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FOREWORD

Following the 23rd International Congress of Byzantine Studies, the Organizing Committee decided to produce an online publication of Proceedings from the Round Tables. According to the official title of the congress, *Byzantium - a World of Changes*, AIEB together with the Organizing Committee, have decided to implement some changes to the concept of the Round Tables. The aim of these changes were to encourage discussion at the Round Tables by presenting preliminary papers at the website in advance. The idea was to introduce the topic and papers of the individual Round Tables that would be discussed, first between the participants, and then with the public present. Therefore, the conveners of the Round Tables were asked to create Round Tables with no more than 10 participants. They collected the papers, which were to be no longer than 18,000 characters in one of the official languages of the Congress and without footnotes or endnotes. Conveners provided a general statement on the goal of each roundtable and on the content of the papers.

The present volume contains papers from 49 Round Tables carefully selected to cover a wide range of topics, developed over the last five years since the previous Congress. The topics show diversity within fields and subfields, ranging from history to art history, archaeology, philosophy, literature, hagiography, and sigillography. The Round Tables displayed current advances in research, scholarly debates, as well as new methodologies and concerns germane to all aspects of international Byzantine studies.

The papers presented in this volume were last sent to the congress organizers in the second week of August 2016 and represent the material that was on hand at that time and had been posted on the official website; no post-congress revisions have occurred. We present this volume in hope that it will be an initial step for further development of Round Tables into collections of articles and thematic books compiled and published following the Congress, in collaboration with other interested institutions and editors. With this volume, the organizers signal their appreciation of the efforts of more than 1600 participants who contributed, both to the Round Tables and to the Congress in general.

Bojana Krsmanović
Ljubomir Milanović
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André Binggeli – Sophie Métivier,
Qui sont les « nouveaux » martyrs des Byzantins? Pour une analyse
de l’usage du terme néos dans l’hagiographie

Francesco D’Aiuto,
Nuovi martiri nel « Menologio Imperiale »

Stephanos Efthymiadis,
L’hagiographie des nouveaux martyrs face aux Arabes et à l’islam:
les enjeux et l’évolution d’une littérature

Michel Kaplan,
Les saintes femmes, mariées et battues par leur époux, sont-elles des néomartyres?

Eleonora Kountoura Galaki,
Rewriting on the Martyrs of the Iconoclast Period during the Palaiologan Time

Smilja Marjanović-Dušanić,
Nouveaux martyrs dans la piété serbe du Moyen Âge tardif

Symeon Paschalidis,
Becoming a New Martyr in Palaiologan Byzantium
Introduction

Une fois achevée la période des persécutions par les empereurs païens, l’Empire byzantin a continué de produire des martyrs tout au long de son histoire. Pour ce faire, ses hagiographes ont puisé dans des modèles élaborés dès les derniers siècles de l’Antiquité, qu’ils aient composé sur des figures du passé ou des figures qui leur sont contemporaines. Le principal enjeu de la table ronde est d’analyser comment la notion de martyr a été renouvelée et réactualisée à différents moments du Moyen Âge byzantin, en particulier à la période iconoclaste et sous les dominations arabe, seldjoukide et ottomane. On commencera par examiner, en introduction, la genèse de la notion de néomartyr (A. Binggeli / S. Métivier). On analysera ensuite la question des emprunts et réécritures dans l’hagiographie martyriale, en même temps que leur enjeu politique (F. D’Aiuto, E. Kountoura-Galakè). À travers différentes figures de martyrs, du soldat fait prisonnier au confesseur de l'iconoclasme, de la femme battue au roi martyr, on s’interrogera sur ce que peut recouvrir et signifier le martyr à l’époque médiévale (S. Efthymiadis, M. Kaplan, S. Marjanović-Dušanić).
Qui sont les « nouveaux » martyrs des Byzantins ?
Pour une analyse de l’usage du terme néos dans l’hagiographie

Le terme et la notion de « néomartyr » ont principalement été utilisés pour désigner des martyrs et saints des époques moderne et contemporaine, sous les domination ottomane et soviétique. Pour autant ils ne sont pas exclusivement modernes. Ils ont en effet été élaborés dès la période médiévale pour qualifier, en particulier, des chrétiens sanctifiés pour avoir été mis à mort par les autorités arabes entre le viiᵉ et le ixᵉ siècle dans l’hagiographie grecque palestinienne, comme l’a montré Antonio Rigo dans son article « O martiri vittoriosi di Cristo apparsi di recente… », et des saints de l'iconoclasme dans l’hagiographie mésobyzantine. Il n’en reste pas moins que cette notion n’èst pas si évidente dans le monde byzantin, faute d’avoir été employée systématiquement là où on l’attendrait et en raison d’une élaboration qui, à plusieurs reprises, a eu lieu hors du monde byzantin. Une analyse diachronique de l’usage du terme néos dans l’hagiographie de la période médiévale permet de mieux comprendre la conception que les Byzantins ont élaborée de la figure du martyr.

