from the additional perspective of the relationship the speeches bear to the past, reveals the interpretation of these competing constructions of the past (and contemporary identity) that Procopius guides his readers towards.[323]

---

[323] See above, pp 169-207

Narses, notably, gathers "the army" to speak to them, without any "Roman" identifier. He gives one last rehearsal of the imperial version of recent history, characterizing the Goths as...

> ...τούτων δὴ τῶν ληστῶν...οἵ γε δοῦλοι βασιλέως τοῦ μεγάλου τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὄντες καὶ δραπέται γεγενημένοι τύραννόν τε αὑτοῖς ἀγελαῖόν τινα ἐκ τοῦ συρφετοῦ προστησάμενοι ἐπικλοπώτερον συταράξαι τὴν Ῥωμαῖων ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ καιροῦ τινὸς ἴσχυσαν...ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ διαρρήδην ἐπὶ ποινὰς τῶν πεπολιτευμένων ἀγόμενοι...ὑμεῖς μὲν πολιτείας εὐνόμου προκινδυνεύοντες καθίστασθε εἰς ξυμβολὴν τήνδε, οἱ δὲ νεωτερίζουσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς νόμοις ζυγομαχοῦντες, οὐ παραπέμψειν τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἐς διδόχους προσδοκῶντές τινας...τῶν γὰρ οὐ νόμῳ καὶ ἀγαθῇ πολιτείᾳ ξυνισταμένων ἀπολέλειπται μὲν ἀρετὴ πᾶσα... (8.30.2-6)
>
> ...these robbers, who being originally slaves of the great emperor and then turning fugitives and setting a tyrant over themselves who was a worthless fellow from the common rabble, have been able for a certain season to work havoc in the Roman empire by their thievish actions... being indisputably led on by God to the punishment earned by their administration of the state... while you for your part are entering this combat in defense of a lawful government, they are in revolt against the law and fighting a battle of desperation, not expecting to transmit anything they hold to any successors... for those who are not organized under law and good government are bereft of all virtue...

As we have seen, Procopius has been building up a picture of the Italian Romans' suffering due to the war and the imperial Romans' mistreatment of them (cf especially 7.17). The Goths' claims that the people of Italy and Rome were better off under Gothic rule are increasingly supported by the narrator's own sentiments, and validated by the strongly positive cultural memory of the rule of Theoderic. Theoderic's respect for Roman laws and institutions is increasingly mirrored in Totilla's sentiments and behavior.[324]

---

[324] See pp 238-42 above

Narses' exhortation naturally paints a very different picture, calling the Goths "robbers" and "originally slaves of the emperor," a characterization with little basis in fact. He characterizes Theoderic as a tyrant, an issue which Procopius-as-narrator addressed specifically at 5.1.26, when he claimed that Theoderic, though a tyrant in name, behaved like an emperor.[325] Narses describes the imperial Romans' cause as "in defense of lawful goverment" while the Goths are sure to fall (in part) because they do not have law and good goverment on their side, but we have seen over the course of the last books how Theoderic and Totilla are associated with respect for Roman law and just governace, while the behavior of the imperial army, especially its commanders, has become more and more excerable.

Totilla, for his part, delivers a speech that he names "a final exhortation," predicting that the coming battle will surely be decisive:

> οὕτω γὰρ ἡμᾶς τε καὶ βασιλέα Ἰουστινιανὸν ἐκνενευρίσθαι τετύχηκε καὶ μάχαις καὶ περιῃρῆσθαι δυνάμεις ἁπάσας, πόνοις τε καὶ μάχαισ καὶ ταλαιπωρίαις ὡμιληκότας ἐπὶ χρόνου παμμέγεθες μῆκος, ἀπειρηκέωαι τε πρὸς τὰς τοῦ πολέμου ἀνάγκας, ὥστε, ἢν τῇ ξυμβολῇ τῇ νῦν τῶν ἐναντίςν περιεσόμεθα, οὐδαμῶς ἀναποδιεῖν τὸ λοιπὸν ἕξουσιν, ἢν δὲ ἡμεῖς τι προσπταίσωμεν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ μάχῃ, ἐλπὶς οὐδεμία εἰς τὸ ἀναμαχήσεσθαι λελείψεται Γότθοις... 8.30.9
>
> For so thoroughly have both we and the emperor Justinian become exhauseted and stripped of all power through being subject to toils and battles and hardships for an exceedngly long time, and so completely have we found ourselves unable to meet the demands of the war that, if we shall overcome our opponents in this present engagement, they will be utterly unable to come back in the future, while if we meet with any reverse in this battle, no hope will be left the Goths of renewing the fight...

[325] pp 205-6 above

Therefore the Goths should fight with all the energy and resources they have left, holding nothing back (8.30.10-16). Totila concludes his speech by belittling the make-up and motives of the Roman army: wheras the Goths are fighting for their own land and their lives, the Roman army is a patch-work of soldiers hired from many nations: Huns, Lombards, Eruli; and such mercenaries will never value silver over their own lives (8.30.17-20). In the batle that ensues, the Roman army defeats the Goths, but Totilla's predictions are not proven wrong, stictly speaking: the batle was decisive, for the Romans.[326] Furthermore, Totila's reasoning, resting on the ravages that years of war have wrought on both peoples and land, are far more in accord with the presentation of the immdediate past given by Procopius' narration than Narses' claims about the righteousness of the Romans' cause. The sentiments in Narses' speech to his troops, by contrast, are so arrestingly at variance with the picture of Gothic rule in Italy and the imperial army's behavior that Procopius has been building that he, Procopius, must be setting Narses up here as the commander with the poorer understanding and the wrong interpretation of the larger situation. Though Totila loses the decisive battle, and Narses seems for the current time to be winning the war, the imperial Romans have failed to comprehend the larger battlefield of history.[327]

[326] It is furthermore implied that the monetary incentives played a large role in motivating the barbarians of the Roman army (8.31.9), proving Totila partially correct and perhaps cheapening the Roman victory as well.
[327] Importantly, Narses is not depicted as having out-manuvered or beaten Totila; rather, "Totila was outgeneraled by his own folly," (διὸ δὴ Τουτίλαν πρὸς τῆς ἀβουλίας καταστρατηγηθῆναι τῆς αὑτοῦ ξυνηνέχθη) (8.32.7). Procopius later provdes two slightly different stories of Totila's subsequent death having fled some distance from the battlefield, with the second, less ignoble version being hinted to be true

**Part IV: Rome and the Romans at the end of the *Wars***

Thus Procopius's history evinces an evolving contempt for the imperial Romans as Romans, and turns rather toward the Romans of Rome, and their city, as the true bastion of *Romanitas* in the sixth century. Totila served as an able guard of these for a season, but after he is killed following the battle of Taginae (8.32.27), no one is left within the narrative to speak for and protect Rome and its people. Just as the Romans have been responsible for preserving Rome as an embodiement of cultural memory through the intervening years, so death and depravation of the Romans signals the symbolic end of classical Rome along with its physical near-destruction by the end of the *Wars.* While Book 8 and the *Wars* will end with the imperial forces having defeated Totila and re-taken much of Italy from the Goths, Procopius' narrative conveys the impression of a hollow victory, for what kind of Roman victory is it if Rome herself is destroyed?

We have discussed several times already Belisarius' letter to Totila at 7.22.7-19, but we must return to it one final time. His impassioned plea for the preservation of Rome as the preservation of memory is worth quoting again here:

> Ῥώμη μέντοι πόλεων ἁπασῶν, ὅσαι ὑφ᾽ ἡλίῳ τυγχάωουσιν οὖσαι, μεγίστη τε καὶ ἀξιολογωτάτη ὡμολόγηται εἶναι. οὐ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς ἑνὸς ἀρετῇ εἴργασται οὐδὲ χρόνου βραχέος δυνάμει ἐς

(8.32.22-28 and 8.32.33-40, cf 8.32.2) and a eulogy for Totila lamenting the the capriciousness of Fate.

> τόσον μεγέθους τε καὶ κάλλους ἀφῖκται, ἀλλὰ βασιλέων μὲν πλῆθος, ἀνδρῶν δὲ ἀρίστων συμμορίαι πολλαί, χρόνου τε μῆκος καὶ πλούτου ἐξουσίας ὑπερβολὴ τὰ τε ἄλλα πάντα ἐκ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ τεχνίτας ἀνθρώπους ἀνταύθα ξυναγαγειν ἴσχυσαν. οὕτω τε τὴν πόλιν τοιαύτην, οἵανπερ ὁρᾷς, κατὰ βραχὺ τετκηνάμενοι, μνημεῖα τῆς πάντων ἀρετῆς τοῖς ἐπιγενησομένοις ἀπέλιπον, ὥστε ἡ ἐς ταῦτα ἐπήρεια εἰκότως ἂν ἀδίκημα μέγα ἐς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος δόξειεν εἶναι· ἀφαιρεῖται γὰρ τοὺς μὲν προγεγενημένους τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς μνήμην, τοὺς δὲ ὕστερον ἐπιγενησομένους τῶν ἔργων τὴν θέαν (7.22.9-12).
>
> Now among all the cities under the sun Rome is agreed to be the greatest and most noteworthy**.** For it has not been created by the ability of one man, nor has it attained such greatness and beauty by a power of short duration, but a multitude of monarchs, many companies of the best men, a great lapse of time, and an extraordinary abundance of wealth have availed to bring together in that city all other things that are in the whole world, and skilled workers besides. Thus, little by little, have they built the city, such as you behold it, thereby leaving to future generations memorials of the ability of them all, so that insult to these monuments would properly be considered a great crime against the men of all time; for by such action the men of former generations are robbed of the memorials of their ability, and future generations of the sight of their works.

Here, the sense of Rome as "the eternal city" conveys the impression of transcendence, that the contemporary city's true importance is as a link in the chain of past, present, and future. Procopius, through Belisarius, emphasizes that the city was built and maintained over a long stretch of time, and that its greatness reflects and encompasses "all other things that are in the whole world," a classic trope in praise of Rome that takes on new meaning as the city comes under existential threat.[328] What does it mean to endanger the

[328] Aristides, Aelius, and James Henry Oliver. (1953) *The ruling power: a study of the Roman Empire in the second century after Christ through the Roman oration of Aelius Aristides*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 43:4. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society. For more on the city of Rome as encompassing the breadth of its empire, geographically as well as chronologically, see: Edwards and Woolf "Cosmopolis: Rome as World City" in Edwards, C., & Woolf, G. (2003). *Rome the Cosmopolis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-20; and Larmour, D. H. J., &

city that encapsulates, as no other does, the spaitial and temporal breadth of the Roman world?

Additionally, in the words and actions of Procopius' main characters, we have observed the devolpment of some of the primary thematic concerns of his history. When Belisarius, who has been throughout the early and middle parts of the work an important mouthpiece for Procopius on the importance of Rome and Roman memory, makes his appeal to Totilla for its preservation, it signals a shift in the narrative. Now it is a Goth, rather than a Byzantine Roman, who is charged with the protection of the city of Rome and empowered to preserve the Roman cultural memory that it embodies.

As Rome changes hands several more times in the latter part of Book 7, Procopius includes a few choice statements that speak to its continued importance, but uncertain state as a pawn passed back and forth between Romans and Goths. At 7.35.1-3, Procopius describes how Belisarius has returned to Byzantium, his most recent campaign in Italy having been so unsuccessful that he never really set foot on Italian soil, only sailing around from one fortified coastal town to another, unable to make any headway. Meanwhile "the enemy, having now little to fear, had enslaved Rome and everything else, practically speaking" (καὶ ἀπ᾿ αὐτοῦ ἀδεέστερον τοὺς πολεμίους τετύχηκε Ῥώμην τε ἀνδραποδίσαι καὶ τἄλλα ὡς εἰπεῖν ἅπαντα). Here, Procopius is rather using Rome's cultural cachet to make his point; enslaved is perhaps a bit strong, as Totila is depicted elsewhere as treating Rome's inhabitants with some decency.

---

Spencer, D. (2007). The sites of Rome: Time, space, memory. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2-4.

Indeed, when Totila re-takes Rome at 7.36.29, depopulated though it is by siege and long warfare, he again does not destroy it, but rather settles both Goths and Romans there:

> Ῥώμην δὲ οὔτε καθελεῖν οὔτε ἀπολιπεῖν τὸ λοιπὸν Τουτίλας ἤθελεν, ἀλλὰ Γότθους τε καὶ Ῥωμαίους τοὺς ἐκ τῆς συγκλήτου βουλῆς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἅπαντας ξυνοικίζειν ἐνταῦθα ἔγνω ἐξ αἰτίας τοιᾶσδε.
>
> As for Rome itself, Totila was unwilling thereafter either to dismantle it or to abandon it; instead he decided to establish in residence there both Goths and Romans, not only members of the Senate, but also the others...

Here, Procopius shows Rome's importance even to a barbarian; Totila is again cast in a positive light in this passage, making an effort to keep Rome functioning as a city. Moreover, Totilla's plan to settle a mix of Goths and Romans in the city casts him as a latter-day Romulus, creating unity between the Romans and Sabines. This potential rebirth for the city is aborted when then imperial forces retake the city at 8.33.17. It is both a final blow, and a reheasal in minature, of the effect the wars have had on the city: trying to take back Rome has in fact destroyed it.

As to the ultimate responsibility for the empire's destruction and loss of its namesake city, Procopius has already had Belisarius intimate to his emperor that history would censure Justinian should his inaction lead to the loss of Italy and Rome (5.24.9-10, see above pp 232-4). A similar condemnation comes directly from Procopius, immediately before Totilla's second recapture of Rome. Belisarius returns from his ineffectual mission (7.35.1-3), and Justinian initially resolves to send another commander in his place:

> Βασιλεὺς δὲ Ἰουστινιανὸς ἐπειδὴ Βελισάριον ἐς βυζάντιον ἥκοντα εἶδεν, ἄρχοντα πέμπειν ξύν στρατῷ ἄλλον ἐπὶ Γότθους τε διενοεῖτο καὶ Τουτίλαν. καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐπιτελῆ ταύτην δὴ έπεποιήκει τὴν ἔννοιαν, οἶμαι ἄν, Ῥώμης μὲν ἔτι ὑπ᾿ αὐτῷ οὔσης, σεσωσμένων δέ οἱ τῶν ἐνταῦθα στρατιωτῶν καὶ τοῖς έκ Βυζαντίου ἐπιβεβόηθηκοσιν ἀναμίγνυσθαι δυναμένων, περιέσεσθαι τῶν ἐναντίων αὐτὸν τῷ πολέμῳ. νῦν δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα Λιβέριον ἀπολεξάμενος, ἄνδρα τῶν έκ Ῥώμης πατρικίων, ἐν παρασκευῇ ἐκέλευε γενέσθαι, μετὰ δὲ ἀσχολίας οἱ ἴσως ἐπιγενομένης ἑτέρας τινός τὴν προθυμίαν κατέπαυσε. (7.36.4-6)

> As soon as the emperor saw Belisarius returned to Byzantium, he began to make plans for sending another commander with an army against the Goths and Totila. And if he had actually carried out this idea, I believe that, with Rome still under his power, and the soldiers in the city saved for him and enabled to unite with the relieving force from Byzantium, he would have overcome his opponents in the war. But in fact, after first selecting Liberius, one of the patricians from Rome, and ordering him to make himself ready, he later, perhaps because some other business claimed his attention, lost interest in the matter.

Procopius implicitly criticizes Justinian by trivializing his reasons for not carrying forward with his plans. It is interesting, also, that a Roman from Rome was set to be the commander of the relieving force. What is key, however, is how Procopius puts Justinian's decision in light of the imminent loss of Rome to the Goths. He makes the city the lynchpin for success or failure in Italy, for the whole enterprise of re-conquest.

It is in Book 8, as we have long been anticipating, that Procopius' story of the fate of Rome and its citizens reaches its tragic peak. The fates of both are, of course, inextricably intertwined. The people's Roman identity was bound up in, if not contingent upon, their residence in and relationship with Rome. What seems to have made these men so very Roman, in Procopius' eyes, was their part in the continuing life of the city, their use of the Latin language and their preservation of the ancient monuments. Their Roman identity, like that of the imperial Romans, is made uncertain by these troubled

times. While the bad behavior of the imperial Romans toward the Romans of Italy problematizes their own identity as Romans, it likewise threatens that of the other group, as it forces them to abandon the city and its memories.

At 8.22.5-8 comes that passage where Procopius expounds on the Romans' love for the city and their devotion to the preservation of its memorials, worth quoting again here for its continued relevance and the new light shed on it by our discussions of the surrounding events:

> καίτοι ἀνθρώπων μάλιστα πάντων ὧν ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν φιλοπόλιδες Ῥωμαῖοι τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες, περιστέλλειν τε τὰ πάτρια πάντα καὶ διασώζεσθαι ἐν σπουδῇ ἔχουσιν, ὅπως δὴ μηδὲν ἀφανίζηται Ῥώμη τοῦ παλαιοῦ κόσμου. οἵ γε καὶ πολύν τινα βεβαρβαρωμένοι αἰῶνα τάς τε πόλεως διεσώσαντο οἰκοδομίας καὶ τῶν ἐγκαλλωπισμάτων τὰ πλεῖστα, ὅσα οἷόν τε ἦν χρόνῳ τε τοσούτῳ τὸ μῆκος καὶ τῷ ἀπαμελεῖσθαι δι᾽ ἀρετὴν τῶν πεποιημένων ἀντέχειν. ἔτι μέντοι καὶ ὅσα μνημεῖα τοῦ γένους ἐλέλειπτο ἔτι, ἐν τοῖς καὶ ἡ ναῦς Αἰνείου, τοῦ τῆς πόλεως οἰκιστοῦ, καὶ εἰς τόδε κεῖται, θέαμα παντελῶς ἄπιστον. νεώσοικον γὰρ ποιησάμενοι ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει, παρὰ τὴν τοῦ Τιβέριδος ὄχθην, ἐνταῦθά τε αὐτὴν καταθέμενοι, ἐξ ἐκείνου τηροῦσιν (8.22.5-8).
>
> Yet the Romans love their city above all the men we know, and they are eager to protect all their ancestral treasures and to preserve them, so that nothing of the ancient glory of Rome may be obliterated. For even though they were for a long period under barbarian sway, they preserved the buildings of the city and most of its adornments, such as could through the excellence of their workmanship withstand so long a lapse of time and such neglect. Furthermore, all such memorials of the race as were still left are preserved even to this day, and among them the ship of Aeneas, the founder of the city, an altogether incredible sight. For they built a ship-house in the middle of the city on the bank of the Tiber, and depositing in there, they have preserved it from that time.

We might note again the emphasis on the labor that must be put into maintaining the physical memories that link the present city to the ancient past, as well as Procopius' admiration that the Romans have been able to maintain these monuments for the "long

period under barbarian sway up to this day." What is most important to note here, though, is the context in which Procopius places these exclamations. Totila has re-captured Rome once again, and repenting of the burning of the city, he establishes some senators in the city and charges them to take care of it,

> οἱ δὲ καθεστῶτες ἐν αἰχμαλώτων λόγῳ καὶ περιῃρημένοι χρήματα πάντα, μὴ ὅτιτῶν κοινῶν, ἀλλ᾽οὐδὲ τῶν ἰδία σφίσι προσηκόωτων δυνατοὶ ἦσαν μεταποιεῖσθαι. (8.22.4)
>
> But they, being reduced to the state of war-captives and stripped of all their money, were not only unable to lay claim to the public funds, but could not even secure those which belonged to them personally.

Thus the decline of the city is, in Procopius' picture, due to the incapacitation of the Roman senators and people to preserve it. Were they able, they would use even their own resources to do so, but the prolonged warfare (as well as the extortion of the Roman officers) has stripped them of all resources. Additionally, the phrasing of "reduced to the state of captives," recalls in sentiment, if not quite in language, how the Goths had "enslaved Rome and everything else, practically speaking" at 7.35.3. This implicates the Goths in responsibility for the Romans' and Rome's pitiable state. However, recall that the barbarians were able to enslave Italy because of Belisarius' inability to make any headway in Italy and Justinian's failure to send another commander with reinforcements (7.35.1-3, 7.36.4-6). The blame ultimately rests on the imperial forces, and the emperor.

As the war in Italy drags on, Rome continues to be passed back and forth between the two sides, each eager to have but unable to hold onto the capital. At the same time those two sides, their resources progressively depleted by the long years of fighting, become less and less able to defend, or indeed attack, Rome properly. We witnessed this

difficulty even early on, in the first siege of Rome at 5.18-22, when Belisarius was strained to defend the various parts of the lengthy circuit walls, the Goths were unable to encircle the whole thing, and the Romans even could get through the siege to re-supply. This was the motivation behind Totila's intended destruction of Rome at 7.22.7, motivating Belisarius' letter, since he doubted the Goths could hold the city against the reinforced imperial army. This becomes even more painfully obvious when imperial Roman forces again march on Rome at 8.33.17: the Goths have fortified a small portion of the city near Hadrian's Tomb, for the city wall of Rome is "so extraordinarily long" that the Goths cannot defend it all, but neither can the Romans encircle it all. Accordingly, a small Roman force easily steals over a deserted portion of the city wall, and though the Goths flee to the fortress, they soon surrender before Narses' advance (8.33.26). On the one hand, this may be simply a reflection of the reality of Rome's great size, which ties back to its past greatness. Procopius may be trying to convey to a Constantinopolitan audience how immense in size the city is, and thus how immense in population it used to be.