Les martyrs ne sont pas les seuls saints à être caractérisés comme néoi. L’expression, traduite en français tantôt par « le jeune », tantôt par « le nouveau » (avec toutes les ambiguïtés du terme « nouveau »), qualifient en effet des figures très diverses du sanctoral byzantin. Son usage est clair : de même que, lorsqu’elle est appliquée à des empereurs, elle sert à distinguer deux individus homonymes en établissant un ordre de succession (par exemple, Théodose Iᵉʳ et Théodose II, dit le Jeune), dans notre cas elle créé un lien entre deux saints homonymes. Son emploi n’indique pas uniquement que l’un est postérieur à l’autre, il peut suggérer également que l’un se situe par rapport à l’autre, pris, sinon comme modèle, du moins comme référence. Ainsi, dès l’Antiquité, pour Mélanie la Jeune et Syméon Stylite le Jeune ou, à la période médiévale, pour Antoine le Jeune, présenté dès le prologue de sa Vie (BHG 142) comme l’émule d’Antoine le Grand, et Euthyme le Jeune, moine athonite, fondateur du monastère de Péristérai dans la périphérie de Thessalonique, sur la Vie duquel (BHG 655) plane l’ombre du grand fondateur palestinien homonyme du vᵉ siècle. Quant aux martyrs médiévaux, ont pu être caractérisés comme tels ou comme néophaneis plusieurs d’entre eux : Bacchos, martyr en Palestine pour apostasie de l’islam, Étienne, martyr du premier iconoclasme, Théophile, général byzantin fait prisonnier et mis à mort par les Arabes, les XLII martyrs d’Amorion, pour ne citer que quelques exemples.

L’emploi du terme n’â bast pas pour seule fonction de situer, dans une relation ordonnée, deux individus. Dans son article intitulé « Observations on the Nea Ekklesia of Basil I », Paul Magdalino l’a commenté dans un autre contexte. Lorsque Basile Iᵉʳ désigne l’église qu’il a fondée au Palais comme étant la Néa,
il entend marquer à la fois la supériorité de cette fondation – par rapport aux autres églises qu’il a fait construire ou restaurer –, en même temps que l’authentifier. L’historien souligne que le terme implique une comparaison (synkrisis) entre deux termes, dont le second renouvelle, voire supplante le premier. Ainsi, dans la Vie de Basile le Jeune (BHG 263), l'hagiographe n'hésite pas à écrire : « Notre père, vraisemblablement la plus grande, est devenu à la fois célèbre grâce à des miracles extraordinaires, même si l’a été appelé néos en raison de l’ordre (taxis) et du temps puisqu’il est apparu parmi nous dans les derniers temps. […] Pour ce qui est de la clairvoyance et de la prophétie, il a surpassé tous les saints d’autrefois […]. » (éd. D. F. Sullivan et A.-M. Talbot, III 42, p. 342, l. 13-21).

L’usage du terme néos pour caractériser plusieurs martyrs de l’époque médiévale peut être interprété suivant le même schéma. L’un des plus anciens qui nous soient connus, Étienne le Jeune, un martyr du premier iconoclasme mort en 765 ou 767, est dit néos dans le titre et le prologue de sa Vie ancienne (BHG 1666) – dans un passage interpolé, faut-il préciser. La comparaison avec le prôtomartyr homonyme est introduite dès la naissance du saint lors de la prédiction du patriarche Germain et le choix du nom par ses parents. Elle est ensuite reprise lors de la première injonction adressée par Constantin V à Étienne : au moment où ce dernier refuse de souscrire au décret du concile de Hiéreia, il est caractérisé comme étant « l’émule du prôtomartyr ». Elle est réitérée à la fin du récit, lorsque la relique du saint est déposée dans la chapelle dédiée au prôtomartyr du monastère tou Diou. Dans ce texte, composé au début du ixème siècle, la notion de néos n’est donc introduite que ponctuellement, voire simplement suggéré dans le cas du martyr lui-même. En revanche, elle est maintes fois utilisée pour qualifier le contexte de la persécution et, surtout, le persécuteur, suivant un schéma attesté de longue date ; ainsi Constantin V est-il désigné, entre autres, comme le « nouvel Héraode ». La fonction de cet usage rhétorique est connue : authentifier le « nouveau », en faisant de lui l’accomplissement de la figure de référence. Il est donc intéressant de noter que l’auteur de la Vie d’Étienne le Jeune fait usage des comparaisons d’abord et avant tout pour qualifier les persécuteurs. On sait en effet que la Vie a pour premier objet de dénoncer les empereurs iconoclastes – nous renvoyons au commentaire de Marie-France Auzépy. Syméon Métaphraste accorde une place similaire au motif du « nouveau martyr » dans sa Vie d’Étienne le Jeune (BHG 1667).