On the other hand, we might note that the scale of the conflict, especially in and around Rome, has gotten smaller and more ineffectual since the start of the war. Compared to Belisarius facing his (still small, but nearly united) initial invading force against the whole of the Gothic army, these petty sieges by forces much depleted by long war and division throughout Italy cannot hold a candle. Unable even to defend the city they are fighting over; they fall short, not just of the better times at the beginning of the

war, but of the city itself: its size, its defenses, the long history of its long walls defending the people and the memories protected within. They are unworthy of it.

This third and final recapture of Rome by the Roman forces inspires a last commentary on Rome's fate from Procopius immediately after, at 8.34.1-8. He begins with a reflection on fate and misfortune:

> Τότε δὴ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις διαφανέστατα ἐπιδέδεικτα ὡς ἅπασιν, οἷσπερ ἔδει γενέσθαι κακῶς, καὶ τὰ εὐτυχήματα δοκοῦντα εἶναι εἰς ὄλεθρον ἐποκέκριται, κατὰ νοῦν τε ἀπαλλάξαντες ἴσως τῇ τοιαύτῃ εὐημερίᾳ ξυνδιαφείρονται. Ῥωμαίων γὰρ τῇ τε ξυγκλήτῳ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τὴν νίκην τήνδε πολλῷ ἔτι μᾶλλον φθόρου αἰτίαν ξυνηνέχθη γενέσθαι τρόπῳ τοιῷδε (8.34.1-2).
>
> At that time it was shown to the world with the greatest clearness that in the case of all men who have been doomed to suffer ill, even those things which seem to be blessings turn out for their destruction, and even when they have fared as they wish they are, it may be, destroyed together with this same prosperity. For this victory turned out to be for the Roman senate and people a cause of far greater destruction, in the following manner...

Procopius starts from the rhetorical assumption that the return to "Roman" hands ought to have been a good thing for the senate and people of Rome, but we have already seen how this is not necessarily the case. Indeed, while the Roman citizens suffer some misfortune at the hands of the Goths, as they kill and destroy on their way out of the city, the final twist of the knife comes as the imperial forces enter the city:

> Γότθοι μὲν φεύγοντες καὶ τὴν Ἰταλίας ἐπικράτησιν ἀπογνόντες, ὁδοῦ ποιούμενοι πάρεργον, τοὺς παρατυχόντας σφίσι Ῥωμαίους οὐδεμιᾷ διεχρῶντο φειδοῖ. οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι τοῦ Ῥωμαίων στρατοῦ ὡς πολεμίοις ἐχρῶντο πᾶσιν οἷς ἂν ἐντύχοιεν ἐν τῇ ἐς τὴν πόλιν εἰσόδῳ (8.34.3-4).
>
> The Goths on the one hand, as by their flight they abandoned the dominion of Italy, made it an incident of their progress to destroy without mercy the Romans who fell in their way. And the barbarians of the Roman army, on the other hand, treated as enemies all whom they chanced upon as they entered the city.

Here at the last, the "Roman" army is reduced to the barbarianism of its individual soldiers victimizing the people of Rome; acting indeed just as the barbarians of the Gothic army do. Moreover, the imperial forces are in the end treating their supposed fellow Romans just as conquered enemies (ὥς πολεμίος), the very thing that Belisarius, back at the beginning of the war, and for so long, insisted they must not do. It was the virtuous behavior mandated by Beliasrius, as the archetype of the latter day Roman general, that made the victories possible, practically speaking, and made the attainment of the goal of re-union of the empire an attainable goal for one shining moment. In treating the westerners as fellow Romans, the army were behaving as Romans themselves, and affecting the goal by their very operation by its strictures. That moment, however, is now crumbled past recognition, and all that remains is a barbarous invading army, whose original mission, now lost sight of (by all, Procopius perhaps feels, but himself) is a hopelessly lost cause.

The war, though, has one last parting blow for Rome: Totila had previously left some senators in Campagnia, who, when they hear that Rome was again held by "the emperor's army" (note the lack of "Roman" identifier"), try to go to Rome. The Goths kill them to prevent them going (8.34.5-6). Then, they kill the children of the Senators whom Totila had been holding hostage:

> ἐτύγχανε δὲ καὶ Τουτίλας, ἡνίκα Ναρσῇ ὑπαντιάσων ἐνθένδε ᾔει, τῶν ἐκ πόλεως ἑκάστης δοκίμων Ῥωμαίων τοὺς παῖδας ἀγείρας καὶ αὐτῶν ἐς τριακοσίους ἀπολεξάμενος...καὶ αὐτοὺς Τουτίλας μὲν τότε ὑπὲρ ποταμὸν Πάδον ἐκέλευσεν εἶναι, Τεΐας δὲ τανῦν ἐνταῦθα εὑρὼν ἅπαντας ἔκτεινε (8.34.7-8).

> It happened also that Totila, when he went from there to encounter Narses, had gathered the children of the notable Romans from each city and selected about three hundred of them... And at that time Totila merely commanded that they should be north of the Po River, but now Teïas found and killed them all.

This is a thematically powerful end to the story of Rome in Procopius' work: long the seat of cultural memory and model for the preservation of the memorials of the ancient past, now not only are those citizens dead (or fled) who for so long worked so hard towards the preservation of the heritage of the past, but Rome is robbed of the children who would have, and now can not, carry those memories and memorials forward into the future. The Romans' continued existence is threatened by the elimination of their future generations.[329] The two-fold aims of memory and memorialization, to preserve the memory out of the past and carry it forward into the future, are both utterly undone for Rome.

## Conclusions

Just as Procopius depicts the historical Rome's function as a locus of cultural memory (as at 3.2.4, where he describes the house of Sallust, or 8.22.8, the ship of Aeneas), he extends that function onto a metanarrative level, making the city a symbolic center for the remembering of the ancient world which pervades his text, as well as a model for the power of memory. Conversely, even as Rome's value as, and ability to be,

[329] We might wonder as well to what degree Procopius would consider those Romans who flee to Constantinople or elsewhere continue to be Roman, at least, their own particular kind of Roman, sundered from the city that made them.

an embodiment of cultural memory declines precipitously in the historical world the narrative represents, the city's role in the text as locus of Roman memory takes on greater dimensions and urgency. Again, Procopius makes his text function as a continuer of social memory, picking up where real-world actors and engines have left off, and demonstrating the role and importance, not only of cultural memory to history, but of history to cultural memory.

When Belisarius threatens take Naples by force at 5.9.27, his very pleas to its leaders to surrender so that he will not be forced to use violence against fellow Romans themselves rest upon the un-*Romanitas* of his largely barbarian army.[330] This problematization of the *Romanitas* of the army and the imperial Roman cause adds further nuance to the memory-dense section between the capture of Naples and the army's peacful, triumphant entrance into Rome. The ancient memories with which Procopius laces these sections function to reaffirm the strentgh of *Romanitas*, not of the army particularly, but as a phenomenon that is larger than Belisarius' forces, larger even perhaps than the conflict, one which inhabits the Roman landscape and imbues the narrative's events and the characters' actions with meaning, and informs the historian's and readers' interpretation of them.

We have examined in painstaking detail Procopius' careful handling and evolving picture of *Romanitas* in a sixth-century world of shifting identity and contested memory. We have observed in action Megill's axiom, "when identity becomes uncertain, memory

[330] see above, pp 222, as well as Pazdernik (2000).

rises in value."[331] There is surely more we can say, though, about the role that memory plays in the struggle to define and claim contemporary *Romanitas,* and the way these unstable identities impact the value and functioning of memory in Procopius' text. How, then, does Roman memory function in the struggle to define contemporary *Romanitas,* and how is Procopius responding to the tensions in the use and ownership of Roman memories and identity? He responds, at least in part, by making memory more cross-cultural: that is, by emphasizing the common memory culture shared between east and west. He problematizes and undermines a straightforward, imperialistic view of the eastern Roman right to re-conquor the west based on their *Romanitas* in favor of an approach that recognizes both groups as Roman. He acknowledges, and even privileges the unique claims of the Romans of Italy and Rome to that identity.

Moreover, as we have seen, Procopius responds to the tension between the East and West, not (primarily) by staking a claim for eastern Roman identity that is at the expense of western Roman identity, but rather by using the western claims to *Romanitas* to question and problematize those of the east. Thus the the tension, the contest(ation) that really concerns him would seem to be the one taking place within the eastern empire itself, the tensions in Roman identity arising out of the passage of time and the many changes between the classical Roman world and Procopius' own day, as well as the contestation of Roman memory, and hence identity, from Justinian's autocratic and revisionist co-option of ancient memory for his imperial programme. Not least, there is the paradox of Justinian's efforts to regain the western empire with the damage to

---

[331] Megill 42

Romans and *Romanitas* (on both sides) that those efforts wreak. That Procopius should be concerned foremost with the memory-and-identity situation back home in Constantinople is, of course, highly appropriate, as this would have been the context in which he was composing his history, having been exposed to so much challenging and complicating evocation of ancient memory during his time with Belisarius and army in the West.

**Conclusion: History as Memory**

We have considered, several times and in several ways, the role of history generally, and of Procopius' history specifically, as a continuance and transformation of cultural memory. History begins in and from social remembering, and Procopius makes particular effort to make his work a carrier of memory. There are, as we have begun to explore, two complementary apects to this process, two sides of the same coin.

On the one hand, there is the cultural and social memory depicted in the world of Procopius' *Wars*: memory *in* history. The preservation of memorials and sites of memory in the city of Rome Procopius records with admiration and a sense of urgency about their future. The many battle sites, buildings, bridges, cities, and fortifications (still standing and ruined) that dot the Roman landscape provide Procopius with poignant evocations of ancient memory (often Roman, sometimes Hellenistic). His characters mobilize memory of the ancient and recent past in speeches and letter-writing. In all of these cases, the depiction of remembering in the *Wars* is presumably grounded somewhere in the historical reality of the sixth century, though we cannot of course know to what degree it is embellished by Procopius for his own ends. We need not suppose that the dialogue between Belisarius and the Goths at 6.6.14-26 is a word-for-word transcript of an actual conversation to surmise that the sentiments and controversy that it articulates must have been prevalent topics at the time, or to understand that the negotiation of social memory that Procopius articulates for his actors could not have existed in the vacuum of his historical imagination.

On the other hand are the ways in which a work of history may functions *as* memory. It serves as a record of the immediate past events of which it tells the story, certainly, but classical historiography also remembers its own long tradition. The dialogues, disagreements, imitation and self-styling of works of historiography have all the hallmarks of the dynamics of social memory, though played out in texts of a single genre, stretched over hundreds of years. In Procopius' case, his engagement with his genre's modes of remembering (direct and intertextual references, debates on methodology and aims, etc) not only often highlight the impressiveness of ancient days but also serve the larger purpose of modeling the usefulness of classical heritage. Procopius' history uses the memory of its genre as a model for how to preserve a memory of the events, the acheivements good and bad, the glory, of one's own day.

We will, in the course of this conclusion, analyze Procopius' history as memory informed by several different strains of memory studies. We will consider Procopius' use of memory as manipulation of canon and archive, as the transference from collective to historical memory, and as a (purposeful) manipulation of the dynamic between Roman memory and Roman identity.

## Part I: Questions and Answers

Having surveyed the many and varied ways in which Procopius engages with the memory of the ancient world in his history, we are now in a position to (begin to) answer

some of the questions with which we began, and to be able to draw together characterizations of Procopius' historical memory in the *Wars*. We have seen much of the function of memory in Procopius' text, and of what Procopius remembers: both the broad view of the course of history and in specific historical details. We have observed and can infer also, what value Procopius seems to see in the memory of the ancient world.

One of those questions with which we began was how Procopius engaged with the memory of the ancient past: in what ways does he incorporate it into his text, and to what uses does he put it? How, in short, does historical memory function in Procopius' *Wars*? As we have seen, Procopius uses classical memory to make intertextual points about his contemporary world (as one did in classical allusive practice). He infuses historically significant moments in his text with cultural memories which both emphasize and characterize that historical significance.[332] He uses cultural memories of both the historic and the mythic past to color the long-inhabited landscape through which his history moves: as ancient, yes, but much more. Procopius explores commonality and difference in his remembering. The landscape of Italy in particular is intensely Romanized,[333] at times in a way which draws attention to the distance of Procopius' Constantinopolitan readers from their Roman (Italian, Latin-speaking) roots,[334] but at others in a way which seeks to cultivate a sense of the universality of Mediterranean cultural heritage, and even points to the primacy of Greek cultural heritage and

[332] See above Ch 4 pp 181-192 on Belisarius' re-entry into Rome, of course (5.11-15), but also Ch 2 pp 72-9 on the plague (2.22-23), or p 125 on Belisarius' triumph (4.9).
[333] Ch 3 pp 120-7
[334] Ch 2 pp 97-108, Ch 4 pp 224-6

influence.[335] Procopius also engages with memory when he draws attention to the long stretch of intervening time when he engages with the historiographical tradition,[336] or employs a well-placed explanatory aside to bridge, but also highlight, the long gap between the classical world and his own.[337]

Procopius uses the memories he deploys of the ancient past, in all their forms, to put forward a particular understanding, not only of the past, but of the long course of time that includes and connects the classical (and mythic) past with Procopius' own contemporary world. The larger history that is the backdrop to Procopius' *History* is one that is long, indeed epic, and it is in spite of this great length of time that Procopius seeks to make the events and lessons of the classical past relevant to his own day. Procopius presents his contemporary world as the (potential) heirs of a rich classical tradition, making his passionate argument that that heirloom is worth taking up. This endangered state of the memory of the ancient past is itself, I would argue, also a feature in the shape of the past that Procopius presents. Returning one final time to E. Zerubavel's concept of "time maps,"[338] we might say that Procopius' map of Roman history ends with a valley, or perhaps a precipice, on the brink of which the present teeters. The result depends upon the outcome of the war, surely, and its effects on the population of Italy, but also on Procopius' audience, and their response to Procopius' presentation of historical memory. To extend the map metaphor beyond its relationship to the past, but narrow it to one element of cultural history, we might say that Procopius presents a time map with a

---

[335] Ch 3 pp 146-9, Ch 4 pp 188-190
[336] Ch 2 pp 85-90, Ch 3 pp 132-141
[337] Ch 2 pp 97-108
[338] See above Ch 3 pp 159-161

turning point, at which his contemporaries can choose to take forward true, accurate and useful knowledge and sense of what it has meant and means to be Roman (that is to say, Roman memory), and continue to benefit from the cultural highs that it provides. Or, they will not, and like the memorials of Rome, this version of *Romanitas*, sanctioned by legitimate Roman memory, will drop off the map.

If Procopius' Eastern Roman readers are invited to own, to repossess, their classical heritage, it is particularly the *Roman* elements of that heritage that Procopius emphasizes with greatest persistence and urgency. We will turn shortly to considering the interrelated reasons for this perspective, but for now, it is a noticeable feature of the shape of the ancient past in Procopius' remembering: the Roman past looms large in the memory of the *Wars.*[339] The Roman past was itself long, and its Republican origins distant in terms of time, culture, and form of government.[340] While this and the relative proximity of the imperial period, may have helped it be more well-represented than the classical Greek past, references to the ancient Roman past are not strongly differentiated from the pre-Roman past. This is not to say that Procopius was unaware of the chronology, certainly, and we can look to passages like that on the Palladium or the history of the Moors for occasions when the relative ages and succession of civilizations was important, but the language of referring to the ancient Roman and the pre-Roman past is much the same: phrases such as ἐκ παλαιοῦ, (5.24.4, 7.40.43, many others) or

---

[339] For more on the reasons for the Roman past looming so large in Procopius' remembering, see above (Ch 2 pp 97-108 Ch 3, pp 120-128), and just below, pp 292-310.
[340] Recall Greatrex's study of references to the Republic in Procopius and Ammianus (Greatrex 1996), and Jeffreys' arguments about the disinterest of Byzantine chroniclers in non-monarchical polities (Jeffreys 1979).

ἐν τοῖς ἄνω χρόνοις (4.9.1, 7.18.19, etc.) serve to convey a great, though often unspecified, distance back in time in many diverse cases.

Further than this, though, a final feature of the Roman-ness of the past in Procopius is the way in which the Roman past has, in some sense, subsumed that of the Greek world, and the wider Mediterranean. As the Roman Empire had long incorporated so much of the Mediterranean world, so in Procopius' remembering the long reign of Roman rule means that the pasts of other Mediterranean cultures are inextricably caught up in Roman memory. For Greece and the identity of Greek-speakers, the long period of Roman rule combined with the more recent but still lengthy establishment of the seat of that power in Constantinople and the east, and finally its more recent sundering from its western source, all serve to make a Greco-Roman history and identity that blurs the distinctions between pre-Roman Hellenistic memory, Roman heritage, and Greek-controlled Roman cultural power. For other peoples, like the Moors or the Franks, this phenomenon is manifested in the way in which the retelling of their histories is occasioned by, or ends in, their involvement in Roman history. Finally, this phenomenon plays out in many important memory-related passages. From the statues in the Forum of Peace (8.21.10-17), Aeneas and his ship (8.22.8) and the Palladium (5.15.5-14), to the treasures of the temple of Solomon (5.12.41-42), many, many roads of memory in Procopius lead to Roman memory.

* * * *

As we have seen, Procopius engages with Greek and Roman memory in different ways. Aside from a handful of references to specific persons or events in (mostly Hellenistic) Greek history, Procopius' memory of classical Greece is through his intertextual and stylistic engagement with the historiographical tradition, as well as with the myths of Odysseus' and Jason and Medea's travels. For Roman memory, there are many references to the imperial preiod, although fewer to the Republic.[341] At the same time, there seems naturally to be substantially less familiarity (on the part of Procopius and his contemporary audience) with Latin historiographical and literary traditions.[342] Thus Procopius works with what he has available to him and is able to use in each case, but in so doing, he also characterizes himself and his readers: as Greek-speakers but Romans, inheritors of the classical Greek literary and scholarly culture, but bound up in the history of the Roman Empire and its wide geographical horizons, and obligated to remember and reconnect with the origins of the institutions that characterized it and made it great.

How Procopius viewed himself in relationship to his classical predecessors is another facet, which reflects the whole, of how he understood his contemporary world's relationship to its ancient past. One of the fundamental themes we observed from the start was Procopius' interest in making use of his classical sources by means of adaptation, rather than imitation. From using Thucydidean language to characterize Belisarius[343] or

[341] Above, pp 120-8 and below, pp 283-4.
[342] cf Greatrex (1996b) 2-4, nn 2, 16.
[343] Ch 2, Part I, Sections I & II

the plague of 542 CE[344] to taking up an ancient debate on the division of Europe and Asia,[345] Procopius' intertextual engagement with classical memory gives every impression of stemming from an interest in participating in the historiographical tradition, and being accounted among its prominent writers. Now, this is certainly not to say that Procopius was alone or unique in this desire among ancient history-writers, but it is a useful aspect of his attitude toward the ancient past, and its relationship with the contemporary world, to keep in mind as we consider the larger whole. Procopius sought to use his classical predecessors as models for historical analysis, and in so doing provided a model of one striking way in which the classical past could be made relevant. He used references to figures and events of classical history to analyze and communicate meaning about contemporary events, whether they were intertextual, as with Belisarius' flirtation with various Thucydidean models of behavior,[346] or overt, as the complex comparison of Justinian to Cyrus and Alexander.[347] Classical modes of understanding history, and one's contemporary world, were something in which Procopius evidently saw great value.

Certainly, also, the *Wars* showcases more concrete, practical uses which memory of the ancient past could be to the world of the sixth century. His explanations of Latin and other specialized terminology, though they make subtle points about Roman identity, and are, of course, also a part of an overall Atticizing style, also seem to be in some cases intended to be genuinely helpful, supplying a word or meaning that was expected to be

---

[344] Ch 2, Part I, Section III
[345] Ch 2, Part II, Section II
[346] Pazdernik (2000) and (2006), Ch 2 pp 69-71 above
[347] See Kaldellis (2007) 260-2, and Ch 3 pp 116-8 above

unfamiliar. Additionally, the larger point Procopius makes with these asides, about the regrettable dissociation of familiarity with Latin from *Romanitas*, carries with it the suggestion that an increased knowledge of this terminology, and more generally the root meanings behind words, would serve his audience well in better understanding the world around them. Indeed, a better knowledge for his readers of the ways of the world and the functioning of history that is to be gained from such passages as those on the Amazons (8.3.5-11) or the meaning of "foederatii" (3.11.2-4) must be a primary motivating factor in their inclusion (at least ostensibly).

There is obvious, practical applicability in the knowledge to be gained from the past in the episode on the trumpeters' calls to the army to advance and retreat (6.23.26) with which we began the present study.[348] On the one hand, this passage highlights the wisdom and greater knowledge to be found in the study of the classical past. This is an element that can be found in quite a number of places and forms in the *Wars*: the information on revenues in Libya (4.8.25), the skill of construction of the walls of Amida (1.7.13) and the well of Auximus (6.27.19), the wisdom and nobility of past Roman leaders (3.3.15). However, not only does the trumpeters episode argue for a level of learning and skill that was greater in the classical past, but it also provides a model for how that knowledge can be of real use to contemporary Romans. This ability of historical memory to be of value to Procopius' contemporaries, well beyond the general moral and pedagogical value claimed by classical historiography as a genre, is a distinctive feature of Procopius' approach to history-writing.

---

[348] p 1, see also Ch 3 pp 164-7.

## Part II: Remembering and Forgetting in the Sixth Century

The particular goals that Procopius had in remembering—demonstrating the practical applicability of ancient knowledge, the value of classical historiography, and the centrality of historical memory to contemporary *Romanitas*—help us, in fact, to examine *how* he remembered: the functioning, the mechanics of memory in Procopius' text, and may even suggest something of how Procopius hoped to have his work contribute to the project of memory in the late antique world. "Preservation" of classical memory is accurate but vague: Procopius depicts a continuum of memory that is more complex than a hard line between remembered and forgotten, and advocates for pulling things out of the twilight of forgetfulness back into the bright light of contemporary consciousness and circulation. We can consider in this light episodes such as the description of the "ship of Aeneas" (8.22.8-25) and the trumpeters' different strains (6.23.23-27), as well as other elements of Procopius' style, like his interest in Latin terminology or the lost meanings behind words and names, and even his choice of the classical historiograhpic form for his history.

In fact, Procopius' depiction of the functioning of the process of remembering in a social context over a long stretch of time has much in common with Aleida Assmann's theories on the functioning of active and passive remembering.[349] She characterizes these

---

[349] As well as on his goals in remembering, see above, Ch 3, pp 166-7.

different forms of memory by means of the metaphor of a museum that displays in a gallery some works that are deemed important, while keeping many others in a storeroom:

> I will refer to the actively circulated memory that keeps the past present as the *canon* and the passively stored memory that preserves the past as past as the *archive*.[350]

Assmann explores the functioning of each, arguing that the memories of the canon are those that a culture keeps alive in the present with continual rehearsal of their cultural relevance, while

> At the other end of the spectrum, there is the storehouse for cultural relics. These are not unmediated; they have only lost their immediate addressees; they are de-contextualized and disconnected from their former frames which had authorized them or determined their meaning. As part of the archive, they are open to new contexts and lend themselves to new interpretations...[351]

Forgetting is a necessary part of this process of remembering, for not only does it clear the way for new memories to come to the fore, but the slippage of memory from canon to archive allows memories from the archive to eventually be repurposed in the construction of new schemes of memory, new formulations of identity. Viewing Procopius' characterization of the functioning of Roman memory in terms of Assmann's concepts of canon and archive helps us appreciate his understanding of his own role: the role of history in general and his history in particular, in this process.

Applying this schema to Procopius' writing, we can think of the classical literary tradition (historiographical and otherwise) as an archive of long-stored knowledge from

---

[350] Assmann, Aleida. "Canon and Archive" *Cultural Memory Studies: an Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. 97-107.
[351] *ibid.*

which Procopius can draw memories to aid him in his construction of the particular understanding of the ancient past that his history puts forward. The erudite references to historiographc debates on the division of Europe and Asia or the Latin derivations of military and administrative terms; the classical legendarium of the travels of heroes that pervades a history of a long-Christianized Roman Empire; and the very genre, with all its techniques and concerns in history-writing; all are pulled from the storehouse of classical knowledge and learning to be restructured, reformulated into a new version of ancient memory.

We can, furthermore, see in Procopius' text any number of cultural artifacts, material and not, on the point of slipping from the canon of Roman memory into the archive. These memories are not necessarily in danger of being completely forgotten or destroyed, but rather are on the point of loosing, or have already lost, their status of canonicity in the memory of the Romans. Others, like the knowledge of tax rates in Roman North Africa, have eluded the archive's safety net, and slipped out of memory altogether.

We might take for an example Procopius' treatment of the legend of the Palladium (5.15.5-14), a cultural memory once so central that it was likely not in danger of being completely forgotten, certainly not by the inhabitants of Rome whom Procopius claims to have spoken to about it. While the alternate accounts of the ultimate fate of the relic serves Procopius' (Herodotean) stylistic and problematizing ends, the extensive length and thoroughness of the passage and its prominent placement (just after Belisarius' first entry into Rome) suggest that Procopius positioned the passage, and handled it the

way he did, in order to make an argument for the importance of that memory, and its relationship to the momentous event that had just taken place: to shore up, in short, the canonical position of the Palladium in Roman cultural memory.

For those instances where Procopius records cultural remembering active in his own day—the ship of Aeneas and the house of Sallust are two examples we keep finding reason to return to—his efforts at preservation evoke a sense of danger to those memories and memorial practices, and his text serves, as we have explored, to transmute those cultural memories into historical memory. However, to stop there is to consider only Procopius' readers of future generations. His contemporary audience are prime targets of Procopius' memory agenda as well, for by promoting awareness of these intensely Rome-centric cultural memories among Constantinopolitan Romans, he increases their chances not only of surviving the vicissitudes of the war in Italy, but also becoming important in the cultural remembering of both eastern and western Romans. Procopius' literary efforts cannot reconstruct the housing for the ship of Aeneas should it fall into disrepair, but by preserving and circulating the memory, he can cement a place for it in the living, identity-constructing canon of Roman memory.

In the case of the episode of the ambushes at Auximus and adapting the memory of the trumpeters' calls, we can see Procopius pulling memories out of the "archive" and endowing them with new meaning and context. Whatever cultural cachet this skill might once have had (and perhaps it had little or none in particular), it has lost its original "frame" of reference in the archive of history. In Procopius' reworking the memory becomes a symbol for reconnecting with classical Roman skill and wisdom. In a similar

way, those physical sites of memory like the house of Sallust or the ship of Aeneas, in their afterlife as historical memories, represent not just the particular figures or events that they originally commemorated, but constitute a more generalized memorial of the Roman spirit of responsible curatorship of the past and the importance of ancient cultural memory to contemporary *Romanitas.* Procopius, far from being slavishly attached to a particular, traditional construction of Roman memory and identity, is skilled at drawing old (and new) memories together to construct a schema of Roman memory that is at once appropriate to the world of the sixth century and faithfully based in the stable, deep roots of a centuries-long tradition.

* * * *

We should also here take a step back and consider Procopius' own forgetting: the handful of factual mistakes, and the larger array of confusions, inconsistencies, and omissions which characterize areas of his own text's memory of the ancient world. In a few cases, Procopius seems to make outright errors in his historical information, or make references that indicate confusion or limited familiarity with his sources. He incorrectly attributes fortification of the Caspian Gates to Alexander the Great (1.10.8-10). He disregards or ignores the defeat of Varus as a classical precedent for the Romans' loss of their standards (7.4.31.32). He identifies the site of the Romans' and Goths' decisive battle as near that of Livy's *Busta Gallorum*, wheras, as Dewing observes, Livy placed the *Busta Gallorum* in the city of Rome itself.[352] He references Thucydides on the walls

[352] See above, pp 122-3.

of the Piraeus (1.93.5) in a manner quite inappropriate to his description of the Appian Way (5.14.8-10).[353] Individually, these infelicities and others like them could be chalked up to Procopius' use of intermediate sources which are themselves confused, or deliberate error on Procopius' part to convey some subtle point to knowledgeable readers,[354] but both are difficult to trace and even more difficult to prove. Taken together, moreover, they are very suggestive of the deep divide in time, space, and culture separating Procopius and the classical world the memory of which he seeks to (re)construct. When we speak of Procopius' memory of the ancient past, we need not assume or imagine that every detail he rememembered was factually, historically correct (nor does it greatly matter, ultimately, whether the mistake originated in Procopius' sources or with Procopius himself). Memory is, necessarily, a *re*-construction of the past, and if Procopius' remembering of the ancient Roman past differs from our own in certain respects, with our greater scholarly resources but even greater distance also, then we should be concerned not with identifying the "errors" in our author's memory, but with analyzing the vision of the past constructed out of so many diverse elements.

Let us recall once again Greatrex's investigation of historical memory in Procopius. He compared Procopius' references to the period of the Roman Republic to those of Ammianus Marcellinus, and they are much scarcer than those of his fourth-century predecessor. By considering the knowledge of the period displayed in authors contemporary with and later than Procopius, he concluded that Procopius must have had

[353] See above, pp 188.
[354] As Kaldellis suggests is the case with the Homeric bowmen comparison of the Introduction (1.1.6-16), see above pp _45-9 (Kaldellis (2004) 21-3).

more information about the Republic available to him than he chose to include, though likely less than Ammianus had had. Greatrex traces Procopius' and other sixth-century historians' scant references to the Republican past to a divide between classical historiography and antiquarianism, arguing that the former, in prioritzing the contemporary world, were only following the spirit of Thucydides and other classical historians. Greatrex's general conclusions on this point are compelling,[355] but need to be pursued further. It is not simply the priority of contemporary events and concerns (or of history that most resembles the present day[356]) that motivates and colors Procopius' presentation of the past, recent and distant, but the text's presentation (and the narrator-historians's self-presentation) of the state of Roman memory and contemporary identity. In his effort to construct historical memory and present a picture of *Romanitas* that is relevant, compelling, and adoptable for the contemporary sixth-century world, it would be counter-productive for Procopius to overload his narrative with a plethora of references to a distant and alien past. Rather, he concentrates on aspects of *Romanitas* that are more easily approachable to his Greek-speaking, eastern Roman readers: imperial history, the Latin of the bureacracy and the army, and a mythology that east and west, Latin-and Greek-speakers, have in common.[357] I beleive Procopius understood as well as

[355] Though I cannot agree with his further supposition that it was an awareness of the inferiority of Belisarius' forces to those at the height of Roman strength that led Procopius to demure from comparing his general to a Scipio or a Hannibal: Greatrex (1996b) 1-2, 5.
[356] Jeffreys (1979)
[357] We might also consider that Procopius chose other means to make such comparisons as he might have made between Belisarius and Hannibal: rather than an overt textual comparison (more overt, in any case, than the reference to the battle of Cannae he makes (7.18.19)), he engages in the more complex web of references and associations with the

anyone that in order for memory to function, for a "usable past" to be constructed, forgetting was just as important as remembering.

Part III: Memory and Landscape

In examining the causes for the "world-wide upsurge in memory" of the last few decades,[358] Pierre Nora theorizes that our self-conscious interest in memory and our own pasts is due to a break in continuity in the very collective memory on which the understanding of the past had rested for generations.[359] Nora, like Megill and others discussed in the Introduction,[360] draws a sharp distinction between memory and history, a division that drives and underpins contemporary society's obsession with memory as an object of study:

---

past on the sub-textual level, as Pazdernik, Kaldellis, and others have examined (pp 59-95 above.) This intertextual engagement with the ancient past and the historiographical tradition thus not only adds to his credentials as a historian and make his points about contemporary politics in a safe and politically savvy manner, but allows him to do so without detracting from or complicating his surface-level presentation of history.

[358] see pp 29-30 above

[359] In writing about this phenomenon in France, Nora cites several factors contributing to this break, including the diminishment of the French peasantry, the collapse of Marxism, and the end of the de Gaulle era: "Sociologists and historians had been writing about the end of the peasantry for fifteen years, but its demise suddenly became almost tangible and as painful as an amputation. It was the end of the prototypical "collective memory"... The ending of the rural era, soon accompanied by the ending of the mass in Latin, cut the umbilical cord that still connected France to what Jacques Le Goff has called the long Middle Ages of France and led to the growing popular success enjoyed ever since by the Middle Ages and its monuments." Nora, Pierre. (2002) "Reasons for the Current Upsurge in Memory." *Transit* 22:1-8

[360] pp 32-34 above.

> The "acceleration of history" thus brings us face to face with the enormous distance that separates real memory—the kind of inviolate social memory that primitive and archaic societites embodied, and whose secret died with them—from history, which is how modern societies organize a past they are comdemned to forget because they are driven by change...[361]

In Nora's scheme what we have been studying as "memory" or "historical memory" in Procopius would be simply "history," a self-conscious effort to reconstruct and reconnect with a past which one is aware of no longer inhabiting:

> Memory and history, far from being synonymous are thus in many respects opposed. Memory is life, always embodied in living societies, and as such in permanent evolution, subject to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, unconscious of the distortions to which it is subject... History, on the other hand, is the reconstruction, always problematic and incomplete, of what is no longer. Memory is always a phenomenon of the present, a bond tying us to the eternal present, history is a representation of the past.[362]

Differences in terminology aside, Nora's evocative descriptions of the contemporary memory scene, in fact, could be interestingly applied to Procopius' evocations of sixth-century Roman memory. In Procopius as well as his contemporaries (see immediately below), we can discern a sense of discontinuity with the ancient past, which makes the project of connecting with it all the more urgent (In Nora's dichotomy, "If the old ideal was to resrrect the past, the new ideal is to create a representation of it."[363]). Such a project, though, deserves not only a more in-depth reading of Nora than is possible here, but would be, I beleive, most fruitful if undertaken with an eye toward analyzing in this light not only Procopius, but a selection of his contemporaries, as well. Instead, let us

---

[361] Nora, P. (1996) ""General Introduction: Between Memory and History" in P. Nora, ed, *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*. 3 vols. Columbia University Press: New York (1996-8). 2
[362] *ibid* 3
[363] Nora (1996) 12

turn toward a particular facet of Nora's thought that sheds interesting light on a strain of Procopius' remembering to which we have often returned in the course of this study.

We mentioned above, quite briefly, Nora's concept of the *lieu de mémoire*.[364] A central manifestation of Nora's vision of the break between the "pure" memory of primitive societies and our own memory adulterated by history is the transition from *milieux de mémoire*, environments of memory, to *liex de mémoire*, sites of memory. While a society that is not separated from its traditional remembering dwells unselfconsciously in its environments of memory, "settings in which memory is a real part of everyday experience,"[365] by contrast Nora characterizes the modern world as obsessed with *lieux de mémoire*, in which we recognize the vestiges of memory and artificially attempt to fix them as touchstones of an identity we feel threatened or divorced from:

> If the expression *lieu de mémoire* must have an official definition, it should be this: a *lieu de mémoire* is any significant entity, whether material or non-material in nature, which by dint of human will or the work of time has become a symbolic element of the memorial heritage of any community...

Nora considers both literal, geographic or structural, sites as well as immaterial concepts, texts, and even persons, as such *lieux*. We will reserve consideration of the latter for the moment, for this concept is so useful to us in understanding the former in Procopius' work that it deserves uninterrupted consideration.

The landscape of Procopius' *Wars* is littered with *lieux de mémoire*, from the house of Sallust and the ship of Aneas, assiduously preserved by the Romans as

---

[364] p 174-6 above
[365] *ibid* 1

monuments to their national memory, to the ruins of cities and fortifications so evocative of the destruction that time and barbarians had wrought on the landscape of the empire. Some of these are *lieux* of cultural memory-history, as Nora envisions the phenomenon: constructed and reified, by the effort of the society, into touchstones of memory. In other cases, we cannot know only from his text to what exent these places were recognized and valued by sixth-century Romans, of east or west, more broadly. However, Procopius invests them, for his text and for us his audience, with symbolic significance, creating them as sites of his historical memory. We have seen again and again in the course of this study the importance of physical space to memory in Procopius' work, and considering the function of such places in the world of the text's and the sixth century's remembering helps us to undertand their power.

For Procopius, and for the sixth century world he represents in the *Wars*, the Romans' relationship with their past was as troubled and complicated as Nora depicts our own contemporary one to be. In his treatment of the Latin language, Roman customs, matters of religion, Procopius operates as conscious of a break in continuity with the past, and it is by dint of this that he must make his arguments for the continued relevance of classical memory in despite of this rupture. Procopius reaches out to the touchstones of *lieux de mémoire*, seemingly particularly drawn to those that he encountered in Rome, as well as desirous of creating his own. While the prominence of physical place and objects in Procopius' remembering speaks to the importance of the ancient past (to some) in the sixth century and to Procopius personally, the localizing of memory in particular places in the landscape is indicative of the transition, in some cases long accomplished, from a

"living memory" that dwells in the landscape to one that seeks to reconnect with and revivify that memory in the places where it it is felt the strongest. The crystallization of such sites, of memorials and monuments as well as rituals like Belisarius' triumph, as a means of "getting in touch" with the Romans' Roman past speak ultimately to the divide they percieved between it and themselves.

Many of those *lieux* which Procopius describes indicate a long-past transition from *milieux* to sites of memory: he depicts them as curated for generations by the Romans—espeically the inhabitants of Rome—as cultural memorials. In other cases, Procopius's text provides a window into this process as it occurred during the tumultuous time of the wars of Justinian: the city of Rome, especially, undergoes a transformation. At the start of the work it is the home of the living community which carries Roman memory in tradition, language, and preservation of memorials. Although almost certainly too sophisticated and self-conscious in their remembering to qualify as possessors of Nora's "true memory," they nevertheless in Procopius' depiction represent a continuity and lived tradition that is absent by the end of the work. Rome's physical memorials and population ravaged by the war, it is at the close of the work bereft of life, but not of significance. In its continued importance to the actors in the history, as well as its symbolic significance in the history itself, Procopius makes the city of Rome into a site of Roman memory. He is, to be certain, niether the first nor the last to do so, but one participant, and a self-conscious one at that, in a long line of Romans to invest the eternal city with quintessential significance to Roman memory. Procopius' treatment of the

phenomenon, however, is unique for its singular depiction of a crucial step in the city's transition from *milieu* to *lieu de mémoire*.

More than simply recording this transition, though, in some instances we can say that Procopius himself participates in it. We discussed above the way in which Procopius' descriptions of physical objects and landscapes—what we can now term sites of memory—works as a kind of memory *ekphrasis* to transmute the cultural memory of the community of Romans he depicts into the historical memory of the text.[366] Inasmuch as elements of the physical landscape such as the Appian Way and the the city of Rome were still parts of the living landscape as well as carrying cultural cachet to western Romans, used by sixth-century Italians much as they had been for centuries, they were still some sense *milieux de mémoire*. In his efforts to preserve their memory (the memory of them, and the memory that they represented), Procopius creates and solidifies them as *lieux de mémoire* for posterity: for his audience back in Constantiople and forward into the future, they exist solely as symbols of the memory of Rome.

We can also observe, as something of a side note, how the centrality of physicality to Procopius' remembering in the form of the *lieux de mémoire* impacts memory in the work more broadly. There is a common thread of decay over time, and survival in spite of the passage of time: the one triumphing, for a while, over the other. We can see this model of the effects of the passage of time not only in the physical embodiements of memory, but in others as well: the survival of knowledge (or not) in spite of the challenges of time, distance, and power; the tension between factual and

---

[366] above, pp 121-2.

mythic explanations of names, the survival of cultural practices. The forgetting that haunts Procopius' remembering shares much in common, as we saw above, with physical decay.[367]

As mentioned above, Nora envisions not only physical locations as potential sites of memory, but also such things as objects and ideas- anything which can be imbued with memory-related significance, can "become a symbolic element of the memorial heritage" of a community. In Procopius' text, physical objects—the classical Greek statues in the Forum of Peace in Rome , the treasures of Solomon's Temple looted first by the Romans and then by the Goths, and, of course, the Palladium—constitute a specialized subset of *lieux de mémoire*. Already invested with historical, memorial importance by the communities that took them from their original setting and installed them in a new one in an effort to co-opt their symbolic power, they are further reinforced as such by Procopius' treatment of them in the narrative, using their stories to weave together disparate threads of memory: Roman, Greek, Christian, barbarian. They provide an opportunity for Procopius to connect many layers of memory, from the very ancient through his present day, and look forward into the future. The world of Procopius' sixth century is one of a tumultuous past and uncertain future, particularly where the survival of ancient memory and the fate of sites of memory are concerned. In such a world *lieux de mémoire* which are moveable objects—trophies able to be taken from conquered lands, endangered relics "rescued" from the destruction which mught befall their

---

[367] See above, pp 149-173.

immovable locations—are both particularly relevant as a source of continuity and particularly poingant as a symbol of the embattled, uncertain state of ancient memory.