D’autres figures de martyrs, apparues dans cette même période du premier ou du second iconoclasme, ont été qualifiées de néoi ou de nêophaneis. Les XLII martyrs d’Amorion, dans l’une des Passions qui leur a été dédiée et qui a été composée dans les années suivant leur exécution en 845 – la Passion composée par le syncelle Michel (BHG 1213) –, sont dits nêofaneis dans l’exhortation finale (« ô athlètes victorieux nouvellement apparus du Christ ») ; dans celle placée sous le nom de Sophronios (BHG 1209), ils sont caractérisés comme nêofaneis άγωνωσται. Ils ont été comparés, au fil du récit, aux soldats martyrs condamnés par l’empereur Licinius à mourir de froid, les XL martyrs de Sébaste. À la fin du viiième siècle, un stratège de l’armée byzantine, Théophile, ayant été fait prisonnier par les Arabes et ayant refusé d’abjurer, est exécuté sur ordre du souverain. Dans la notice du Synaxaire de Constantinople qui le commémore à la date du 30 janvier – aucun texte proprement hagiographique n’a été conservé –, il est présenté comme « le saint martyr Théophile le Jeune » (άθλησις τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Θεοφίλου τοῦ νέου). C’est dans ces mêmes termes que Théophile a été mentionné dans le présynaxaire conservé dans le Patmiacus gr. 266, daté du tournant des ixème et xème siècles. Il n’est pas à confondre avec son homonyme quasi contemporain, confesseur lors du premier iconoclasme et commémoré dans le Synaxaire tantôt au 2 tantôt au 10 octobre, qualifié lui aussi parfois de néos : μνήμη τοῦ ἁγίου Θεοφίλου τοῦ νέου ὀμολογητοῦ.
Le motif dans l'hagiographie de l'époque mésobyzantine n'est encore introduit que dans peu de cas. Remarquons que le Synaxaire de Constantinople tend à en systématiser l'emploi, au xiᵉ siècle au plus tard, sous une forme précise, « le martyr Untel le jeune », et non sous la forme en usage dans l'hagiographie syro-palestinienne des viiiᵉ-xᵉ siècles (voir infra) ou dans l'hagiographie grecque des trois derniers siècles de l'Empire. Ainsi, dans le Synaxaire de Sirmond, il est fait mention de « notre saint père, Étienne le jeune » (au 28 novembre), du « saint martyr Bacchos le jeune » (au 15 décembre), du « saint martyr Théophile le jeune » (au 30 janvier). Les XLII martyrs d'Amorion font exception, ou encore Michel higoumène du monastère de Zôbi et ses trente-six moines (au 1er octobre). Dans la mise en ordre du sanctoral de l'Église de Constantinople, un nombre encore réduit de martyrs des premiers siècles du Moyen Âge trouve une place propre en étant ainsi caractérisés comme néoi.

À la même époque, entre le viiiᵉ et le xᵉ siècle, dans les territoires conquis par les armées arabes où s'est installé le califat omeyyade puis abbasside, la tradition hagiographique, florissante durant les siècles précédents, se perpète sous de nouvelles formes, et une partie non négligeable est consacrée aux chrétiens martyrs aux mains des Arabes. Les motifs de la mise à mort sont divers mais ils concernent toujours, sous une forme ou une autre, une confrontation avec la foi islamique des nouveaux souverains : ce sont soit des chrétiens qui refusent de se convertir à l'islam, comme le moine Michel le Sabaïte ou les LX soldats byzantins faits prisonniers lors de la prise de Gaza, soit des chrétiens accusés d'avoir prêché trop ouvertement leur foi jusqu'à entrer en confrontation avec le pouvoir musulman, comme le prêtre Pierre de Capitolias, soit des musulmans convertis au christianisme et condamnés à mort pour apostasie, comme Bacchos de Maïouma ; d'autres comme Élie d'Héliopoli peuvent avoir été accusés d'apostasie, alors même qu'ils ne se sont jamais convertis à l'islam. La production hagiographique concernant ces martyrs qui s'opposent au pouvoir islamique nous est parvenue dans un état assez disparate, puisque seule une partie de la production est conservée en grec ; le reste étant en latin, en arabe, en syriaque en géorgien ou en arménien, sans qu'il soit toujours possible de déterminer si une partie de cette production remonte à un original grec ; inversement il apparaît qu'une partie de la production en grec est traduite de langues orientales.

Malgré la disparité du corpus qui rend difficile une analyse terminologique comparée, on y rencontre, de manière fréquente mais non systématique, l'emploi du terme néos (ou son équivalent dans une autre langue) associé au terme de martys, selon un schéma de formulation légèrement différent de celui qu'on trouve à la même époque à Byzance. Aucun de ces martyrs n'est en effet mis en regard d'un illustre homonyme, figure de référence dont le nouveau saint serait l'accomplissement ; il est même difficile dans certains cas à savoir à quel homonyme il faut se référer. C'est le cas d'Élie d'Héliopoli, charpentier laïc soupçonné d'avoir embrassé l'islam au cours d'une fête (BHГ 578-579) : à la différence de son contemporain homonyme commémoré à Byzance, Élie d'Enna (BHГ 580), appelé « le Jeune » (néos), moine voyageur parti de Sicile qui s'est mis dans les pas du prophète et participe de sa gloire (οὕτως γένηται καὶ Ηλίῳ τῷ Θεσβίτῃ σύνθρομος καὶ τῆς τούτου συμμέτοχος χάριτος ; éd. G. Rossi Taibbi, p. 6, l. 52-54), il n'y a pas lieu dans le cas d'Élie d'Héliopoli de chercher de succession entre le prophète et le martyr. La qualité de néos est appliquée ici directement au terme martys, et l'hagiographe crée un néologisme νεομάρτυς, calqué sur d'autres termes similaires ὀσιομάρτυς, μεγαλομάρτυς. Dans le prologue, il revendique même ce terme en justifiant la sainteté des « néomartyrs » qui, même s'ils ne sont pas exemplaires en tous points, ont été rachetés par le sang versé.

Faut-il voir dans l'emploi de ce terme – ou dans l'association plus classique de néos et de martys – dans l'hagiographie syro-palestinienne de cette période, la volonté de faire de ces chrétiens martyrs aux mains des Arabes une nouvelle génération de martyrs, après celle des premières siècles aux

Le motif et la notion de « nouveau martyr » ne s'imposent véritablement dans l'Empire byzantin stricto sensu que dans les derniers siècles de son histoire, comme en témoignent, aux XIIIe, XIVe et XVe siècles, différentes Vies consacrées à des martyrs contemporains, comme Nicétas le Jeune, Michel le Jeune ou encore Théodore le Jeune. Au même moment les Passions des martyrs des siècles antérieurs, par exemple ceux de l'iconoclasme, font l'objet de diverses réécritures de la part de plusieurs hagiographes. Usant de manière répétée de la formule, les hagiographes prendraient acte de l'entrée dans un nouvel âge des martyrs. La diffusion de la formulation « le néomartyr » ou « le nouveau martyr », aux dépens de l'expression « le martyr Untel le jeune », à l'époque paléologue – phénomène qui demanderait toutefois à être confirmé – en est-elle l'indice et la conséquence ?
Nuovi martiri nel «Menologio Imperiale»

Composto nella prima metà dell’XI secolo, solo pochi decenni dopo il Menologio di Simeone il Metafrasta, l’anonimo «Menologio Imperiale», legato al nome di Michele IV Paflagone (1034-1041), rappresenta l’ultimo tentativo di una sistematica rielaborazione complessiva del patrimonio di narrazioni agiografiche in lingua greca delle età precedenti: un ambizioso progetto di ricapitolazione dell’agiografia proto- e mediobizantina che, tuttavia, non avrà mai modo di affermarsi veramente al di fuori delle ristrette cerchie per le quali fu concepito e realizzato.

La sua mancata affermazione, in effetti, si deve non soltanto alla concorrenza del Menologio metafrastico, che eccellerà ben presto con il suo straordinario successo ogni altra raccolta agiografica menologica precedente o successiva, ma – credo – soprattutto al fatto che, di per sé, il «Menologio Imperiale» non ambiva affatto a fornire una serie standardizzata di testi utilizzabili in qualunque contesto di lettura, privata o pubblica che fosse, ma mirava piuttosto a fornire le lectiones agiografiche più adatte – quanto a santorale, sequenza calendaria, e adesione a determinati usi locali – alla lettura collettiva in specifici ambienti monastici o ecclesiastici cui i lussuosi volumi originali miniati della raccolta erano destinati.

Per quanto si può giudicare da quel che ne è rimasto, infatti, il «Menologio Imperiale» si presenta chiaramente suddiviso in due distinte e autonome redazioni, ognuna delle quali mostra una scelta di commemorazioni non del tutto coincidente con l'altra, e soprattutto offre, in ciascuna sua Vita o Passio, una nuova e originale redazione della narrazione agiografica in questione. Così, laddove in entrambe le redazioni abbiamo testi per uno stesso santo e per una medesima commemorazione, ci accorgiamo che essi divergono nel dettato in maniera consistente, di fatto costituendo, dunque, due testi indipendenti – spesso autonome metafrasi di scritti preesistenti – confezionati in maniera svincolata l'uno dall'altro. Pare evidente, quindi, che le due redazioni del «Menologio Imperiale», pur essendo parte di un progetto unitario, dovettero essere allestite in autonomia per (e forse con la collaborazione di) due distinti santuari probabilmente costantinopolitani, nei quali i bei manoscritti illustrati che le contenevano erano destinati a essere conservati, alimentandovi le pratiche di preghiera in favore del sovrano committente o dedicatario dell’impresa.

Michele IV, del resto, era bisognoso di «redenzione» spirituale, o quanto meno, col patrocinio di pie opere intendeva mostrarsene desideroso, preoccupandosi di ottenere anche per tale via la legittimazione del suo potere e di farsi perdonare le modalità poco ortodosse della sua ascesa al trono a seguito dell’assassinio di Romano III Arigio (1028-1034), esito tragico della furtiva liaison amorosa intessuta dal giovane Michele con la moglie di lui, l'imperatrice porfirogenita Zoe. Non è certo un caso, quindi, che alla fine di ciascun testo agiografico del «Menologio Imperiale» stia una preghiera – costruita sull’acrostico Μιχαήλ Π e sempre abilmente variata nel suo dettato – per il bene dell’imperatore, per la sua salvezza ultraterrena, ma anche per la saldezza del suo potere terreno e, infine, per la sua salute fisica: di salute cagionevole, in effetti, Michele soffriva di epilessia e, verso la fine del suo breve regno, di altre gravi disfunzioni che ne affrettarono la morte.
Se, quindi, è assodato che le differenti redazioni del «Menologio Imperiale» furono (almeno) due, va detto però che col tempo si è rivelata erronea la tradizionale suddivisione degli oltre ducentotrenta testi superstiti della raccolta agiografica in due redazioni definite «Menologio Imperiale A» e «B»: una ripartizione che fu proposta da Albert Ehrhard e che via via si costruì nel corso del XX secolo intorno alle progressive scoperte di testi appartenenti alla collezione e di nuovi manoscritti che li tramandavano. La constatazione dell’insostenibilità della suddivisione tradizionale ha imposto, di recente, una revisione delle attribuzioni dei singoli testi all’una o all’altra delle due redazioni, e come conseguenza pratica, per evitare confusioni per il futuro, anche una ridenominazione delle due distinte serie di testi (cf. D’Aiuto, in RSBN, n.s. 49 [2012], pp. 275-361, con la precedente bibliografia).