Part IV: The Instability of Roman Memory and Identity

In this work we have dealt with two complementary ways of talking about "Roman identity." On the one hand, in our investigation of *Romanitas*, we have considered the character of the Roman memories Procopius reaches for, and how he uses them. We have observed that in addition to very topical references to battles and emperors, Procopius is particularly interested in memories of the ancient past evoked by the landscape of Italy and the city of Rome. On the other hand, we have investigated at some length how Procopius apportions Roman identity: grants or withholds the identifier "Roman," and thus how he constructs different groups' identities and problematizes the eastern empire's identity as not wholly, not completely legitimately, Roman. This ultimately also addresses the character of *Romanitas* in Procopius' text, as it speaks to the criteria for inclusion among the Romans, or for exclusion from that identity. In Procopius' formulation, being Roman has to do with mutual protection and respect for your fellow Romans and their dignity, with concern for Roman memory and identity in a broader sense than your own personal memory, identity, and agenda. Being Roman means carrying Roman memory, and a Roman identity solidly based on that memory, forward into the future, not actively destroying or subverting it.

We have investigated in depth, in Chapter Four, Procopius' response to the competing claims to Roman identity of the Western, Italian Romans on the one hand, and the Eastern, imperial Roman forces on the other, a group of which Procopius himself was of course a part. This tension between East and West, however, was far from the only source of friction and instability in the articulation of a universal, or even broadly applicable, Roman identity in the mid-sixth century. We cannot, ultimately, understand Procopius' depiction of the past and relationship to memory by considering it in isolation. Every version of the past is articulated in relation, often in tension, with other, competing alternatives—past and present.[368] We sketched briefly, all the way back in the Introduction, the historical context in which Procopius lived and wrote. While there is limited space here to investigate the broader world of Roman cultural memory in the sixth century, we can survey in a little more detail a few of the other perspectives on the Roman past against which Procopius' own was articulated, and against which it competed.

Among the wealth of scholarship on classical and Late Antique attitudes toward the past, we should of course note the centrality of tradition and the past in providing precedent, a feature of Roman thought obviously still alive and well in the sixth century, as well as being widely available in the historiogrphic and other classical texts Procopius

---

[368] Consider again Cubitt, 203: "Whatever the perceived nature of the national community, and however strong its emphasis on its supposedly immutable character, representations of its past are always forged in tension with possible alternative conceptions, and are seldom simple replications of the way that past has been evoked previously."

and other men of letters were educated in.[369] In examining the work of John Lydus (see below), Michael Maas has wonderfully explicated the tension in the reign of Justinian over control and articulation of the past, especially the Roman past. He explores the intellectual environment in which Lydus (and likewise Procopius) wrote, in which the imperial efforts to prune undesirable pagan elements in "the search for a usable past" created an artificial dichotomy between pagan and Christian.[370] Justinian and his regime, furthermore, sought to co-opt the legitimizing function of the past for the imperial office and use it to characterize the emperor's program of reform as "restoration."[371]

Justinian's own "classicism" has been the subject of much debate: once generally accepted as the source of the renaissance of classical interest and learning during his reign, he has evolved in modern scholarly understanding into a religious conservative but administrative reformer and opportunist who had little interest in the classical past for its own sake.[372] Instead, Tony Honoré has persuasively demonstrated that the classical references in Justinian's legislation can be traced to his queastor Tribonian, in office from 529-532, and again from 535 to 542.[373] Furthermore, a series of historical prefaces to

---

[369] For more, see for example Croke, B and Emmett, A. (1983) "Historiography in Late Antiquity: An Overview" in B Croke and A Emmett, eds *History and Historiography in Late Antiquity*. Sydney, New York. 1-12.
[370] Maas (1991) 38- 52
[371] The scholarship that touches on Justinian's relationship to, and use of, the past is extensive. For a good introduction with recent bibliography, see Pazdernik, Charles. (2005) "Justinianic Ideology and the Power of the Past" in in Maas, M. *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 185-212
[372] Honoré, T. (1978). *Tribonian*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press., Maas?
[373] Honoré, 26ff. Indeed, Honoré argues that Tribonian himself, while thoroughly educated in the legal classics and especially indebted to the second-century legal scholar Gaius for his thought (246-7), looked to the classics of Roman law more as a model and a source of wisdom rather than any spirit of "slavish imitation," and had no qualms about

administrative reform legislation in Justinian's Novels (undertaken after the completion of the *Corpus Iuris Civilis* proper, in 535) presents a particularly bold use of the Roman pat by the regime.[374] The prefaces utilize a wealth of putative historical data, often quite incorrect or misrepresented, along with myths and legends, and "there is a striking emphasis on ancient titles of magistracies, methods of provincial administration, and ties between Rome and the provinces in the Roman Republic and earlier times."[375] Michael Maas has brilliantly analyzed these curious phenomena, demonstrating that despite the plethora of historical "facts" they contain, "They do not speak for a classicism independent of Christianity,"[376] but rather,

> Appeal to precedent... allowed the present to be explained and legitimized in terms of the past, even if in some cases the past had to be invented... Justinian exploited this conservative tendency in the reform prefaces for immediate goals, primarily to mask the growth of his absolutism, cultivate the educated classes, and disguise the innovative nature of his reforms... The very deliberateness of providing more or less phony precedent to mask contemporary reforms shows how volatile the accusation of innovation could be.[377]

---

disregarding them when necessary, an approach to the heritage of the classical world that certainly has something in common with Procopius' own:
"A deeper and more selective study of the classics was likely, he thought, to acquaint the student and lawyer with the best thinking, the most rational and humane solutions. But this implies no rigid preference for a classical rather than a modrn answer to legal problems... Tribonian's classicism in no way excludes the abandonment of classical solutions when they are unjust, inconveneint or incombatible with Christian ideals" (Honoré 253-4).
[374] Maas, Michael. 1986. "Roman history and Christian ideology in Justinianic reform legislation". *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. 40: 17-32.
[375] Maas (1986) 18
[376] *ibid* 18
[377] Maas (1986) 28

Justinian's approach to the classical and Roman past, then, seems to have been entirely dictated by, on the one hand, considerations of his own power and reforming policies, and on the other, an entirely Christian worldview.[378]

While the regime's emphasis on Justinian as a Christian emperor[379] would have not necessarily been unwelcome to Procopius or any of the authors discussed here, its concomitant hostility those elements of traditional Greco-Roman culture deemed too pagan, best epitomized in the closing of the Neoplatonic Academy in 529, surely made the imperial office's attempts to co-opt and rewrite Roman memory for its own propagandistic purposes ring all the more false in the ears of Procopius, Lydus, and others like them.

Indeed, we need not rely on our imaginations for Procopius' (and his contemporaries') sentiments toward Justinian's policies, for, while overt criticism of the regime was of course dangerous, this hardly stopped those ambivalent or hostile toward the emperor from finding a way to express their dissatisfaction. We have already seen, above in Chapter Two, some of the ways in which Procopius used intertextual reference to covertly criticize public figures including Justinian and even Belisarius in the *Wars*, and Kaldellis explores in depth many more.[380] Likewise, Maas sees in Lydus' writings an implicit criticism of Justinian's failure to preserve the traditional Roman magistracies

---

[378] For more, see Maas (1986) 29-31.
[379] See for example Moorhead, J. (1994) *Justinian.* London: Longman, 116ff, or Cameron's chapter in the *CAH*: (2000) "Chapter III: Justin and Justinian," Cameron, A., Bury, J. B., Bowman, A. K., eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History, XIV: Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors*, Cambridge University Press
[380] Kaldellis (2004, 2010a)

(see just below). Moreover, though, we have the wonderful resource of Procopius' *Secret History*, to give us insight into Procopius' disaffection with Justinian's regime.

Procopius' depiction of the emperor, his court, and his policies is of course a very hostile one in the *Secret History,* and his complaints range from regret over budget-cuts to the imperial postal system (*SH* 30.2) to, famously, lurid accusations that Justinian is in fact a demon and roams the imperial palace with his head tucked under his arm (*SH* 12.14-25). There are, however, several key trends that emerge in Procopius' portrayal of Justinian. Procopius rails against Justinian's persecution of "the Greeks," that is, pagans, at *SH* 11.26-40. There is, moreover, recurring criticism of Justinian's love of innovation for its own sake:

> καὶ φυλάσσειν μὲν τῶν καθεσταμένων ούδεν ἠξίου, ἅπαντα δὲ νεοχμοῦν ἐς ἀεὶ ἤθελε, καὶ, τὸ ξύμπαν εἰπεῖν, μέγιστος δὴ οὗτος ἦν διαξθορεὺς τῶν εὖ καθεστώτων. (*SH* 6.21)
>
> And he took no thought to preserve what was established, but he was always wishing to make innovations in everything, and, to put all in word, this man was an arch-destroyer of well-established institutions.

And again,

> ἃ γὰρ ἔμπροσθεν νόμῳ ἀπορρηθέντα ἐτύγχανεν ἐς τὴν πολιτείαν εἰσῆγε, τά τε ὄντα καὶ ξυνειθισμένα καθελὼν ξύμπαντα, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τούτῳ κεκομισμένος τὸ τῆς βασιλείας σχῆμα, ἐφ᾽ ᾧ ἅπαντα μεταλλάσσοι ἐφ᾽ ἕτερον σχῆμα. ἀρχάς τε γὰρ τὰς μὲν οὖσας ἀνῄρει, τὰς δὲ οὐκ οὖσας ἐφίστη τοῖς πράγμασι· τούς τε νόμους καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν τοὺς καταλόγους ταὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐποίει, οὐ τῷ δικαίῳ εἴκων οὐδὲ τῷ ξυμφόρῳ ἐς τοῦτο ἠγμένος, ἀλλ᾽ ὅπως δὴ ἅπαντα νεώτερά τε καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπώνυμα εἴη. (*SH* 11.1-2)
>
> **For things which previously had been forbidden by law he kept introducing into the constitution, and tearing down all existing institutions and those made familiar by custom**, as if he had put on the imperial garb on the condition that he should change all things also into another garb. For instance, he would depose the existing officials and appoint new ones in control of the State's

> business; **and he treated the laws** and the divisions of the army in the same way, not yielding to the demands of justice nor influenced to this course by any public advantage, **but simply that everything might be new and might bear the impress of his name.**

Procopius repeatedly charges that Justinian is bad specifically because he does not respect the past, does not take the proper care to preserve its memory and institutions. Justinian's disrespect and misuse of Roman memory seem to sit particularly ill with Procopius. He is, finally, particularly concerned with Justinian's changes in the legal realm: he mentions changes to the laws specifically in the passage above, and at *SH* 9.51 he deplores the way in which the repeal of the law which allowed him to marry Theodora would pave the way for other patricians to fall into the same trap.[381] As we will discuss just below, we have reason to suppose that Procopius was in fact reacting to the legal reforms and the propaganda contained therein in his hostile reaction to Justinian's legal reforms.[382]

---

[381] ἀδύνατον δὲ ὂν ἄνδρα ἐς ἀξίωμα βουλῆς ἥκοντα ἑταίρᾳ γυναικὶ ξυνοικίζεσθαι, νόμοις ἄνωθεν τοῖς παλαοτάτοις ἀπορρηθέν, λῦσαί τε τοὺς νόμους τὸν βασιλέα νόμῳ ἑτέρῳ ἠνάγκασε καὶ τὸ ἐνθένδε ἅτε γαμετῇ τῇ Θεοδώρᾳ ξυνῴκησε, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασι βάσιμον κατεστήσατο τὴν πρὸς τὰς ἑταίρας ἐγγύην... (*SH* 9.51)
But since it was impossible for a man who had attained to senatorial rank to contract marriage with a courtesan, a thing forbidden from the beginning by the most ancient laws, he compelled the emperor to amend the laws by a new law, and from then on he lived with Theodora as his married wife, and he thereby opened the way to betrothal with courtesans to all other men...

[382] pp 300-2 below. See also, though, Procopius' comments in the *Buildings* on Justinian's legal reforms, which suggest at least an awareness of the necessity for them, if we must from his other works suspect the sympathy with which he praises them:
πρὸς δὲ καὶ τοὺς νόμους λαβὼν τῷ τε παμπληθεῖς οὐ δέον γεγονέναι σκοτεινοὺς ὄντας καὶ ξυγχεομένους διαφανῶς τῷ ἀπ᾽ ἐναντίας ἀλλήλοις ἰέναι, καὶ τοῦ μὲν ὄχλου αὐτοὺς τῆς τερθρείας ἀποκαθάρας,

The chronicle of John Malalas offers a radically different picture of the ancient past from that presented in Procopius. Malalas, an Antiochene writing in the mid sixth century, sought to combine several different strains of history into a world chronicle. The universal history could trace its roots back to the Hellenistic period, but unlike earlier writers of universal history,[383] Malalas made the Judeo-Christian past the framework into which all other historical narratives were fit.[384] Thus, Malalas' chronicle begins with the creation of Adam and works several references to ancient eastern sages such as the Indian astronomer Gandoubarios (I § 7) into Old Testament geneaology, before introducing Kronos and his son, Picus Zeus, as ancient rulers of a race of giants descended from Shem, the son of Noah (I § 9).[385] The chronicle is organized first by generations in the Old Testament and legendary period (Books I-V), and thereafter by rulers, from Assyrian, Persian and Seleucid (Books VI-VIII), to Roman emperors, beginning with

---

τὸ δὲ ἐς ἀλλήλους διχοστατεῖν βεβαιότατα κρατυνόμενος διεσώσατο. (*B* 1.1.10)
Moreover, finding the laws obscure because they had become far more numerous than they should be, and in obvious confusion because they disagreed with each other, he preserved them by cleansing them of the mass of their verbal trickery, and by controlling their discrepancies with the greatest firmness...

[383] As, for example, Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysus of Halicarnasus. From another angle, one could consider such works of ecclesiastical history as Eusebius' world histories; in this case, what separates Malalas' work is not only the chronicle format, but the attempt to fit not only secular, but "pagan" elements into the Judeo-Christian framework.

[384] Croke, B. "Malalas, the Man and his Work" in: Jeffreys, E., Croke, B. &, Scott, R. (1990). *Studies in John Malalas*. Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1-25. 1, Malalas' preface announces his two-fold intent to combine the Christian history of the chroniclers such as Eusebius with world history "from Adam to the reign of Zeno and those who ruled afterward." (P 5)

[385] References are to the translation of Jeffreys et al: John Malalas. Ed. E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, R. Scott, & B. Croke. *The chronicle of John Malalas*. (1986). Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies. For the Greek text, see the recent edition Malalas, J., & In Thurn, H. (2000). *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Julius Caeasr (Book IX), all the way down to Justinian (Book XVIII).[386][387] Along the way, Malalas includes a great deal of classical legend and Greco-Roman history (the Trojan War (Book V), the foundation of Rome (Book VII), the rise of Julius Caesar (IX § 1-7), and so on) but often with historical details altered or condensed. Classical myth and legend is twisted and bent to fit into a Judeo-Christian structure,[388] while non-monarchical periods in history are treated lightly,[389] and the narrative of the historical periods is often centered around the history of Antioch, Malalas' home city.[390]

Thus, while the chronicle contains a far greater amount of Greco-Roman history, including events in classical Greece or Republican and early imperial Rome, than does Procopius' history, the "facts" and the narrative of the classical past is subordinated into a uniquely sixth-century worldview, one which prioritizes Christian and local (in this case, Antiochene) memory in structuring the narrative of its past. Malalas seems to have had little familiarity with Latin, though through his sources he includes many brief references to major Latin authors, as when he attributes the fate of Pompeius Magnus to Lucan and

---

[386] Jeffreys, E. (1990b). "Chronological Structures" in Jeffreys, E., Croke, B. &, Scott, R. *Studies in John Malalas*. Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies. 111.-166

[387] The chronicle may have originally extended as far as 574, but the primary manuscript breaks off in 563, just before the death of Justinian. Croke 1-2.

[388] Jeffreys, (1990a) 62-66. Malalas' approach to the Greco-Roman mythological canon in euhemerizing: he regularly rationalizes divine figures into ancient rulers who were subsequently deified: i.e., Picus Zeus (I § 9), Dionysios (II § 24), and Poseidon (II § 8). Malalas' rationalizing explanation as to why this occurred, the gratitude of subjects for benefactions and institutions, traces its roots back to Diodorus Siculus, at least (Jeffreys 1990a 62).

[389] See Jeffreys (1979)

[390] Croke 6-11, Jeffreys, (1990a) 55-59.

notes the *floruit* of Livy (IX § 2). Jeffreys analyzes Malalas' sense of the past in discussing his treatment of custom and festival:

> Malalas would seem to have viewed the past and present as a seamless whole: though he could envisage civic customs as having had an origin at a specific point in time, he does not seem to consider either that these customs could subsequently change in any way or that the community in which they were developed could have differed radically from the one that he knew. Thus a state of any sort must be ruled by a βασιλεύς, an emperor: all rulers in the early books of the chronicle are referred to in this way with the title used subsequently of the rulers in Rome and Constantinople.[391]

This is, of course, quite different from Procopius' interest in historical change (for all that Procopius can also imagine continuity of custom and culture over a long stretch of time).[392] Features of this worldview like this and the devaluing of Greco-Roman memory at the expense of Christian and local might well have made devotees of classical learning feel that the classical past they valued was under threat.

Certainly another sixth-century author who wrote during Justinian's reign seems to have felt that the Roman past was in danger of being forgotten. John the Lydian, or Lydus, was a mid-level bureaucrat in the office of the praetorian prefect in Constantinople. Lydus authored several treatises in the mid-sixth century[393] on particular elements of Roman culture: *de Mensibus*, on the Roman calendar, *de Ostentis*, on the interpretation of portents, and *de Magistratibus*, on the magistracies of the empire, particularly his own praetorian prefecture. The subjects and style of Lydus' works speak

---

[391] Jeffreys (1990ba) 62

[392] For more on the comparison between Malalas on the one hand and Procopius and other sixth-century writers on the other, see Scott, R, "Malalas and his Contemporaries" in Jeffreys, E., Croke, B. &, Scott, R. *Studies in John Malalas*. Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies. 67-85, esp. pp 69-72.

[393] See Maas (1991) 10 and notes for bibliography on the contested dating and sequence of the three treatises.

to the tensions their author felt regarding the control and use of the past in Justinian's reign:

> At the same time, the treatises are handbooks that collect interesting and useful data in order to preserve it. Their custodial function carries an edge of political criticism; it is implied that is a properly run empire such material would not be at risk. There is also the implication that discontinuity results in disaster. Lydus posits a society in decline. As a defense of ancient knowledge for its own sake, Lydus' writings illuminate one aspect of Justinian's efforts against "paganism."[394]

Maas also notes the centrality of the Roman past for Lydus,[395] the absence of any Christian material or sentiment, and the perception of history as a cycle of generation and decay to be found in Lydus' works, especially *de Magistratibus* (where he hopes for the restoration of the praetorian prefecture).[396]

Thus at first glance Lydus, with his interest in preserving Roman cultural memory, would seem to have much more in common with Procopius than did Malalas or Justinian's regime. However, Lydus' pieces, while they seem to be motivated by contemporary concerns about Justinian's policies enforcing a rigid distinction between pagan and Christian,[397] still tend more toward antiquarianism. Lydus was certainly reacting to present circumstances in choosing his subject matter, but he seems to have been motivated primarily out of fear of discontinuity with the ancient Roman past,[398] cataloguing obscure ancient knowledge for the sake of its preservation. The ancient past is valued *de facto*, as the past. To return to Assmann's terms, we might say that Lydus'

---

[394] Maas (1991) 117
[395] This includes a thorough knowledge of, and desire to promote the status of, the Latin language (Maas (1991) 30ff).
[396] Maas (1991) 83ff
[397] Maas (1991), esp 1-11
[398] Maas (191) 53ff

handbooks seek to preserve the knowledge he values in the archive, rather than trying to promote the memories' return to the canon.[399]

* * * *

These many perspectives on the value and use of Roman memory speak on the one hand to the importance of memory of the ancient past, in one way or another, in sixth-century Byzantium, and on the other to the instability of Roman memory, and the instability of Roman identity that that implies.[400] We have noted a number of times Megill's axiom, "When identity becomes uncertain, memory rises in value," and its applicability to Procopius' time and work. We would do well now to consider a fuller elaboration of this thought. Here, Megill is discussing the inapplicabilty of Halbwach's models of memory to a modern world in which identity is often unstable:

> In contrast, the most characteristic feature of the contemporary scene is a lack of fixity at the level of identity, leading to the project of constructing memory with a view to constructing identity itself. The appropriate model for understanding such a context is less Halbwach's than Benedict Anderson's. In Anderson's evocative phrase, it is a matter of "imagined communities;" we might think of imagined communities as imagined identities. Of course, every community beyond a very small group is in some strong sense "imagined." The more a community is imagined, the more it finds that "memory" is necessary to it—and so is "forgetting." Conversely, the less rooted the community is in extant and well-functioning practices—that is, the more problematic its identity—the more constitutive for it is its "remembered" past."[401]

[399] See, however, Maas' arguments at 116-7 (1991) for Lydus' perception of some of the material in *de Magistratibus* as relevant and useful in the restoration of the office.
[400] cf Maas (1991) 40-41
[401] Megill, Allan. "History, Memory, Identity" in Megill, A., Shepard, S., & Honenberger, P. (2007). Historical knowledge, historical error: A contemporary guide to practice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 41-62.