Questa nuova ripartizione di testi e manoscritti fra le due redazioni, che distingue ora nel «Menologio Imperiale» una series Mosquensis e una series Baltimorensis, è basata su criteri sia interni, ovvero di natura filologica, sia esterni, ossia paleografico-codicologici o relativi alla tradizione manoscritta, mediante osservazioni svolte a partire dai pochi tomi dei manoscritti originali miniati giunti sino a noi – ovvero, quel che resta degli esemplari di presentazione che dovettero essere offerti ai due santuari per i quali le due distinte redazioni dell’opera furono concepite –, che sono da un lato il manoscritto di Baltimore, Walters Art Museum, W. 521 (unitamente ai pochi frammenti di Atene, Museo Benaki, Προθ. 34,6 [Μπ. 71]) e dall’altro il codice di Mosca, GIM, Synod. gr. 183 (376 Vlad.). Da questi sontuosi codici-capofila di Mosca e di Baltimora, rivelatisi punti di riferimento primari ai fini dell’analisi, ricevono, dunque, la loro nuova denominazione le due redazioni Mosquensis e Baltimorensis del «Menologio Imperiale», giacché ognuno di questi due esemplari miniati si è rivelato pertinente a una diversa fra le due serie di testi e di manoscritti.

A conclusione di questa premessa, è ancora necessario ricordare che una caratteristica strutturale peculiare del «Menologio Imperiale» sta da un lato nella sua copertura di tutti i giorni dell’anno – senza lasciare giornate prive di commemorazione –, ma dall’altro anche nella drastica selezione delle festività, finalizzata a conservare una sola memoria e un unico testo agiografico per ciascun giorno (fatte salve, per la verità, rarissime occorrenze, in una stessa data liturgica, di doppia commemorazione all’interno di una medesima redazione del nostro «Menologio»). Insomma, di norma in ciascuna delle due redazioni del «Menologio Imperiale» ogni giorno dell’anno ha il suo (unico) santo e il suo (unico) testo.

Questo tipo di costruzione della raccolta agiografica, poco comune ma in sé non nuovo – se ne ha un bell’esempio del X secolo nel Menologio premetafrastico di Patmos, Μονὴ τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου, gr. 254 –, si deve all’esigenza di fornire per ciascun giorno dell’anno un solo testo di lunghezza media – una sorta di βίος ἐν συντόμῳ d’estensione generalmente intermedia fra quella di un testo menologico lungo e quella di una succinta notizia del Sinassario –, evidentemente a servizio di pratiche di lettura agiografica collettiva che da un lato intendono prescindere dall’impiego delle notizie sinassariali, sintetiche ma multiple per ciascun giorno, dall’altro riconoscono la scarsa praticità dell’adozione per la lectio agiografica di testi agiografici talora molto estesi quali quelli contenuti nei Menologi pre-metafrastici e nel Menologio dello stesso Simeone Metafrasta.

La severa selezione operata nel «Menologio Imperiale» – un solo santo e un solo testo per ciascun giorno – ha come conseguenza la tendenziale concentrazione su un santorale, per così dire, di base, nel quale sono per lo più presenti soltanto le commemorazioni più diffuse e i culti
più comuni, spesso antichi e riferibili ai primi secoli del Cristianesimo: i più insigni martiri delle persecuzioni tardo-romane o Padri della Chiesa, o ancora asceti o vescovi delle età più antiche, e comunque santi il cui culto era ormai ampiamente radicato nell’orbe cristiano e nel mondo bizantino in particolare.

A fronte, quindi, di una tale scelta non stupisce, in quanto ci resta del «Menologio Imperiale», la totale assenza di santi del X secolo o dei primi decenni dell’XI. Caso mai sorprende rilevare, al contrario, la presenza non del tutto irrievante di testi relativi a santi dei secoli VIII e IX, e in particolare, ma non solo, di martiri e confessori (o, in certi casi, di santi presentati dai testi agiografici con un’aura da «quasi confessori», quali i patriarchi costantinopolitani Callinico e Tarasio):

**Menologii Imperialis «series Baltimoresensis»**
1) [25.02] Vita s. Tarasii patr. CP (sine num. *BHG*, cf. Athen. Benaki Proth. 34,6) [† 806]
2) [06.03] Passio ss. XLII martyrum Amoriensium (*BHG et Nov. Auct. BHG* 1214b) [† post 838]
3) [12.03] Vita s. Theophanis confessoris (*BHG et Nov. Auct. BHG* 1788) [† 817/818]