The importance of memory (of one kind or another) in these sixth-century texts, Procopius' not least, suggests "a lack of fixity at the level of identity," and their differing perspectives on how to remember the Roman past offer different interpretations of Roman identity—what it meant to be Roman—in the sixth century. The many different "remembered pasts" competing to be constitutive for Roman identity belie an empire "less rooted... in extant and well-functioning practices," an issue we can see Procopius addressing as he seeks to remind his readers of things like Latin word-origins and meanings, the classical and Roman history of the landscape, and so on.

This instability and negotiation in Roman memory has been recogonized in the discourse of other Justinianic authors. Maas noted above the "volatility" of the the sixth-century memory scene where accusations of innovation were concerned;[402] elsewhere he characterizes the avoidance of the charges of innovation by "presenting imperial effort as restorative. This required finding adequate precedent, or, in other words, redefining the past to fit present needs."[403] Eslewhere, Roger Scott has in fact drawn on the similarity of topics between Malalas' information on Justinian's reign in Book 18 of his chronicle and Procopius' accusations in the *Secret History* to argue that, on the one hand, Malalas was drawing more or less directly from imperial propaganda. On the other, one of these sources, Procopius or the propaganda, was almost certainly responding to the other, though we cannot know which is which.[404]

---

[402] Maas (1986) 28
[403] *ibid* 31
[404] Scott, R. (1985) "Malalas, The Secret History, and Justinian's Propaganda" *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 39, 99-109.

We should also note that tenuous relationship with the traditions and practices of its Roman past and problematic identity in the sixth century meant that, of the several competing versions of the remembered Roman past, the one that could win out over the others stood to gain a great deal, to become particularly influential by becoming the dominant memory of the ancient past, and being "the more constitutive" for the Eastern Roman Empire, going forward. Surely the official memory, conveyed to us in imperial legislation but presuamably pervasive in Justinian's Constantinople, had the edge, so to speak, but educated, invested elites like Procopius and John Lydus certainly weren't going down without a fight. Thus the vitriol of the *Secret History* reflects Procopius' intense concern for, and historian's expertise in manipulating, historical memory.

All this throws Procopius' own portrayal of the past, and especially of the relationship between ancient past and present, into sharper focus against the context of the memory-culture of Justinian's reign. Procopius' emphasis on the utility and relevance of the classical past charts a path between two opposing viewpoints, one devaluing the Greco-Roman past at the expense of the Judeo-Christian, and the other elevating it primarily for its own sake, because it is traditional.[405] Procopius argues against both. In the midst of a riot of new and old genres for addressing the place of the ancient past in the contemporary world, Procopius chose one of the oldest and most traditional. He makes every effort to craft his work into a paragon of classical historiography, while at the same time taking pains to report in detail the events of his own day and addressing contemporary concerns about the nature of power and the effects

[405] Recall Procopius' charting of a similar middle course in the use of Herodotus and ancient authority in geographic debate (8.6.9-15), pp 85-89 above.

of war. He demonstrates, in short, the inimitable value of classical historiography for understanding both the past and the present. Procopius is keen to portray the importance of the specifically Roman past in the formation of contemporary Roman identity, as with the periphrases and references to Roman history. He emphasizes (in response, we might imagine, to the viewpoints represented by both Malalas and Justinian) the importance of accurate information about the past, and regrets the difficulties that stand in the way of that enterprise.

We have something of a clearer idea now of the tensions that inhabited and delimted sixth-century Roman memory, though there is, I am certain, much more to uncover and explore. We can understand Procopius' themes in representing memory and Roman identity in his own work as one writer's perspective on which tensions were the most important, most worth contesting, as well as which side he was on. In the pull between Christian and classically-rooted memory, Procopius is not precisely (usually) against the former, as he is for the latter. Christianity is not ignored or denied, but it is viewed through a classicizing lens, using archaic language and imagining narratorial distance. This is, of course, in stark contrast, and perhaps deliberate opposition, to the approach of Malalas and Justinian to view the classical past in a Christian context.

The tension between the eastern and western spheres of the Roman world and Roman memory, which played such a role in our analysis in Chapter Four, is less easy to contextualize with our quick survey of eastern authors, though if we had time to investigate memory and Roman identity in writers of the western Roman world we might find much of interest. We should also remember Justinian's characterization in legislation

of the wars in the west as wars of re-conquest and re-incorporation.[406] It is telling that the east-west tension does not seem to be a major concern for other authors of the period in Constantinople; it suggests that Procopius' emphasis on this dichotomy is not only an argument for one side over the other, but rather an attempt to raise awareness of it as an issue that deserves addressing. Procopius' unique position as Belisarius' aide, well-read in the classics and well-traveled in the classical lands, would have made him uniquely sesitive to the problematic nature of imperial identity and involvement in Italy and the west.

A final tension, less easy to define, drew from and built upon these others. Both the geographical divide and the cultural and religious distance from the classical past combined with the considerable temporal distance to heighten the challenge of relating to the ancient past in the sixth-century. This distance, and the cultural forgetting that it facilitated, allowed John Malalas to butcher and squeeze Greco-Roman myths into an alien Christian framework. At the same time John Lydus, motivated by fear of that distance and forgetting, insisted with his works that the distance should not be allowed to be operative, that the details of ancient Roman cultural practices were both worthy of remembering and (in the case of the praetorian prefecture at least) re-implementing in sixth-century society.

Procopius does not deny the length of time that separates the classical past from his present day, he does not minimize it in an attempt to disregard or overcome it as an obstacle to making the past relevant. Rather, he acknowledges the vast sweep of time

---

[406] See above p 214, n 301

and engages with the challenges it presents; from the survival of accurate knowledge of the past, to the relevance of such far distant events and practices (we have often returned to the incident with the trumpet-calls and similar passages, but other features deserve mention here as well, such as Procopius' use of modern evidence to address historical questions, like the historical existence of the Amazons or where to divide the continents). He recognizes historical change and and he makes his case for the continued relevance of classical memory in response to and taking into account the historical distance between that version of the Roman world and his own. He sees continuity in spite of rupture.

However, it is of course not only the writings of other authors that create the context in which Procopius wrote, but the actions and events of his day. Procopius lauds efforts to preserve cultural memory even as he fears its ability to survive the upsets of the present, for the wars of Justinian form not only the subject of the history but a major feature of the backdrop against which Roman memory and identity are formulated in Procopius' history. In addition to informing Procopius' awareness of the paradoxical nature of eastern Roman identity operating as it was in the western empire, the wars and the destruction they bring to Italy color the final books of Procopius' narrative as he contemplates the possibilities for survival of Roman cultural memory into the future. Like its intellectual counterpart, the contestation of Roman identity, the warfare of the present is more of a threat to ancient cultural memory than the long stretch of intervening years. The charges for both these developments, of course, Procopius can lay sqaurely at the feet of Justinian. However enthusiastic Procopius may have been at the start of the enterprise (and the early books of the *Wars* certainly give the impression that he was at

least moderately so), by the close of his history he condemns the destructive power of wrong, of mis-used, memory. The tragedy of Procopius' *Wars* is that one man's ultimately wrong-headed view of what it meant to be Roman and how the Roman past should be used should so threaten what was a truer, more valid Roman identity.

* * * *

This brings us, ultimately, to the crux of what cultural memory adds to the study of Procopius and the sixth century. It helps us understand how Procopius' relationship with the past, including the referencess he does and does not include, even his classicizing style, is influenced by not only the distance from his classical models, but the instability in Roman identity created by the historical moment and his position in it. It highlights the paradox, the memory-related tension of the re-conquest and of Justinian's policies. Procopius is working at balancing identities, making room for one that is at once more (accurately) classically-inspired and acknowledges the distance from the classical past.

We ourselves perceive Justinian's empire and its inhabitants as not quite, not unmixedly, Roman: we perceive a break (or what amounts to one in the accumulation of so much distance). This has been reflected in the scholarship on this period of Late Antiquity: even, and even especially, that which treats Procopius as the last great writer of antiquity. We are convinced by his own protests, by a self-presentation which is part of a larger and complex stance on the relevance of classical memory to his contemporary world. Focusing on memory (cultural, social, historical) and utlizing the theories and

approaches of cultural memroy studies allows us to consider in a nuanced way sixth-century-Romans' own perceptions of their ties with the past; to, with, and from memory. What do they remember and why, how do they percieve historical change and the passage of time? How do they understand their relationship with their own past: as one of continuity or one of rupture, and how are these reflected, deliberately and unconsciously, in their works? The unhelpful answer to the central question is, of course, both: we have seen in Procopius and in our brief survey of other authors a classical past that was contested, no longer simple; but still relevant, one that was retreating rapidly into the background but loomed so large in the rearview mirror of history that it could not be ignored.

On the other hand, these considerations also highlight what the study of memory in the sixth century can add to the field of memory studies more broadly. It presents and opportunity to look at an unparalleled *longé dureé* of memory: a society with almost as much history, as much memory, as our own contemporary world, and oftentimes as complex and troubled a relationship with it. Examining the viccissitudes of cultural and historical memory in Late Antiquity can help us undertand and put in better perspective our relationship with our own past, and how unique, or not, our own memory-culture really is.

## Postscript: What Might Have Been

We spoke, at the beginning of the present undertaking, of the time of Procopius' writing as a moment of great historic potential, ultimately unfulfilled. The wars of Justinian offered the powerful possibility, evident in the optimism of the early books of Procopius' *Wars*, of the re-unification of the empire. Had that been the case, there would have been opportunity, to say nothing of political benefit, to working to re-integrate the sundered halves of Roman cultural memory. We can see Procopius begin to address this in his consideration of the competing claims of *Romanitas* in each half of the divided empire (among other features). Even at the point where the *Wars* leaves off, the campaign was going well for the imperial forces, for all that Procopius himself seems to have become disillusioned with the war and the damage it had done to Italy, the Romans, and Rome. Thus, as a final thought, I would like to consider briefly what the cultural and historical memory situation might have been had Justinian's wars been less protracted and had his successors managed to hold on to Italy for more than a few years before loosing it to another set of barbarians.

The disjunction of cultural memory between the eastern and western Roman worlds in the sixth century deserves its own book-length study, but we can touch on a few telling facets in these last pages. We have discussed above, in the course of examining Procopius' efforts to counteract them, the way in which Italian-, Latin-, and Rome-based remembering, such as familiarity with the Latin language and

terminomogy,[407] or knowledge of sites of memory and practices of curation in Italy and Rome, were slipping out of the Eastern canon of Roman memory. The picture, however, was far from simple, as the eastern empire could make by far the better claim to upholding the traditions of classical education. The schools of Constantinople and Gaza, the law school at Berytus, and others, continued not only classical *paidea*, which of course included use of many *exempla* drawn from Roman history, but the study of Roman law as well. The paradox is beautifully illustrated by an irony pointed out by Michael Maas in his study of John Lydus. Lydus, in his account of the origins of the praetorian prefecture, traces the office to a lieutenant of Romulus and the foundation of Rome. The Italian Roman statesman Cassiodorus, in his *Variae* (VI.3), roots the prefecture not in secular Roman memory, but in the Judeo-Christian past: he gives Joseph's service to Pharaoh as its ultimate origin.[408] For Cassiodorus and his audience, it was the Christian past that was the more relevant, the more compelling. Not for nothing could the eastern empire make a claim to true Roman heritage. Moreover, these threats and destablizing forces from both east and west made Procopius' mission of preservation and re-integration of Roman memory all the more urgent.

---

[407] Certainly, knowledge of Latin had never been as prevalent in the east as where it was a native language, and it use was becoming more and more specialized, restricted largely to the legal profession and the military. An interesting wrinkle, however, is presented by the fact that the emperors Justin and Justinian were from one of the few Latin-speaking regions remaining in the eastern empire, and spoke Latin as their first language. See further Honoré, 25 and notes, on the text of several Novels. What then we are to make of Procopius' engagement with this facet of *Romanitas* is difficult to say. Perhaps he desired to conceptually "take back" Latin from the emperor who would use the Latin language and Roman memory for purposes he found so undesirable.

[408] Maas (1991) 83-4

This brings us to the final "what if": what if Justinian's wars had succeeded in a feat that was never their original goal, and re-united the two halves of the sundered empire? The answer, of course, is far from simple, even in the relatively circumscribed purview of Roman cultural memory, for the separate parts of the empire had been drifting apart for long years before the arrival of Odoacer or Theoderic, and what it meant to be a Roman was already significantly different in each. To the extent that some attempt, some gesture towards re-integration of Roman identity and Roman memory would have been made, we may be sure that it would have followed the age-old patterns of memory-construction where power is involved. Geoffrey Cubitt phrases it well when he notes that reconciliation often occurs by "subjugating the interests and marginalizing the memories of some who had a stake in the original conflict."[409] It is highly likely that Western Roman memory: of the wars of the 530s and 540s, of the actions of Theoderic and the events leading up to the fifth-century separation of east and west, of the city of Rome itself, as well as those pertaining to the more ancient past; would have been "subjugated" to a Byzantine schema of remembering. Something of the Roman memory that Procopius valued and aspired to—something authentic, intrinsically Roman—was doomed when Belisarius landed on Italian soil, and would have been lost whatever the outcome of the war.

---

[409] Cubitt 230

**Appendicies**

**Table 2.1: Selected Herodotean Digressions in the *Wars***

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.4.14-31 | story of Perzoes' pearl |
| 3.2.1-6 | description of Goths and their customs |
| 3.23 | discussion of Vandals' ancestral home, those who stayed behind in Europe |
| 5.9.4-5 | a "Hebrew" conducts an oracle with 3 groups of pigs, who represent the Goths, the Italians, and the emperor's army |
| 5.12 | ethnography and history of Franks |
| 5.20.1-4 | an oracle in two boys' wrestling match |
| 5.24.25-27 | a mosaic of Theoderic predicts Gothic misfortune by falling apart |
| 6.14 | ethnography of Eruli (human sacrifice, bestiality) |
| 6.15 | further digression on Thule (Scandinavia?): 40 days of sun in summer and 40 days of night in winter (credits eyewitnesses), customs, human sacrifice |
| 6.17.3 | miraculous happening: she-goat nurses an infant |
| 6.20.29 | two women who killed 17 travelers during a famine |
| 6.25.4 | ethnography; Frankish axes |
| 7.1.40s | several similar stories about wives and plots and betrayal |
| 7.14 | ethnography, religion of Sclaveni and Antae (explicitly not related to narrative, but something Procopius heard while in Constantinople) |
| 8.5.7-12 | *logos* about how the Cimmerian people used to not cross water, but after a young hunter following a deer did, now they do |
| 8.14.38 | the Persians use elephants in siege of Archaeopolis, a similar case happened at the siege of Edessa and the Romans countered by suspending a squealing pig from the walls; speaking of Edessa, a story about a 2-headed baby that's a portent that the East will be fought over by 2 sovereigns |
| 8.20.11-41 | lengthy digression about a king, his son, and the Angili princess who is slighted by them and gathers an army to herself to enforce their original marriage contract |
| 8.20.42-46 | the island of Britia is divided East-West by a wall, the East side s good, the West side is deadly, and has snakes |
| 8.20.47-58 | further story which Procopius doubts but will report because it is such a common tale, that fisherman on the coast are called from their sleep to ferry the souls of the dead across the channel to Britia |
| 8.24.34-39 | on the occasion of Totilla re-taking Corsica and Sardinia, Procopius uses this last opportunity to tell about a poisonous plant on Sardinia: you die laughing, hence "sardonic" laughter; on Corsica are apes like men and mini-horses the size of sheep |

**Table 2.2: Explanatory Asides in the *Wars*, Roman/Latin Words**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.22.3-4 | Roman centernarium/ *centum* | ἕλκει δὲ λίτρας τὸ κεντηνάριον ἑκατὸν, ἀφ᾽ οὗ δὴ καὶ ὠνόμασται. κέντον γὰρ τὰ ἑκατὸν καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι. | Now the 'centenarium' weighs one hundred pounds, for which reason it is so called; for the Romans call one hundred 'centum.' |
| 1.24.11 | *queastor* | Τριβουνιανὸς δέ... Βασιλεῖ πάρεδρος. κοιαίστωρα τοὐτον καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι. | Tribunianus...was counsellor to the emperor; this person the Romans call 'queastor.' |
| 2.1.7 | *Strata,* an area south of Palmyra | Στρᾶτα γὰρ ἡ ἐστρωμένη ὁδός τῇ Λατίνων καλεῖται φωνῇ. | for 'Strata' signifies a paved road in the Latin tongue. |
| 2.26.29 | *agesta*, a siege mound | ...τὴν ἄγεσταν... (οὕτω γὰρ τὸ ποιούμενον τῇ Λατίνςν φωνῇ ἐκάλουν Ῥωμαῖοι). | ...the agesta (for thus the Romans used to call in the Latin tongue the thing they were making). |
| 2.29.25 | *clisurae*, narrow passes | κλεισούρας ἑλληνίζοντες τάς τοιαύτας ὁδοὺς Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν. | The Romans call the roads through such passes 'clisurae' when they put their own word in a Greek form. |
| 3.1.6 | "Septem," a fort | Σέπτον καλθῦσι τὸ ἐκείνῃ φροῦριον οἱ ἐπιχώπιοι, λόφων τινῶν ἑπτὰ φαινομένων ἐνταύθα. το γὰρ σέπτον ἑπτὰ τῇ Λατίνων φωνῇ δύναται. | Septem is the name given by the natives to the fort at that point, since seven hills appear there; for 'septem' has the force of 'seven' in the Latin tongue. |
| 3.4.7 | *domesticus* | ὁ δὲ τῶν ἀπορρήτων Ἄσπαρι ἔφη κοινωνὸς εἶναι. δομέστικον δὲ τοῦτον τῇ σφετέρᾳ γλώσσῃ καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι. | And he replied that he was a confidential advisor of Aspar; such a person the Romans call 'domesticus' in their own tongue. |
| 3.6.10 | "Mercurium," a town | Ἑρμοῦ δὲ νεὼς ἐνταῦθα ἐκ παλαιοῦ ἐτύγχανεν ὤν, ἀφ᾽ οὗ δὴ καὶ Μερκούριον ὁ τόπος ἐκλήθη. οὓτω γὰρ τὸν Ἑρμήν καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι. | Now it so happened that a temple of Hermes had been there from of old, from which fact the place was named Mercurium; for the Romans call Hermes 'Mercurius.' |
| 3.10.3 | *praetor* | ὅ...ἔπαρχος, ὅν δὴ πραίτωπα καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι | ...the praetorian prefect, whom the Romans call 'praetor' |
| 3.11.2-3 | *foederati* | ...φοιδεράτων... φοίδερα γὰρ τὰς πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους σπονδὰς καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι | foederati... for the Romans call treaties with their enemies 'foedera.' |
| 3.11.4 | *domesticus* (2) | Σολόμον, ὃς τὴν Βελισαριοίυ ἐπετρόπεθε στρατηγίαν. δομέστικον τοῦτον καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι | Solomon, who was acting as a monager for the general Belisarius; such a person the Romans call 'domesticus.' |
| 3.16.12 | *veredarii*, | ξθλληφθέντα δὲ καί τινα τῶν ἐς | And they captured also one |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | gov't post riders | τὰς βασιλικὰς ἀποκρίσεις ἀεὶ στελλομένων, οὓς δὴ βεριδαρίους καλοῦσι. | of those who are occasionally sent to bear the royal responses, whom they call 'veredarii.' |
| 3.16.1 | *optio* | Ἰςάννῃ... ὅς οἱ ἐπεμελεῖτο τῆς περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν δαπάνης. ὀπτίωνα τοῦτον καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι | ...to John, who was in charge of the expenditures of the general's household; such a person the Romans call 'optio.' |
| 4.3.28 | *December* | μεσοῦντος μάλιστα τοῦ τελευταίου μηνός, ὃν Δεκέμβριον Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσι. | ...at about the middle of the last month, which the Romans call 'December.' |
| 4.10.4 | *bandifer*, who carries a general's standard | ὁ δὲ ἕτερος... τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ στρατηγοῦ ἐν ταῖς παρατάξεσιν εἰωθὼς φέρειν, ὃν δὴ βανδοφόρον καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι | the other... was accustomed to carry the standard of the general in battle; such an officer the Romans call 'bandifer.' |
| 4.12.17 | *excubitores* | ὃς τῶν ἐξκουβιτώρων ἡγεῖτο (οὕτω γὰρ τοὺς φύλακας Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσι) | ...who led the 'excubitores' (for thus the Romans call their guards) |
| 4.13.33 | "Shield Mountain" | Ὄρος Ἀσπίδος τῇ σφετέρα γλώσσῃ καλοῦσι Λατῖνοι τὸν χῶρον. | The place is called "Shield Mountian" by the Latins in their own tonuge. |
| 4.20.12 | *optio* (2) | Γέζων ἦν τις ἐν τοῖς στρατιώταις πεζός, τοῦ καταλόγου ὀπτίων εἷς ὃν αὐτὸς ἀνεγέγραπτο· οὕτω γὰρ τὸν τῶν σθντάξεων χορηγὸν καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι. | There was a certain Gezon in the army, a foot-soldier, 'optio' of the detachment; for thus the Romans call the paymaster. |
| 4.26.26 | *casula* | ... ἱμάτιον ἀμπεχόμνος... δούλῳ ἤ ἰδιώτῃ παντάπασι πρέπον· κασοῦλαν αὐτὸ τῇ Λατίνων φωνῇ καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι. | ...clad in a garment... appropriate to a slave or private person; this garment the Romans call 'casula' in the Latin tongue. |
| 5.4.1 | *patrimonium*, estates belonging to the royal household | ...τοὺς ἀγροὺς ἀφελέσθαι οὐδενὶ λόγῳ, τούς τε ἄλλους ἅπαντας καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστά γε τὴν βασίλειον οἰκίαν αὐτήν, ἣν δὴ πατριμώνιον Ῥωμαῖοι καλεῖν νενομίκασι. | ...he had without cause seized their estates, taking not only all private estates but especially those of the royal household, which the Romans are accustomed to call 'patirmonium.' |
| 5.11.1 | *Regata*, a city | ...ἐς χωπίον ξθννελέγνσαν Ῥώμης ὀγδοήκοντα καὶ διακοσίους σταδίους διέχον, ὅπερ Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσι Ῥεγάτα· | ...they gathered at a place two hundred and eighty stades from Rome, which the Romans call Regata. |
| 5.11.2 | *Decenovium*, a river | ῥεῖ δὲ καὶ ποταμός, ὃν Δεκεννόβιον τῇ Λατίνων φωνῇ καλοῦσιν οἱ ἐπιχωριοι | And a river also flows by the place, which the inhabitants call Decennovium in the Latin tongue, because it flows past nineteen milestones... |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5.14.5 | *queastor* | Φιδέλιόν τε πέμψαντες... ὃς δὴ Ἀταλαρίχῳ παρήδρευε πρότερον (κοιαίστωρα δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ταύτην καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι)[410] | So they sent Fidelius... a man who had been an advisor to Atalaric (such an official is called 'queastor' by the Romans). |
| 5.14.15 | *December* | ...ἐνάτῃ τοῦ τελευταίου, πρὸς δὲ Ῥωμαίων προσαγορευομένου Δεκεμβρίου μηνὸς ἑνδέκατον ... | [Rome became subject to the Romans again] on the ninth day of the last month, which is called 'December' by the Romans, in the eleventh year [of the reign of Justinian]. |
| 5.20.7 | the Senate | οἱ ἐκ βουλῆς ἣν σὺγκλητον καλοῦσι... | the members of the council which they call the Senate |
| 5.22.10 | *Vivarium*, part of Rome's fortifications | ...ἐπι μοῖραν τοῦ περιβόλθω ἣν Ῥωμαῖοι Βιβάριον καλοῦσι. | ...to a part of the fortifications which the Romans call the 'Vivarium.' |
| 5.26.3 | *Portus*, harbor | τὸν λιμὲνα, ὃν δὴ Πορτον Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσι | ...the harbor, which the Romans call 'Portus.' |
| 5.26.4-9 | *Portus,* a city on the harbor | Πόρτον τε αὐτὴν τῷ λιμένι ὁμωνύμως καλοῦσιν. | ...it is called, like the harbor, Portus. |
| 5.25.18 | *Penates* | ὁ δε Ἴανος ἕ ουτοσ πρῶτος μὲν ἦν τῶν ἀρχαίων θεῶν οὓς δὴ Ῥωμαῖοι γλώσσῃ τῇ σφετέρα Πένατες ἐκάλουν. | This Janus was the first of the ancient gods whom the Romans call in their own tongue 'Penates.' |
| 5.25.20 | *Tria Fati*, the Moirai | ...τὰ Τρία Φᾶτα· ὅυτω γὰρ Ῥωμαῖοι τὰς Μοίρας νενομίκασι καλεῖν. | ...the 'Tria Fata,' for thus the Romans are accustomed to call the Moirai. |
| 6.22.24 | *magister* | ...Πέτρῳ δὲ τὴν τοῦ μαγίστρου καλουμένου ἀπρχὴν παρασχόμενος. | ..and giving Peter the office of 'magister,' as it is called. |
| 6.23.5 | *metropolis* | Αὔξιμος δὲ αὕτη πρώτν μὲν τῶν ἐν Πικηνοῖς πόλεών ἐστιν, ἣν δὴ μητρόπολιν καλεῖν νενομίκασι. | Auximus is the first of the cities of Picenum, the metropolis, as the Romans are accustomed to call it. |
| 7.1.28 | *logothete*, the comptroller of the state treasury | Ἦν δὲ Ἀλέξανδρός τις ἐν Βυζαντίῳ τοῖς δημοσίοις ἐφεστὼς λουισμοῖς· λογοθέτην τὴν τιμὴν ταύτην ἑλληίζοντες καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι. | Now there was a certain Alexander in Byzantium who held the office of comptroller of the state treasury; this official the Romans call 'logothete,' using a Greek name. |
| 7.28.7 | *"Rock of Blood"* *"Lavula"* | ...ὧν ἁτέρα μὲν Πέτρα Αἵματος τῇ Λατίνων φωνῇ κέκλνται, Λαβοῦλαν δὲ τὴν ἑτέραν καλεῖν οἱ ἐπιχώπιοι νενμίκασιν. | [Two passes], one of which has received the name 'Rock of Blood' in the Latin tongue, while the natives are |

[410] Apparently the function of the queastor as legal advisor, πάρεδρος,

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | accustomed to call the other Lavula.[411] |
| 7.38.5 | *Candidati*, guards in white tunics | ...ἐπεὶ ἐς τοὺς Κανδιδάτους καλουμένους τελῶν ἔτυχε... | ... since he served among the 'Candidi,' as they are called... |
| 7.40.43 | *queastor* (2) | ...ἀνδρὸς τὴν τοῦ καλουμένου κοιαίστωρος ἀρχὴν ἔχοντος. | [The Romans will not prisoner-trade for a woman] a man holding the position of 'quaestor,' as it is called.[412] |
| 8.5.13-14 | *foederati, foedera* | φοιδερᾶτοι ἐπικληθέντες· οὕτω γὰρ αὐτοὺς τότε Λατίνων φωνῇ ἐκαάκεσαν Ῥωμαῖοι... φοίδερα γὰρ Λατῖνοι τὰς έν πολέμῳ καλοῦσι ξυνθήκας, ᾗπέπ μοι ἐν τοῖς ἔμπρσθεν δεδήλωται λόγοις· | ...called 'foederati;' for so the Romans at that time called them in the Latin tongue... for the Latins call treaties in war 'foedera' as I have explained in the previous narrative. |
| 8.10.1 | *magister* (2) | τὴν τοῦ καλουμένου μαγίστρου ἀρχὴν | [A Lazi notable held] the office of magister, as it is called |
| 8.21.10 | *Forum of Peace* | τῆς ἀργορᾶς ἣν Φόρον Εἰρήνης καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι· | the forum which the Romans call the Forum of Peace |
| 8.29.4-9 | *busta (Busta Gallorum)* | Βουσταγαλλώρων καλούμενος. Βοῦστα γὰρ Λατῖνοι τὰ έκ τῆς πθρᾶς καλοῦσι λείψανα. | ...being called 'Busta Gallorum.' For the Latins call the remains of a funeral pyre 'busta.' |

**Table 2.3: Explanatory Asides in the *Wars*: Christian Words and Usages**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2.25.4 | *Catholicos*, a priest of the Christians in Doubios | τόν τε τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἱερέα Καθολικόν καλοῦσι τῇ Ἑλλήνων φωνῇ... | And the priest of the Christians is called "Catholicos" in the Greek tongue, [because he presides over the whole region.] |
| 1.18.15 | Easter | ἑοπτὴ δὲ ἡ Πασχαλία ἐπέκειτο ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιγενησομένη τῇ ὑστερπαίᾳ, ἣν δὴ σέβονται | Now the feast of Easter was near and would take place on the following day; this |

to emperors (and their stand-ins, such as Atalaric) was an important one either in the sixth century generally (cf Dewing v 3 p 143 n 2), or to Procopius personally, as this was the position he held on Belisarius' staff.

[411] It is perhaps noteworthy that the first name is translated from the Latin, while the second is the name given by the "natives."

[412] This Spinus is introduced immediately before as acting as "personal advisor," πάρεδρος, to Totilla. Whether this was the office considered the quaestorship, or that was an independent position, is not clear.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Χριστιανοὶ πασῶν μάλιστα... | feast is reverenced by the Christians above all others... [explains fasting beforehand] |
| 3.6.26 | the *Hagia Sophia* | ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν Χριστοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ (Σοφίαν καλοῦσιν οἱ Βυζάντιοι τὸν νεών, ταύτνω δὴ μαλιστα τῷ θεῷ πρέειν τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἡγούμενοι) | ...in the sanctuary of Christ the Great God ('Sophia' the temple is called by the men of Byzantium who consider this designation is especially appropriate to God) |
| 3.10.18 | bishops | τῶν δέ τις ἱερέων οὓς δὴ ἐπισκόπους καλοῦσιν | one of those priests whom they call 'bishops' |
| 4.14.7 | Easter (2) | ...ὅτε οἱ Χριστιανοί ἑορτὴν ἦγον ἣν δὴ Πασχαλίαν καλοῦσι... | ...when the Christians were celebrating the feast which they call 'Easter'... |
| 4.21.21 | gospels | ...τὰ Χριστιανῶν λόγια...ἅπερ καλεῖν εὐαγγέλια νενομίκασιν. | [he would swear by] the sacred writings of the Christians, which they are accustomed to call 'gospels.' |
| 4.26.17 | monks | οὗ δὴ ἄνδρες οἰκοῦσιν οἷς τὰ ἐς τὸ θεῖον ἀκριβῶς ἤσκηται· μοναχοὺς καλεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀεὶ νενομίκαμεν. | There lived men, very exact in their practice of religion, whom we have always been accustomed to call 'monks.' |
| 4.26.25 | "the sacred bath" = baptism | ἣν τὸ θεῖον λουτρὸν ἱερρουργήσας, ᾗπερ εἴθισται εἶτα πρὸς αὐτοῦ | ...after performing the rite of the sacred bath, in the usual manner... |
| 5.3.5 | "the chief priest of Rome" = pope | τὸν Ῥώμης ἀρχιερέα | the chief priest of Rome |
| 5.11.20 | "priest of the city" of Rome (2) | τῷ τῆς πόλεως ἱερεῖ | the priest of the city |
| 5.25.13 | "chief priest of the city"(3) | Σιλβέριον τόν τῆς πόλεως ἀρχιερέα | Silverius the chief priest of the city |
| 7.15.9 | Vigilius, "chief priest of Rome" (4) | Βιγίλιος, ὁ τῆς Ῥωμης ἀρχιερεύς | Vigilius, chief priest of Rome |
| 8.25.13 | doctrinal controversy | στάσεως ἐνταῦθα πρός τῶν οἰκητόρων γεγενημένης, ὧνπερ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς οἱ Χριστιανοὶ διαμάχονται... | since a civil war had arisen among the inhabitants of that place concerning those matters over which the Christians fight among themselves... |

**Table 2.4: Explanatory Asides in the *Wars*: Other Words and Usages Explained**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.13.16 | *Miranes*, a Persian title | στρατηγὸς δὲ εἷς ἅπασιν ἐφειστήκει, Πέρσης ἀνήρ, μιρράνης μὲν τὸ ἀξίωμα (οὕτω γὰρ τὴν ἀρχ\ην καλοῦσι Περσαι)... | But one general held command over them all, a Persian, whose title was "mirranes" (for thus the Persians designate this office)... |
| 2.12.8 | *toparch* | ...Ἐδέσσης τοπάρχης (οὕττω γὰρ τοὺς κατὰ ἔνθος βασιλεῖς τηνικαῦτα ἐκάλλουν). | [Abgar was] the toparch of Edessa (for thus the kings of different nations were called then). |
| 3.11.16 | *dromones*, fast boats | δρόμωνας καλοῦσι τὰ πλοῖα ταῦτα οἱ νῦν ἄνθρωποι· πλεῖν γὰρ κατὰ τὰχος δύνανται μάλιστα. | Such boats are called 'dromones' [i.e., 'runners'] by those of the present time, for they are able to attain a great speed. |
| 3.21.2 | *Delphix*,<br><br>*palatium*= palace, | Δέλφικα τὸν τόπον καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι οὐ τῇ σφετέρᾳ γλώσσῃ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν ἑλληνίζοντες. ἐν Παλατίῳ γὰρ τῷ ἐπὶ Ῥώμης, ἔνθα ξυνέβαινε στιβάδας τὰς βασιλέως εἶναι, τρίπους ἐκ παλαιοῦ εἱστήκει, ἐφ᾽ οὗ δὴ τὰς κύκλικας οἱ βασιλέως οἰνοχόοι ἐτίθεντο. Δέλφικα δὲ τὸν τρίποδα καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι, ἐπεὶ πρῶτον ἐν Δελφοῖς γέγονε, καὶ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἔν τε Βυζαντίῳ Δέλφικα τοῦτο καλοῦσι τὸ οἴκημα, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ βασιλέως οἰκία Παλάτιον ἑλληνίζοντες καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι. Πάλλαντος γὰρ ἀνδρὸς Ἕλληνος ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χωρίῳ οἰκήσαντος πρὸ Ἰλίου ἁλώσεως οἰκίαν τε λόγου ἀξίαν ἐνταῦθα δειμαμένου, Παλάτιον μὲν τὸ οἴκημα τοῦτο ἐκάλουν, ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν αὐτοκράτορα παραλαβὼν ἀρχὴν Αὔγουστος ἐνταῦθα καταλύειν τὸ πρῶτον ἔγνω, Παλάτιον ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ καλοῦσι τὸ χωρίον οὗ ἂν βασιλεὺς καταλύῃ. | This place the Romans call "Delphix," not in their own tongue, but using the Greek word according to the ancient custom. For in the palace at Rome, where the dining couches of the emperor were placed, a tripod had stood from olden times, on which the emperor's cupbearers used to place the cups. Now the Romans call a tripod "Delphix," since they were first made at Delphi, and from this both in Byzantium and wherever there is a king's dining couch they call the room "Delphix"; for the Romans follow the Greek also in calling the emperor's residence "Palatium." For a Greek named Pallas lived in this place before the capture of Troy and built a noteworthy house there, and they called this dwelling "Palatium"; and when Augustus received the imperial power, he decided to take up his first residence in that house, and from this they call the place wherever the emperor resides "Palatium." |

| 5.1.25 | Theoderic called *rex* by barbarians, not emperor | ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥὴξ διεβίου καλούμενος (οὕτω γὰρ σφῶν τοῦς ἡγεμόνας καλεῖν οἱ βάρβαροι νενομίκασι) | ...but was called "rex" throughout his life (for thus are the barbarians accustomed to call their leaders) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5.8.5 | Naples | ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐς Καμπανίαν ἀφίκοντο, πόλει ἐνέτυχον ἐπιθαλασσίᾳ, Νεαπόλει ὄνομα, χωρίου τε φύσει ἐχυρᾷ καὶ Γότθων πολλῶν φρουρὰν ἐχούσῃ. | But when they reached Campania, they came upon a city on the sea, Naples by name, which was strong not only because of the nature of its site, but also because it contained a numerous garrison of Goths. |
| 5.18.6 | Belisarius rides a horse with a white face | τοῦτον Ἕλληνες μὲν φαλιόν, βάρβαροι δὲ βάλαν καλοῦσι. | Such a horse the Greeks call "phalius" and the barbarians "balan." |
| 5.21.6 | "rams," the siege engines | ...καὶ μηχανὰς τέσσαπας αἳ κριοὶ καλοῦνται. ἔστι δὲ ἡ μηχανὴ τοιαύτη. | ...and four engines which are called rams. Now this engine is of the following sort. |
| 5.21.14 | *ballistae* | Βελισάριος δὲ μηχανὰς μὲν ἐς τοὺς πύργους ἐτίθετο ἃς καλοῦσι Βαλλίστρας. | But Belisarius placed upon the towers engines which they call "ballistae." [description follows.] |
| 5.21.19 | siege engines: "wild asses" and "wolves" | σφενδόνῃ δὲ αὗταί εἰσιν ἐμφερεῖς καὶ ὄναγροι ἐπικαλοῦνται. ἐν δὲ ταῖς πύλαις λύκους ἔξω ἐπετίθεντο, οὓς δὴ ποιοῦσι τρόπῳ τοιῷδε. | Now these resemble slings and are called "wild asses."<br><br>And outside the gates are placed "wolves," which they make in the following manner. |
| 6.13.7 | *Ancon,* a rock pointed like an elbow | ὁ δὲ Ἀγκὼν οὗτος πέτρα τίς ἐστιν ἐγγώνιος, ἀφ᾽ οὗ καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν εἴληφε ταύτην· ἀγκῶνι γὰρ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἐμφερής ἐστιν. | Now this Ancon is a sort of pointed rock, and indeed it is from this circumstance that it has taken its name; for it is exceedingly like an "elbow." |
| 6.19.15 | colonnade of poles | ...τινὰς δὲ ἐκέλευσεν ἐν τῷ ὁμαλεῖ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ῥάβδων ἐπάγειν στοάν· οὕτω γὰρ καλεῖν τὴν μηχανὴν νενομίκασι ταύτην. | ...and then commanded a few men to move forward the colonnade of poles (for such is the name by which this device is customarily called) where the ground was level. |
| 8.9.19 | *Trachae*, a city on a rugged gorge | φέρεται δὲ καὶ προσηγορίαν τῆς φάραγγος ἀξίαν ὁ χῶρος, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸν ἑλληνίζοντες οἱ τῇδε ἄνθρωποι τὰ Τραχέα καλοῦσιν. | And the place bears a name worthy of the gorge, for the inhabitants call it Trachea, using a Greek word. |

**Table 3.1: References to Greek History**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.10.8-10 | Alexander the Great | ὅπερ ἐπειδὴ ὁ Φιλίπου Ἀλέξανδρος κατενόησε, πύλας τε ἐν χώρῳ ἐτεκτήνατο τῷ εἰρημένῳ καὶ φυλακτήριον κατεστήσατο. | When this was observed by Alexander, the son of Philip, he constructed gates in the aforesaid place and established a fortress there. |
| 2.2.12-15 | Cyrus and Alexander the Great | ...ταῦτα γὰρ καῖ Κύρῳ ἄν τις ἐπενέγκοι τῷ Περσῶν βασιλεῖ καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῷ τῷ Μακεδόνι... | ...For these accusations one might make also against Cyrus, the king of the Persians, and Alexander, the Macedonian... |
| 2.28.4 | Hellenistic rulers | οἱ δὲ αὐτὸν καταλαμβάνουσιν ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις, οὗ δὴ πολίσματα δύο Σελεύκειά τε καὶ Κτησιφῶν ἐστι, Μακεδὸνων αὐτὰ δειμαμένων οἳ μετὰ τὸν Φιλίππου Ἀλέξανδρον Περσῶν τε ἦρξαν καὶ τῶν ταύτῃ ἐθνῶν | And they overtook him in Assyria, at the place where there are two towns, Seleucia and Ctesiphon, built by the Macedonians who after Alexander, the son of Phillip, ruled over the Persians and the other nations there. |
| 8.6.9-12 | Herodotus, Aeschylus | For text, see Ch 2, pp 85-90 | |
| 8.21.10-17 | classical Greek statues in Rome | ἔστι δέ τις ἀρχαία πρὸ ταὐτης δὴ τῆς ἀργορᾶς κρήνη, καὶ βοῦς ἐπὶ ταύτης χαλκοῦς ἕστηκε, Φειδίου, οἶμαι, τοῦ Ἀθηναίου ἢ Λυσίππου ἔργον... οὗ δὴ καὶ Φειδίου ἔργον ἕτερον· τοῦτο γὰρ λέγει τὰ ἐν τῷ ἀγάλματι γράμματα. ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὸ τοῦ Μύρωνος βοΐδιον... | And there is a certain ancient fountain before this forum, and a bronze bull stands by it, the work, I think, of Pheidias the Athenian or of Lysippus... Here, for example, is another statue which is certainly the work of Pheidias; for the inscription one the statue says this. There too is the calf of Myron. |