**Menologii Imperialis «series Mosquensis»**
1) [25.02] Vita s. Tarasii patr. CP (*BHG et Nov. Auct. BHG* 1698c) [† 806]
2) [06.03] Passio ss. XLII martyrum Amoriensium (*BHG et Nov. Auct. BHG* 1211) [† post 838]
3) [12.03] Vita s. Theophanis confessoris (*BHG et Nov. Auct. BHG* 1791) [† 817/818]
4) [13.03] Sermo in transl. s. Nicephori ep. CP (*BHG et Nov. Auct. BHG* 1337b) [an. 847]
5) [02.06] Vita s. Nicephori patr. CP (*BHG et Nov. Auct. BHG* 1337e) [† 829]
6) [08.06] Passio s. Pauli in Caiuma (*BHG et Nov. Auct. BHG* 1471) [† sub Constantino V]
7) [19.07] Passio s. Theodosiae mart. CP (*BHG et Nov. Auct. BHG* 1773y) [† sub Leone Isauro]
8) [30.08] Vita s. Callinici patr. CP (*Nov. Auct. BHG* 287z) [† 705]

Certo, gli scritti dedicati a questa categoria di santi sono, come risulta dalla lista, un’esigua minoranza. All’interno, infatti, di un dossier di 232 testi superstiti appartenenti alle due diverse redazioni del «Menologio Imperiale» – degli oltre 730 di cui in origine esse dovevano constare complessivamente: ovvero 365 testi, quanti sono i giorni dell’anno, per ciascuna delle due redazioni, con qualche raro testo aggiuntivo per le sporadiche doppie commemorazioni in una stessa data –, le *Passiones* di «nuovi» martiri o le *Vitae* di confessori (o «quasi-confessori») a partire dall’VIII secolo sono, in definitiva, in tutto meno una dozzina, dunque meno del 5% dei testi giunti: una percentuale bassa, ma non trascurabile proprio in considerazione dello stringente meccanismo di selezione di cui si è detto, che difficilmente permetteva di far spazio, nel «Menologio Imperiale», a santi delle età più recenti.

Ci si può allora chiedere se, nel «Menologio Imperiale», questo pur ridotto numero di neo-martiri e neo-confessori di VIII e IX secolo, unitamente ad altre figure di santi asceti o vescovi non perseguitati ma da riferirsi allo stesso periodo – fra tutti, ricordo soltanto i significativi esempi si s. Eudocimo e di s. Leone di Catania –, sia il mero sintomo di una preminenza ormai acquisita e riconosciuta, nel santorale della Chiesa Greca dopo il Mille, della categoria dei santi dell’età della crisi iconoclasta, a due secoli di distanza dalla restaurazione dell’Ortodossia, o se invece non sia, almeno in parte, segno di una scelta consapevole da parte dei redattori del «Menologio Imperiale».

Negli altri casi, gli anonimi redattori del «Menologio Imperiale» paiono essi stessi aver in qualche misura promosso culti recentiores che nelle età precedenti avevano trovato poco o punto spazio nei Menologi, tanto premetafrastici quanto metafrastico, e che si trovavano spesso in posizione per così dire subordinata, come commemorazioni successive alla prima, nei testimoni più antichi del Sinassario. Così accade, entro la series Mosquensis, nei due giorni consecutivi del 12 e 13 marzo, in relazione a s. Teofane Confessore (BHG 1791) e alla traslazione di s. Niceforo patriarca di Costantinopoli (BHG 1337b), feste che – sull’onda di una tendenza già ravvisabile stabolta nei Sinassari B* – sono elevate a commemorazione prescelta delle due suddette giornate, spostando ad altro giorno le memorie che si trovano per lo più in prima posizione sotto tali date nei Sinassari più antichi (H*, D), ovvero quella di s. Gregorio Magno (che nel «Menologio Imperiale di Mosca» del 12 marzo è trasferita al 14) e quella di s. Sabino martire (che dal 13 marzo – o 12 nei Sinassari B* – è dislocata all’11). In altri casi – di segno opposto, ma complementare per tipo di soluzione adottata – i redattori del «Menologio Imperiale» trasportano, al contrario, in altra data vicina il culto del neo-martire da valorizzare e promuovere, evidentemente per evitare di scalzare dalla medesima giornata un’altra memoria liturgica ben consolidata nell’uso. È quanto accade con s. Teodosia martire di Costantinopoli (BHG 1773y), che nella series Mosquensis del «Menologio Imperiale» si trova commemorata il 19 luglio (ove soppianta s. Macrina e s. Dio di Antiochia) anziché, come nei Sinassari, il 18, data che anche nella nostra raccolta agiografica rimane riservata a s. Emiliano di Durostoro, sempre in prima posizione nei Sinassari (H*, B*, D, e così via). E lo stesso si verifica per s. Callinico patriarca di Costantinopoli (Nov. Auct. BHG 287z), commemorato dai Sinassari più antichi il 23 agosto, ma non certo in prima posizione. In tale data anche nella series Mosquensis del «Menologio Imperiale» – sacrificando il ricordo dei vescovi antiocheni Eustazio e Melezio – viene privilegiata la memoria, molto ben attestata nei Sinassari, dei martiri Ireneo, Or e Oropseo, trovando però modo di recuperare successivamente il culto del patriarca costantinopolitano Callinico mediante l’espedito dello spostamento della sua festa in avanti di una settimana, ovvero sotto la data del 30 agosto.
In quest’ultimo giorno, del resto, si ricordano collettivamente in diversi testimoni del Sinassario altri patriarchi costantinopolitani – forse, in quanto non «perseguitati», meno significativi agli occhi degli anonimi agiografi della nostra raccolta, e dunque del tutto trascurati dal «Menologio Imperiale» –, ovvero Alessandro († 337), Giovanni Nesteuta (582-595) e Paolo il Giovane (780-784): la memoria di questi presuli costantinopolitani, sebbene omessa dal «Menologio Imperiale» – come pure sacrificate sono le concorrenti commemorazioni, al 30 agosto, di s. Felice e compagni, o di s. Filonide di Curio –, sembra però aver attratto qui quella del patriarca Callinico, che i nostri anonimi agiografi avranno inteso privilegiare in quanto figura circondata di un’aura di vittima del sommo potere politico, per esser stato maltrattato dall’imperatore Giustiniano II.