**Table 3.2: References to Roman History**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.19.27-37 | Diocletian (gave the lands beyond the Nile to the Nobatae) | ...πρότερον δὲ οὐ ταῦτα ἐγεγόνει τὰ ἔσχατα τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπέκεινα ὅσον ἕπτα ἑτέρων ἐπίπροσθεν ὁδὸν ἡμερῶν· ἡνίκα δὲ ὁ Ῥωμαίων αὐτοκράτωρ Διοκλητιανὸς ἐνταῦθα γενόμενος... | Formerly this was not the limit of the Roman empire, but it lay beyond there as far as one would advance in a seven days' journey; but the Roman Emperor Diocletian came there... |
| 2.12.6-19 | King Abgar of Edessa, Augustus | ὁ δὲ Αὔγαρυς οὗτος ξυνετώτατος ἐγεγόνει τῶν κατ᾽αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπων ἅπαντων, καὶ ἀπ᾽αὐτοῦ βασιλεί Αὐγούστῳ ἐς τὰ μάλιστα φίλος. | Now this Abgar was the cleverest of all men of his time, and he was a special friend of the Emperor Augustus. [the story follows of how Abgar, in Rome to sign a treaty, impressed Augustus so much that he wanted to keep him in Rome, Abgar had to convince him to let him go by filling the hippodrome with different animals.] |
| 2.24.2 | Hestia | τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ πῦρ ὅπερ Ἑστίαν ἐκάλουν τε καὶ ἐσέβοντο ἐν τοῖς ἄνω χρόνοις Ῥωμαῖοι. | This is the fire which the Romans worshipped under the name of Hestia in ancient times. |
| 3.1.12-13 | size of the Roman Empire in ancient times | ὥστε ξύμπασα ἡ Ῥωμαίων ἐπικράτεια κατά γε τὴν ἐπὶ θαλάσσῃ ὁδὸν ἐς ἑπτὰ καὶ τεσσαράκοντα καὶ τριακοσίων ἡμερῶν ξύνεισι μέτρον, ἤν τις, ὅπερ εἴρηται, τὸν Ἰόνιον κόλπον ἐς ὀκτακοσίους μάλιστα διήκοντα σταδίους ἐκ Δρυοῦντος διαπορθμεύηται. ἡ γὰρ τοῦ κόλπου πάροδος ἐς ὁδὸν ἡμερῶν διήκει οὐχ ἧσσον ἢ τεσσάρων. τοσαύτη μὲν ἡ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴ κατά γε τὸν παλαιὸν ἐγένετο χρόνον. | So that the whole Roman domain, according to the distance along the sea at least, attains a measure of a three hundred and forty-seven days' journey, if, as has been said, one ferries over the Ionian Gulf, which extends about eight hundred stades from Dryous. For the passage across the gulf amounts to a journey of not less than four days. Such, then, was the size of the Roman empire in ancient times. |
| 3.2.24 | house of Sallust | οἱ δὲ τάς τε οἰκίας ἐνέπρησαν αἳ τῆς πύλης ἄγχιστα ἦσαν, ἐν αἷς ἦν καὶ ἡ Σαλουστίου, τοῦ | And they set fire to the houses which were next to the gate, among |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Ῥωμαίοις τὸ παλαιὸν τὴν ἱστορίαν γράψαντος, ἧς δὴ τὰ πλεῖστα ἡμίκαυτα καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἕστηκε... | which ws also the house of Sallust, who in ancient times wrote the history of the Romans, and the greater part of this house has stood half-burned up to my time... |
| 3.2.25-26 | Honorius | τότε λέγουσιν ἐν Ῥαβέννῃ Ὁνωρίῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν τινα εὐνούχων δηλονότι ὀρνιθοκόμον ἀγγεῖλαι ὅτι δὴ Ῥώμη ἀπόλωλε. καὶ τὸν ἀναβοήσαντα φάναι “Καίτοι ἔναγχος ἐδήδοκεν ἐκ χειρῶν τῶν ἐμῶν.” εἶναι γάρ οἱ ἀλεκτρυόνα ὑπερμεγέθη, Ῥώμην ὄνομα· καὶ τὸν μὲν εὐνοῦχον ξυνέντα τοῦ λόγου εἰπεῖν Ῥώμην τὴν πόλιν πρὸς Ἀλαρίχου ἀπολωλέναι, ἀνενεγκόντα δὲ τὸν βασιλέα ὑπολαβεῖν “Ἀλλ᾽ ἔγωγε, ὦ ἕταιρε, Ῥώμην μοι ἀπολωλέναι τὴν ὄρνιν ᾠήθην.” | At that time they say that the Emperor Honorius in Ravenna received the message from one of the eunuchs, evidenctly a keeper of poultry, that Rome had perised. And he cried out and said, “And yet it has just eaten from my hands.” For he had a very large cock, Rome by name; and the eunuch comprehending his words said that it was the city of Rome which had perised at the hands of Alaric, and the emperor with a sigh of relief answered quickly, “But I, my good fellow, thought that my fowl Rome had perished.” |
| 3.5.4 | temple of Jupiter Capitolinus | ἐύλησε δὲ καὶ τὸν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Καπιτωλίου νέων καὶ τοῦ τέγους τὴν ἡμίσειαν ἀφείλετο μοῖραν. | He plundered also the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, and tore off half of the roof. |
| 3.6.10 | “Mercurium,” a town | Ἑρμοῦ δὲ νεὼς ἐνταῦθα ἐκ παλαιοῦ ἐτύγχανεν ὤν, ἀφ᾽ οὗ δὴ καὶ Μερκούριον ὁ τόπος ἐκλήθη. οὕτω γὰρ τὸν Ἑρμήν καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι. | Now it so happened that a temple of Hermes had been there from of old, from which fact the place was named Mercurium; for the Romans call Hermes ‘Mercurius.’ |
| 3.11.9 | Massagetae = Huns | ...Ἀϊγὰν δὲ ἦν Μασσαγέτης γένος, οὓς νῦν Οὔννους καλοῦσιν. | ...and Aïgan was by birth of the Massagetae whom they now call Huns... |
| 3.9.20-29 | Zeno and Gizeric | λύοντι δέ σοι τὰς σπονδὰς καὶ ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς ἰόντι ἀπαντήσομεν ὅση δύναμις, μαρτυόμενοι τοὺς ὅρκους τοὺς Ζήνωνι ὀμωμοσμένους, οὗ τὴν | Gelimer to Justinian: “...and if you break the treaty and come against us, we shall oppose you with all our power, |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | βασιλείαν παραλαβὼν ἔχεις. | calling to witness the oaths which were sworn by Zeno, from whom you have recieved the kingdom you hold.” |
| 3.21.25 | ‘Delphix,’ Troy, Augustus | for text, see Table 2.2 | |
| 4.9 | Republican triumphs, Titus and Trajan | χρόνος δὲ ἀμφὶ ἐνιαυτοὺς ἑξακοσίους παρῳχήκει ἤδη ἐξ ὅτου ἐς ταῦτα τὰ γέρα οὐδεὶς ἐληλύθει, ὅτι μὴ Τίτοω τε καὶ Τραϊανός, καὶ ὅσοι ἄλλοι αὐτοκράτορες στρατηγήσαντες ἐπί τι βαπβαρικὸν ἔθνος ἐνίκησαν. | And a period of about six hundred years had now passed since anyone had attained these honors, except, indeed, Titus and Trajan, and such other emperors as had led armies against some barbarian nation and had been victorious. |
| 4.10.4 | Dido; Roman conquest of Carthage | χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον καὶ ὅσοι μετὰ Διδοῦς ἐκ Φοινίκης ἀνέστησαν ἅτεπρός ξυγγενεῖς τοὺς ἐν Λιβύῃ ᾠκημένους ἀφίκοντο... ἔπειτα δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι πάντων καθυπέρτεροι τῷ ποέμῳ γενόμενοι... Καρχηδονίους δὲ καὶ λίβυας τοὺς ἄλλους κατηκόους σφίσιν ἐς φόρου ἀπαγωγὴν ἐποιήσαντο | [The history of the Moors starting with Joshua driving the Phoenicians to Libya (4.10.13-24)] And in later times those who removed from Phoenicia with Dido came to the inhabitants of Libya as kinsmen... [foundation of Carthage]...Later on the Romans gained the supremacy over all of them in war... and made the Carthaginians and the other Libyans subject and tributary to themselves. |
| 5.7.7-8 | Sibyllene Oracle | τότε Ῥωμαῖοι ἀνεμνήσθησαν τοῦ Σιβύλλης ἔπους, ὅπερ ᾀδόμενον ἐν τῷ πρὶν χρόνῳ τέρας αὐτοῖς ἔδοξεν εἶναι. | And at that time the Romans recalled the verse of the Sibyl, which had been pronounced in earlier times and seemed to them a portent |
| 5.11.26 | “Senate and the people of Rome” | Ῥωμαίων τοῖς τε ἐκ βουλῆς καὶ τῷ δήμῳ | [Vittigis urges] ..the Senate and the people of the Romans.. [to be loyal to the Goths] |
| 5.14.2 | cave of the Sibyl | ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ Κύμῃ οἱ ἐπιχώριοι τὸ Σιβύλλης δεικνύουσι σπήλαιον ἔνθα δὴ αὐτῆς τὸ μαντεῖον γεγενῆσθαι φαριν | It is in this city of Cumae that the inhabitants point out the cave of the Sibyl, where they say her oracular shrine was... |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5.14.6-8 | Appian Way, Appius Claudius | τὴν Αππίαν ὁδὸν ἀφεὶς ἐν ἀριστερᾷ, ἣν Ἄππιος ὁ Ῥωμαίων ὕπατος ἐννακοσίοις ἔνιαυτοῖς πρότερον έποίησέ τε καὶ ἐπώνυμον ἔσχεν. | [Belisarius goes to Rome via the Latin Way,]....leaving on the left the Appian Way, which Appius, the consul of the Romans, had made nine hundred years before and to which he had given his name. |
| 5.15.13 | Constantine (in Palladium story) | Βυζάντιοι δέ φασι τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦτο Κωνσταντῖνον βασιλέα ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ἣ αὐτοῦ ἐπώνυμός ἐστι κατορύξαντα θέσθαι. | The Byzantines, however, say that the emperor Constantine dug up this statue in the forum which bears his name and set it there |
| 5.17.11 | bridge over Narnus built by Augustus | ταύτην δὲ τὴν γέφυραν Καῖσαρ Αὔγουστος ἐν τοῖς ἄνω χρόνοις ἐδείματο, θέαμα λόγου πολλοῦ αξιον· τῶν γὰρ κυρτωμάτων πάντων ὑψηλότατόνἐστιω ὧν ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν. | This bridge was built by Caesar Augustus in early times, and it is a very noteworthy sight, for its arches are the highest of any known to us. |
| 5.22.13 | Hadrian’s tomb (x2) | Ἀδριανοῦ τοῦ Ῥωμαίων αὐτοκράτορος τάφος ἔξω πύλης Αύρηλίας ἐστιν... | The tomb of the Roman Emperor Hadrian stands outside the Aurelian Gate... |
| 5.24.28 | Sibylline Oracle | Ἐν μέντοι Ῥώμῃ τῶν τινες πατρικίων τὰ Σιβύλλης λόγια προὔφερον, ἰσχυριζόμενοι τὸν κίνδυνον τῇ πόλει ἄχρι ἐς τὸν Ἰούλιον μῆνα γεγενῆσθαι μόνον. | [At the start of the Gothic siege of Rome] In Rome, moreover, some of the patricians brought out the Sibylline Oracles, declaring that the danger which had come to the city would continue only up to the month of July. |
| 7.18.19 | Cannae | τούτου Κανουσίου πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι σταδίους ἀπέχουσι Κάνναι, ἵνα δὴ λέγουσι Λιβύων στρατηγοῦντος ἐν τοῖς ἄνω χρόνοις Ἀννίβαλος τὸ μέγα πάθος ξυμβῆναι Ῥωμαίοις. | Twenty-five stades away from this city of Canusium is Cannae, where they say the Roman in early times suffered their greatest disaster at the hand of Hannibal the general of the Libyans. |
| 7.24.32 | Mulvian Bridge | γέφυραν μέντοι μίαν, ἣ Μολιβίου ἐπώνυμός ἐστι, διαφθεῖραι οὐδαμῆ ἴσχυσαν, ἐπεὶ ἄγχιστα τῆς πόλεως ἐτύγχανεν οὖσα. | One bridge, however, which bears the name of Mulvius, they were quite unable to destroy, since it was very close to the city. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7.36.17 | Hadrian's Tomb | οὗτος ὁ Παῦλος, ἁλισκομένης τότε τῆς πόλεως, ξὺν ἱππεῦσι τετρακοσίοις ἔς τε τὸν Ἀδριανοῦ τάφον ἀνέδραμε καὶ τὴν γέφυραν ἔσχε τὴν ἐς Πέτρου τοῦ τοῦ ἀποστόλου τὸν νεὼν φέρουσαν. | This Paulus, during the capture of the city at that time, rushed with four hundred horsemen into the Tomb of Hadrian and seized the bridge leading to the church of the Apostle Peter. |
| 8.2.16 | time of Trajan | λέγουσι μὲν οὖν ὡς κατὰ τοὺς Τραϊανοῦ τοῦ Ῥωμαίων αὐτοκράτορος χρόνους | Now they say that in the time of the Roman Emperor Trajan... |
| 8.7.9 | Anastasius | ἀλλὰ χρόνῳ πολλῷ ὕστερον ἢ τὴν πόλιν Ἀναστάσιος βασιλεὺς ἐδείματο ταύτην... | ...but a long time after the Emperor Anastasius built this city... |
| 8.21.10-17 | classical Greek statues taken to Rome | for text, see table 3.1 | |
| 8.22.8 | ship of Aeneas | ἔτι μέντοι καὶ ὅσα μνημεῖα τοῦ γένους ἐλέλειπτο ἔτι, ἐν τοῖς καὶ ἡ ναῦς Αἰνείου, τοῦ τῆς πόλεως οἰκιστοῦ, καὶ εἰς τόδε κεῖται, θέαμα παντελῶς ἄπιστον. νεώσοικον γὰρ ποιησάμενοι ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει, παρὰ τὴν τοῦ Τιβέριδος ὄχθην, ἐνταῦθά τε αὐτὴν καταθέμενοι, ἐξ ἐκείνου τηροῦσιν | [The Romans have preserved many memorials to Procopius' own day] ...and among them the ship of Aeneas, the founder of the city, an altogether incredible sight. For they built a ship-house in the middle of the city on the bank of the Tiber, and depositing in there, they have preserved it from that time. |
| 8.29.4-6 | *Busta Gallorum* | ἵνα δή ποτε στρατηγοῦντα Ῥωμαίων Κάμιλλον τῶω Γάλλων ὅμιλον διαφθεῖραι μάχῃ νενικηκότα φασί. φέρει δὲ καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ μαρτύριον τοῦ ἔργου τούτου τὴν προσηγορίαν ὁ χῶρος καὶ διασώζει τῇ μνήμῃ τῶν Γάλλων τὸ πάθος, Βουσταγαλλώρων καλούμενος. βοῦστα γὰρ Λατῖνοι τὰ ἐκ τῆς πυρᾶς καλοῦσι λείψανα. τύμβοι τε τῇδε γεώλοφοι τῶν νεκπῶν ἐκείνων παμπληθεῖς εἰσίν.... | the very place where once, they say, Camillus as general of the Romans defeated in battle and destroyed the host of the Gauls. And the place even to my day bears witness to this deed in its name and preserves the memory of the disaster which befell the Gauls, being called *Busta Gallorum*, for the Latins call the remains of a funeral pyre "busta." And there are great numbers of mounded tombs of their bodies in this place |
| 8.33.14 | Hadrian's tomb | ...τειχίσματι βραχεῖ ὀλίγην τινὰ τῆς πόλεως μοῖραν ἀμφὶ τὸν | ...he enclosed a small part of the city with a |

| | (x3) | Ἀδριανοῦ περιβαλὼν τάφον... | short wall around the Tomb of Hadrian... |
|---|---|---|---|

**Table 3.3: References to the Mythological Past**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1.9-1 | Homeric Bowmen | For text, see Ch 1 pg 45-50 | |
| 1.17.11-12 | Orestes and Iphegenia | ...οὗ δὴ τὸ ἐν Ταυροῖς τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν ἦν, ἔνθεν λέγουσι τὴν Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἰφιγένειαν ξύν τε Ὀρέστῃ καὶ Πυλάδῃ φυγεῖν τὸ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἄγαλμα φέρουσαν... | ...where was the sanctuary of Artemis among the Taurians, from which they say Iphigenia, daughter of Agamemnon, fled with Orestes and Pylades, bearing the statue of Artemis [a summary of Iphigenia and Orestes' adventures follows] |
| 2.17.2 | Colchis as land of Jason and Medea | ἀφικομένοις τε αὐτοῖς ἐς μέσην Κολχίδα (οὗ δὴ τά τε ἀμφὶ Μήδειαν καὶ Ἰάσονα οἱ ποιηταὶ υευενῆσθαι μυθολογοῦσιν)...). | And when they arrived in the centre of Colchis (the place where the tales of the poets say that the adventure of Medea and Jason took place).. |
| 3.9.2 | Hoamer nephew of Ilderic is "Achilles of the Vandals" | ὃν δὴ καὶ Ἀχιλλέα Βανδίλων ἐκάλουν. | ...he it was whom they called the Achilles of the Vandals. |
| 3.13.16 | Baths of Achilles | ...ἐς τὸ δημόσιον βαλανεῖον ἐσκομίσας τὸν Ἀχιλλέα... | ...[brought] to the public baths of Achilles... |
| 5.7.5 | a Cadmean victory for the Romans | τῆς τε μάχης κρατεράς γεγενημένης τὴν Καδμείαν νίκην Ῥωμαιοις νικῆσαι ξυνέπεσε. | The battle was stubbornly contested, and the victory was a Cadmean vistory for the Romans |
| 5.8.1 | Scylla and Chaybdis | [1]...ἐς Ῥήγιον (ἔνθα δὴ οἱ ποιηταὶ τήν τε Σκύλλαν γεγονέναι μυθοποιοῦσι καὶ Χάρυβδισ)... | ..to Rhegium (where the myths of the poets say Scylla and Charybdis were)... |
| 5.11.2-4 | Circe | ἧς ἄγχιστα ὄρος τὸ Κίρκαιόν ἐστιν, οὗ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα τῇ Κίρκῃ ξυγγενέσθαι φασίν, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, ἐπεὶ ἐν νήσῳ Ὅμηρος τὰ τῆς Κίρκης οἰκία ἰσχυρίζεται εἶναι | ...and very near that place is Mt. Circaeum, where they say Odysseus met Circe, though the story seems to me untrustworthy, for Homer declares that the |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | habitation of Circe was on an island. |
| 5.15.5-14 | The Palladium: Diomedes, Caledonian Boar, Aeneas, Odysseus | For text, see Ch 3 pg 146-9 | |
| 7.27.17-20 | Scylla | ἐν ἀριστερᾷ ἔχων τὸν Σκύλαιον καλούμενον χῶρον, ἐφ᾽ οὗ δὴ τὴν Σκύλλαν οἱ ποιηταὶ γεγενῆσθαί φασιν, οὐχ ὅτι ταύτῃ πη τὸ θηριῶδες γύναιον, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνοι λἐγουσιν... | ...and as he sailed by he had on his left the place called Scylaeum, at which the poets say that Scylla once lived, not because there really existed there the woman in the form of a beast, as they say... |
| 8.2.2 | Amazons | ...οὗ δὴ τὸ τῶν Ἀμαζόνων στρατόπεδον γεγενῆσθαί φασιν. | ...where they say the army of the Amazons originated. |
| 8.2.12 | Apsyrtus, Jason and Medea | ἐνταῦθα γάρ φασιν οἱ ἐπιχώριοι ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς Μηδείας τε καὶ Ἰάσονος τὸν Ἄψυρτον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀφανισθῆναι, καὶ δι᾽ αὐτὸ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τὸ χωρίον λαβεῖν... | For in that place the natives say that Apsyrtus was removed from the world by the plot of Medea and Jason, and that from this circumstance the place received its name... |
| 8.2.15 | Colchians | ταύτῃ μὲν γὰρ καὶ τὸ δέρας ξὺν τῇ Μηδείᾳ συλήσας Ἰασων οὐκ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ τὰ πάτρια ἤθη φυγὼν φαίνοιτο, ἀλλ᾽ ἔμπαλιν ἐπὶ Φᾶσίν τε ποταμού καὶ τοὺς ἐνδοτάτω βαρβάρους. | For on this hypothesis it would appear that after Jason in company with Medea had captured the fleece, he actually did not flee toward Hellas and his own land, but backward to the Phasis River and the Barbarians in the most remote interior. |
| 8.2.30-31 | Golden Fleece, Jason and the Argonauts | κατὰ ταύτην δέ που τὴν Λαζικῆς μοῖραν ἀπέκειτο, ὥσπερ οἱ ἐπιχώριοι λέγουσι, καὶ τὸ δέρας ἐκεῖνο, οὗπερ ἕνεκα οἱ ποιηταὶ τὴν Ἀργὼ ἀποτετορνεῦσθαι μυθολογοῦσι... οὐ γὰρ ἄν, οἶμαι, λαθὼν τὸν Αἰήτην Ἰάσων ἐνθένδε ἀπηλλάσσετο ξὺν τῇ Μηδείᾳ τὰ δέρας ἔχων, εἰ μὴ τά τε βασίλεια καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τῶν Κόλχων οἰκία τοῦ χωρίου διείργετο Φάσιδι ποταμῷ, ἵνα | It was somewhere in this part of Lazica, as the inhabitants say, that the famous fleece was placed for safekeeping, that fleece on account of which, as the poets tell the tale, the Argo was fashioned... For I think that Jason would not have eluded Aeetes and got away from there with that fleece in |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | δὴ τὸ δέρας ἐκεῖνο κεῖσθαι ξυνέβαινεν... | company with Medea, unless both the palace and the other dwellings of the Colchians had been separated by the Phasis River from the place in which that fleece was lying... |
| 8.3.5-11 | Amazons | ἐνθένδε μὲν τὰς Ἀμαζόνας ὡρμῆσθαί φασιν, ἀμφὶ δὲ τὸ Θεμίσκουρον καὶ ποταμὸν τὸν Θερμώδοντα ἐνστρατοπεδεύσασθαι, ᾗπέρ μοι ἔναγχος εἴρηται... | And they say that the Amazons really originated here and afterwards established their camp near Themiscryra on the Thermodon River, as I have stated above... |
| 8.5.23 | Iphegenia | ...ἵνα δὴ καὶ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τὸν νέων γεγονέναι φασίν, οὗπερ ποτε ἡ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἰφιγένεια προὔστη. | ...and this is the place where they say the Temple of Artemis was, over which Agamemnon's daughter Iphigeneia once presided. |
| 8.6.22-24 | Charybdis | ἀλλὰ καὶ ἴλιγγοι ἐξαπιναίως ἐνταῦθα συχνοὶ ἀπ᾽ οὐδεμιᾶς ἡμῖν φαινομένης αἰτίας τὰς ναῦς διαχρῶνται. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οἱ ποιηταὶ λέγουσι πρὸς τῆψ Χαρύβδεως ῥοφεῖσθαι τὰ πλοῖα | But there are also numerous whirlpools which appear there suddenly from no cause apparent to us ad destroy ships. It is on account of this that the poets say that the boats are gulped down by Charybdis... |
| 8.11.35 | Medea's oil | ...καὶ φαρμάκου ὅπερ Μῆδοι μὲν νάφθαν καλοῦσιν, Ἕλληνες δὲ Μηδείας ἔλαιον... | ...and [with] the substance which the Persians call "Naphtha" and the Greeks "Medea's oil"... |
| 8.14.49 | Aeetes, Colchis | ἕτεροι δέ φασι πόλιν τε γεγονέναι ἐν τοῖς ἄνω χρόνοις τὸ χώριον καὶ Κοίταιον καλεῖσθαι· ἔνθεν τε τὸν Αἰήτην ὡρμῆσθαι, καὶ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ τοὺς ποιητὰς αὐτόν τε Κοιταϊέα καὶ γῆν τὴν Κολχίδα Κοιταΐδα καλεῖν. | But others say that the place was a city in ancient times and was called Coetaeon; and that Aeetes was born there, and as a result of this the poets both called him a Coetaean and applied the same name to the land of Colchis. |