Significative, dunque, paiono complessivamente sia la selezione di queste memorie cultuali recenti all’interno del «Menologio Imperiale», sia la modalità del loro inserimento in esso, mediante l’espedito di accorti giochi di modifiche di data. Meno interessanti e originali, invece, paiono la scelta e l’uso che in questi casi gli anonimi agiografi fanno delle fonti-modello, e il modo in cui esse vengono rielaborate. Per i loro nuovi testi dedicati a questi neo-martiri o neo-confessori, infatti, i redattori del «Menologio Imperiale» adottano le stesse strategie «opportunistiche» che per questa collezione agiografica sono state adotte, quanto a impiego dei modelli letterari, in relazione ad altre categorie di santi, e inoltre ricorrono alla stessa gerarchia delle fonti e ai medesimi meccanismi di preferenze ai fini della loro selezione (cf. RSBN, n.s. 49 [2012], pp. 314ss.). In particolare, ove esistente si privilegia come modello il testo incluso nel Menologio metafrastico, fonte prediletta dei redattori del «Menologio Imperiale»: è quel che accade nel caso dei martiri di Amorio, laddove sia per la series Baltimorensis (BHG 1214b) che per la series Mosquensis (BHG 1211) è utilizzata come modello, in maniera autonoma fra le due redazioni, la premetafrastica Passio auct. Evodio BHG 1214, inserita da Simeone nel suo Menologio. Altrimenti si fa ricorso, ove disponibili e adatti all’uopo, a testi lunghi non metafrastici, di norma premetafrastici: così è per i testi per s. Teofane Confessore, che in entrambe le redazioni (ser. Baltim.: BHG 1788; ser. Mosqu.: BHG 1791) derivano, rielaborandola in maniera indipendente l’una dall’altra, dalla Vita auctore Methodio BHG 1787z; ma lo stesso accade, nella series Mosquensis, per s. Tarasio patriarca (BHG 1698c, che ha per fonte la Vita auct. Ignatio diaic. BHG 1698), o per la traslazione di s. Niceforo patriarca di Costantinopoli (BHG 1337b, modellata sulla Translatio auct. Theophane presb. BHG 1336-1337), e infine per s. Paolo del Καϊουμᾶ (BHG 1471, testo che deriva, come si è detto, dalla premetafrastica Passio BHG 1471b). Infine, laddove mancassero del tutto altri testi lunghi, o quando quelli disponibili parevano magari
troppo retorici o prolissi – e perciò difficili da rilavorare per ridurli a una narrazione piana di buon livello stilistico e media estensione –, i redattori del «Menologio Imperiale» fecero ricorso, secondo il loro costume, alle brevi notizie del Sinassario, le cui notizie furono da loro alquanto amplificate con luoghi comuni e nozioni generali e soprattutto rimodellate in senso retorico, come sembra di poter rilevare nei casi di s. Teodosia di Costantinopoli (BHG 1773y), di s. Callinico patriarca di Costantinopoli (BHG 287z) e persino della commemorazione del 2 giugno di s. Niceforo patriarca (BHG 1337e), per la quale la concisa notizia sinassariale sembra esser stata preferita, come fonte, alla ricca e complessa Vita auct. Ignatio diacono BHG 1335.

Se, dunque, non è la selezione o il trattamento delle fonti a permetterci di evincere un particolare interesse, nel «Menologio Imperiale», per la categoria dei neo-martiri e neo-confessori, va rilevato che neppure il dettato dei testi ad essi dedicati spinge in modo particolare sul pedale dell’ideologia, giacché esso non mostra specifiche coloriture o sottolineature concettuali, limitandosi gli agiografi a mirare all’elevazione stilistica e alla riduzione del plot entro i limiti d’una estensione maneggevole, come consueto in questa collezione agiografica. Il dato rilevante consiste, allora, nella pura e semplice decisione – che pare consapevole, e conseguentemente messa in atto – di includere nel «Menologio Imperiale» questi eroi della Chiesa delle età più recenti, privilegiandoli anzi rispetto alle commemorazioni concorrenti, a dispetto dei rigidhi vincoli di selezione imposti dalla struttura stessa della raccolta.