# Bibliography

## Ancient Sources:

Aristides, Aelius, and James Henry Oliver. *The ruling power: a study of the Roman Empire in the second century after Christ through the Roman oration of Aelius Aristides*. (1953) Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 43:4. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

Herodotus, & Rosén, H. B. (1987). *Herodoti Historiae*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Herodotus, Strassler, R. B., & Purvis, A. L. (2007). *The Landmark Herodotus: The histories.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Malalas, J., & In Thurn, H. (2000). *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

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

Justinian. *Institutes.* trans. P. Birks and G. MacLeod. In *Justinian's Institutes* (1987). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Lydus, J. L., & Carney, T. F. *John the Lydian: On the magistracies of the Roman constitution : De Magistratibus ; edited and translated by T.F. Carney*. (1971) Kansas: Coronado Press.

Procopius of Caesarea . Ed. W. Dindorf and C. Maltret. *Procopius*. In: *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae.* (1833) Bonnae: E. Weber.

------ Ed. J. Haury. *Procopii Caesariensis Opera omnia*. (1905) Lipsiae: In aedibus B.G. Teubneri.

------- Trans. H. B. Dewing. *Procopius, with an English translation.* 7 vols. (1914-40) Loeb Classical Library: London and Cambridge.

------- Ed. J. Haury and G. Wirth. *Procopius Caesariensis Opera omnia*. In: Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. (2001) Monachii: K.G. Saur.

Thucydides, & Hude, K. (1910). *Thucydidis Historiae*. Lipsiae: B.G. Teubner.

Thucydides, Strassler, R. B., & Crawley, R. (1996). *The landmark Thucydides: A comprehensive guide to the Peloponnesian War*. New York: Free Press.

Secondary Sources:

Adshead, K. (1990) “Procopius’ *Poliorcetica*: Continuities and Discontinuities” in Clarke, G. W. *Reading the past in late antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press. 93-115.

Alcock, S. E., Cherry, J. F., & Elsner, J. (2001). Pausanias: Travel and memory in Roman Greece. New York: Oxford University Press.

Allen, P. (1979) “The ‘Justinianic’ plague.” *Byzantion* 48: 5-20.

Assmann, Aleida. “Canon and Archive” *Cultural Memory Studies: an Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. 97-107

Assmann, Jan (1995) “Collective Memory and Cultural Identity” *New German Critique* 65: 125-133

Assmann, J. (1997). Moses the Egyptian: The memory of Egypt in western monotheism. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Barnes, T. D. (1990) in Clarke, G. W. *Reading the past in late antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press. 59-92

Bjornlie, M. S. (2012). *Politics and tradition between Rome, Ravenna and Constantinople: A study of Cassiodorus and the Variae 527-554*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blackman, D and Rankov, B. (1014) *Shipsheds of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Cambridge University Press.

Blockley, R.C. (1972) “Dexippus and Priscus  and the Thucydidean Account of the Siege of Platea.” *Phoenix* 26: 18-27.

Bommas, M. (2011). *Cultural memory and identity in ancient societies*. London: Continuum.

Börm, Henning (2007). *Prokop und die Perser : Untersuchungen zu den römisch-sasanidischen Kontakten in der ausgehenden Spätantike.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Braun, H. (1885) *Procopius Caesariensis quatenus imitatus sit Thucydidem*. Diss.Erlangen.

------------ (1894) *Die Nachahmung Herodts durch Prokop.* Beilage zum Jahresbericht1893/94 des K. Altes Gymnasium zu Nurnberg. Nuremburg.

Browning, R. (1987). *Justinian and Theodora.* Rev. ed. New York, N.Y.: Thames and Hudson.

Burke, Peter (1989) “ History as Social Memory” in Butler, T. *Memory: History, culture, and the mind*. Oxford, UK: B. Blackwell. 97-110

Bury, J. B. (1967). *A history of the later Roman empire : from Arcadius to Irene (395 A.D. to 800 A.D.).* Chicago: Argonaut Inc.

Cameron, Alan and Averil Cameron (1964) “Christianity and tradition in the historiography of the late empire.” *Classical Quarterly* 14: 316-28.

Cameron, Averil. 1965. "Procopius and the Church of St. Sophia". The Harvard Theological Review. 58 (1): 161-163.

Cameron, Averil M. 1966. "The "Scepticism" of Procopius". Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte. 15 (4): 466-482.

------------ (1970) *Agathias.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Cameron, Averil (1981) *Continuity and Change in sixth century Byzantium.* Variorum: Collected Studies Series CS143. London.

------------ (1985) *Procopius and the sixth century*. The transformation of the classical heritage 10. Berkley.

------------ (2000) "Chapter III: Justin and Justinian," Cameron, A., Bury, J. B., Bowman, A. K., eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History, XIV: Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors*, Cambridge University Press.

Carrié, J.-M., Duval, N., Roueché, C., & Association pour l'antiquité tardive (Lyons, France). (2001). De ædificiis*: Le texte de Procope et les réalités*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Cesa, M (1982) "Etnografia e geografia nella visione storica di Procopio di Cesarea." *SCO* 32: 189-215

Clarke, G. W. (1990). *Reading the past in late antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press.

Confino, Alon (1997). "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method" *American Historical Review* 102(5): 1386-1403

Conte, G. B. (1986). *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, ed. C. Segal. Ithaca.

Cooper, Kate and Julia Hillner, eds. (2007) *Religion, Dynasty and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 300-900.* Cambridge.

Croke, B. (1983) "The Origins of the Christian World Chronicle" in B Croke and A Emmett, eds *History and Historiography in Late Antiquity*. Sydney, New York. 116-31.

Croke, B. (1990). "Malalas, the Man and his Work" in: Jeffreys, E., Croke, B. &, Scott, R. *Studies in John Malalas*. Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1-25.

Croke, B and Emmett, A. (1983) “Historiography in Late Antiquity: An Overview” in B Croke and A Emmett, eds *History and Historiography in Late Antiquity*. Sydney, New York. 1-12.

Cubitt, G. (2007). *History and memory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Dahn, F. (1865) *Prokopius von Cäsarea*. Berlin.

Downey, G. (1958) “The Christian Schools of Palestine: a chapter in literary history,” *Harvard Review Bulletin* 12, 297ff.

Edmunds, L. (2001). Intertextuality and the reading of Roman poetry. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Edwards, C., & Woolf, G. (2003). *Rome the cosmopolis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards and Woolf “Cosmopolis: Rome as World City” in Edwards, C., & Woolf, G. (2003). *Rome the cosmopolis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-20.

Erskine, A. (2001). *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local tradition and imperial power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, J. A. S. (1969) “The dates of the *Anecdota* and the *De Aedificiis* of Procopius,” *Classical Philology* 64, 29-30.

Evans, J. A. S. (1972) *Procopius*. Twayne’s World Author Series 170: Greece, New York.

Fentress, J., & Wickham, C. (1992). *Social memory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Gibbon, E. (1900). *The decline and fall of the Roman empire.* New ed. New York: P. Fenelon Collier.

Greatrex, G. (1994) “The dates of Procopius’ works” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 18. 101-114.

Greatrex, G. (1996a) “Stephanus, the Father of Procopius of Caesarea?” *Medieval Prosopography* 17: 125-145.

Greatrex, G. (1996b) “The Classical Past in the Classicizing Historians,” in L. Hardwick and S. Ireland (eds) *The Reception of Texts and Images*, 2 Vols., Milton Keynes, The Open University, and at http://www.open.ac.uk/Arts/CC96/greatrex.htm (accessed 1/18/2014)

Gray, P. T. R. (2005) “The Legacy of Chalcedon: Chistological Problems and their Significance” in Maas, M. (2005). *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 215-238.

Gross, D. (2005) *Lost Time: On Remembering and Forgetting in Late Modern Culture*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Halbwachs, M. (1925). *Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, par Maurice Halbwachs. Paris: F. Alcan.

Halbwachs, M. (1941*). La topographie légendaire des Évangiles en Terre Sainte: Étude de mémoire collective*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Halbwachs, M. (1980). *The collective memory*. New York: Harper & Row.

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

Haury, J. (1896) *Zur Beurteilung des Geschichtscheiberss Procopius von Casarea.* Proramm des K. Wilhelms-Gymnasiums in Muchen.  Munich.

Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and intertext: Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Honoré, T. (1978) *Tribonian*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press

Horden, Peregrine. (2005) “Mediterranean Plague in the Age of Justinian” in Maas, M. *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 134-160

Howard-Johnson, J. (2000) “The Education and Expertise of Procopius” Carrié, J.-M., Duval, N., Roueché, C., & Association pour l'antiquité tardive (Lyons, France). (2000). De ædificiis*: Le texte de Procope et les réalités*. Turnhout: Brepols, 19-30

Humfress, C. (2005) “Law and Legal Practice in the Age of Justinian,” *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian.* Cambridge. 161-184

Jeffreys, E. (1979) “The Attitudes of Byzantine Chroniclers towards Ancient History” *Byzantion* 49. 199-238.

Jeffreys, E., Croke, B. &, Scott, R. (1990). *Studies in John Malalas*. Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies.

Jeffreys, E. (1990a) “Malalas’ Worldview” in Jeffreys, E., Croke, B. &, Scott, R. *Studies in John Malalas*. Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies. 55-66.

Jeffreys, E. (1990b) “Chronological Structures” in Jeffreys, E., Croke, B. &, Scott, R. *Studies in John Malalas*. Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies. 111-166.

Jeffreys, E. (1990c) “Malalas’ Use of the Past” in Clarke, G. W. *Reading the past in late antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press. 121-146

Jones, A. H. M. (1964). *The later Roman Empire, 284-602: a social, economic and administrative survey.* Oxford: B. Blackwell.

Kaldellis, A. (2004) *Procopius of Caearea: tyranny, history and philosophy at the end of antiquity.* University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia.

Kaldellis, A. “The Literature of Plague and the Anxieties of Piety in Sixth-Century Byzantium,“ in F. Mormando and T. Worcester, eds*., Piety and Plague: From Byzantium to the Baroque* (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2007) 1-22.

Kaldellis, A. (2009). The date and structure of Prokopios' « Secret History » and his projected work on church history. *Greek, Roman And Byzantine Studies*, *49*(4)4), 585-616.

Kaldellis, A. (2010a) “Procopius’ *Persian War*: a thematic and literary analysis” In Macrides, R. J. *History as literature in Byzantium: Papers from the Fortieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, April 2007.* Surrey, England: Ashgate. 253-273.

Kaldellis, A. (2010b). *The secret history: With related texts*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co.

Kelly, C. (2004). *Ruling the later Roman Empire*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Larmour, D. H. J., & Spencer, D. (2007). *The sites of Rome: Time, space, memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lee, A.D. (2005) *The Empire at War* . In Maas, M., ed. *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.113-133.

Lieberich, H. 1900. *Studien zu den Proomien in der griechschen und byzantinischen Geschichtsreibung*, 2. Teil. *Die byzantinischen Geschichtsschreiber und Chronisten*. Programm de K. Realgymnasiums Muchen. Munich.

Littman, R. J. (2009). The plague of Athens: epidemiology and paleopathology. *The Mount Sinai Journal of Medicine*, New York, 76, 5, 456-67.

Littmann, R.J. and M.L. Littman 1973, “The Athenian plague: smallpox,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 100. 261-75.

Lyne , R. O. A. M (1994), “Vergils’ *Aeneid*: subversion by intertextuality” Greece & Rome: 41:187-204.

Maas, Michael. 1986. "Roman history and Christian ideology in Justinianic reform legislation". *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. 40: 17-32.

Maas, M. (1991). *John Lydus and the Roman past: Antiquarianism and politics in the age of Justinian*. London: Routledge.

Maas, M. (2005). *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maas, Michael. (2005) "Roman Questions, Byzantine Answers: Contours of the Age of Justinian" in Maas, M. *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3-27

Marasco, G. (2003). *Greek and Roman historiography in late antiquity: Fourth to sixth century A.D*. Leiden: Brill.

Mason, H. J. (1974). *Greek terms for Roman institutions: A lexicon and analysis.* Toronto: Hakkert.

Megill, Allan. (2007) "History, Memory, Identity" in Megill, A., Shepard, S., & Honenberger, P. Historical knowledge, historical error: A contemporary guide to practice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 41-62.

Moffat, Ann (1990). "A Record of Public Buildings and Monuments." In Jeffreys, E., Croke, B. &, Scott, R. (1990). *Studies in John Malalas*. Sydney: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies. 87-109.

Momigliano, A. (1945) "Review: *Les Origines de la Légende Troyenne de Rome (281-31)* by Jacques Perret." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 35, Parts 1 and 2 99-104.

Moorhead, J. (1983) "The West and the Roman Past from Theoderic to Charlemagne" in B Croke and A Emmett, eds, *History and Historians in Late Antiquity*. Sydney. 155-169.

Moorhead, J. (1994) *Justinian.* London: Longman.

Moravcsik, G. (1966) "Klassizismus in der byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung." In P. Wirth, ed., *Polychronion: Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag.* Heidelberg: C. Winter. v. 1, 366-377.

Nixon, C. E. V. (1990) “The Use of the Past in the Gallic Panegyrists” in Clarke, G. W. *Reading the past in late antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press. 1-36.

Nora, Pierre. (1996-8) *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*. Columbia University Press: New York.

Nora, Pierre. (2002) “Reasons for the Current Upsurge in Memory.” *Transit* 22:1-8.

Olick, Jeffrey K. (1999) "Collective Memory: The Two Cultures". *Sociological Theory*. 17 (3): 333-348.

Olick, Jeffrey K., and Joyce Robbins. (1998) "Social Memory Studies: From "Collective Memory" to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices". *Annual Review of Sociology*. 24: 105-140.

Olick, J.K. (ed.). (2003). *States of Memory: Continuities, Conflicts and Transformations in National Retrospection.* Durham.

Olick, J. K., Vinitzky-Seroussi, V., & Levy, D. (2011). *The Collective Memory Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pazdernik, C. (2000) “Procopius and Thucydides on the Labors of War: Belisarius and Brasidas in the Field.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 130: 149-87.

Pazdernik, Charles. (2006) "Xenophon's Hellenica in Procopius' Wars: Pharnabazus and Belisarius". *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*. 46 (2): 175.

Pazdernik, Charles. (2005) “Justinianic Ideology and the Power of the Past” in in Maas, M. *The Cambridge companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 185-212

Perret, J. (1942). Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome (281-31). Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles lettres".

Popular Memory Group (1998) “Popular Memory: Theory, Politics, Method,” *Oral History Reader.* Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson, eds. New York: Routledge. 43-53.

Rohrbacher, D. (2002). *The historians of late antiquity*. London: Routledge.

de Romilly, Jacqueline. (1956) *Histoire et raison chez Thucydide*. Paris: Les Belles lettres.

Rubin, B. (1954). *Prokopios von Kaisareia*. Stuttgart: A. Druckenmüller.

Schudson, Michael. (1989) “The Past in the Present versus the Present in the Past.” *Communication* 11:105-13.

Scott, R. (1981) “The Classical Tradition in Byzantine Historiography” In M. Mullett and R. Scott, *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*, Birmingham: Center for Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham. 61-73.

Scott, R. (1985) “Malalas, The Secret History, and Justinian’s Propaganda” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 39, 99-109.

Scott, R. (1990) “Malalas’ View of the Classical Past” In *Reading the past in late antiquity*. ed. G. W. Clarke. Rushcutters Bay, NSW, Australia: Australian National University Press. 147-164.

Scott, R. (2012). *Byzantine chronicles and the sixth century*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Smith, R. (2006) “The Construction of the Past in the Roman Empire” in D. S. Potter, ed, *A Companion to the Roman Empire*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 411-438.

Sophocles, E. A. (1870). *Greek lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine periods: (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100).* Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Soyter, G. (1939) “Prokop als Geschichtsschreiber des Vandalen- u. Gotenkrieges,” *Neue Jahrb. f. Antike u. deutsche Bildung* II 106.

Soyter, G. (1951) “Die Glaubwudigkeit des Geschichtsschreibers Prokopios von Kaisarea.” *ByzZ* 44: 541-45.

Stein, E., & Palanque, J. (1949). *Histoire du Bas-Empire.* Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.

Teuffel, W.S. (1871) *Studien und Charakteristiken*, Leipzig, 191-236.

Tucci, P. L. (1997) “Dov’ erano il tempio di Nettuno e la nave di Enea” *Bulletino della Commissione Archeologia Comunale di Roma* 98. 15-42.

Vavřínek, V. (1985). From late antiquity to early Byzantium: Proceedings of the Byzantinological Symposium in the 16th International Eirene Conference. Praha: Academia.

Veh, O. (1952-3). *Die Geschichtsschreibung und Weltauffassung des Prokop von Caesarea*. Bayreuth: Gymnasium Bayreuth.

Wagner, D.  (2014) “Yersinia pestis and the Plague of Justinian 541–543 AD: a genomic analysis” *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 28 January 2014
DOI: 10.1016/S1473-3099(13)70323-2

Weinrich, H. *Lethe: The Art and Critique of Forgetting*.  Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Whitby, M. (1995) “Recruitment in Byzantine Armies from Justinian to Heraclius (ca. 565-615) In *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East.* Vol. 3, *States, Resources, and Armies,* ed. Averil Cameron, Princeton. 61-124.

Whitby, Mary. (2000a), "Procopius’ Buildings Book I: A Panegyrical Perspective” Late Antiquity. 8. 45-57.

Whitby, M. (2000b) “The Army, c. 420-602.” *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 14, ed. Averil Cameron, Bryan Ward-Perkins, and Michael Whitby. Cambridge. 288-314.

Zerubavel, E. (2003). *Time maps: Collective memory and the social shape of the past.* Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Press.

Zerubavel, Y. (1995). *Recovered roots: Collective memory and the making of Israeli national tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.