Ci si può domandare allora se, nel «Menologio Imperiale», l’esaltazione di vescovi o asceti martirizzati o perseguitati nelle età più recenti, vittime di un potere imperiale «non ortodosso» e quindi «tirannico» – ma per ciò stesso martiri o confessori i cui cerchi, come s. Teodosia di Costantinopoli (BHG 1773y), di s. Callinico patriarca di Costantinopoli (BHG 287z) e persino della commemorazione del 2 giugno di s. Niceforo patriarca (BHG 1337e), per la quale la concisa notizia sinassariale sembra esser stata preferita, come fonte, alla ricca e complessa Vita auct. Ignatio diacono BHG 1335.
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L’hagiographie des nouveaux martyrs face aux Arabes et à l’islam :
enjeux et évolution d’une littérature

Toute enquête menée à propos d’une littérature qui fait écho aux nouvelles réalités historiques et qui s’engage à la défense d’une identité établie contre une autre, nouvelle, qui la menace doit d’abord envisager les circonstances de sa création et les milieux où elle a pu être cultivée. Il s’ensuit un examen des coordonnées qui encadrent une littérature formée d’un ensemble plus ou moins homogène de textes : les types de ses héros, les leitmotivs narratifs qui la caractérisent, l’identité de ses auteurs, le public auquel ceux-ci s’adressaient, son extension chronologique et sa diffusion, etc.

La conquête arabe de la Palestine, de la Syrie et de l’Égypte au viiᵉ siècle, toutes provinces d’une valeur indiscutable pour l’empire romain d’Orient, et la soumission d’une large population chrétienne à un pouvoir politique et militaire qui devait son élan à une nouvelle religion ont donné naissance à une littérature de polémique qui se développa notamment au cours du viiiᵉ et du ixᵉ siècle et qui prit des formes diverses : traités théologiques, dialogues, histoires édifiantes, Passions et Vies de saints. C’est par ces deux derniers types du discours hagiographique que les chrétiens de l’Orient, byzantin ou non, ont célébré les nouveaux martyrs, à savoir les héros de la foi chrétienne qui, à l’instar de leurs prédécesseurs qui furent confrontés au pouvoir païen, perse, hérétique ou autre, ont subi la torture et l’exécution aux mains des Arabes pendant la période omeyyade et abbasside. Ce corpus hagiographique, qui va de la fin du viiᵉ au xᵉ siècle, est d’une variété remarquable si l’on considère à la fois les langues dans lesquelles il est composé (grec, arabe, syriaque, géorgien et arménien) et les éléments de differentiation qui le caractérisent si on le parcourt d’un bout à l’autre. Même considérée dans son ensemble, c’est une littérature qui, vis-à-vis des héros de la foi qu’elle célèbre, n’épuise pas le nombre des saints attestés dans des sources de caractère différent, comme, par exemple, les chroniques de Théophane le Confesseur et de Michel le Syrien ou les traités de S. Jean Damascène. En fait, la liste des nouveaux martyrs qui ressort d’un dépouillement des sources chrétiennes et islamiques dépasse celle dressée sur la seule base des témoins hagiographiques. Il s’agit au total d’environ quinze saints martyrs célébrés dans une ou plusieurs pièces à caractère hagiographique, auxquelles il faut ajouter à peu près une dizaine d’autres qui font l’objet d’une mention généralement brève dans des sources de caractère différent.

Si l’ouvrage de Robert Hoyland (Seeing Islam as Others Saw It) et le dictionnaire bibliographique édité par David Thomas et Barbara Roggema (Christian–Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History, t. I) nous fournissent un aperçu plus ou moins complet des documents sur les nouveaux saints de la période omeyyade et abbasside, une étude systématique de l’hagiographie du martyre face aux Arabes et l’islam reste à faire. L’étudier dans le détail serait une tâche nécessaire pour en dégager les points communs, les thèmes répétés d’un texte à l’autre, les types des héros, des anti-héros et des personnages secondaires mis en scène, la rhétorique qui accompagne leurs aventures, en somme tous les éléments constitutifs à travers desquels on peut discerner les enjeux qui se cachent derrière ces compositions.
Laissant de côté la question de la langue originale, cette matière disparate peut être classée en deux catégories, les martyres individuels et les martyres collectifs. Dans la première catégorie on peut ranger un certain nombre de Passions de structure narrative plutôt banale, dont les sujets concernent une période assez haute et dont la date de composition est difficile à préciser. L’élément variant repose dans l’identité des héros : outre des moines (Michel le Sabbaïte), on rencontre des laïcs d’origine humble (Élie le Jeune) et des prêtres mariés (Pierre de Capitolias) !

À côté de ces Passions qui exaltent un héroïsme individuel et qui céderont plus tard leur place à d’autres, d’une prose plus sophistiquée, on notera avec intérêt l’attestation d’au moins quatre martyres collectifs, séparés les uns des autres par une certaine distance dans le temps mais tous marqués par une historicité qui n’est pas aussi évidente dans les cas de martyre individuel. Du fait que la Passion des soixante martyrs de Gaza remonte à une époque aussi haute que celle de la chute de Jérusalem et de Gaza en 638-639, il paraît raisonnable de le considérer comme le plus ancien texte conservé du corpus hagiographique consacré aux nouveaux martyrs traités ici. La forme problématique dans laquelle cette Passion est conservée n’empêche pas de discerner sa dépendance envers l’archétype de toute Passion collective chrétienne, celle des Quarante Martyrs de Sébastée, dont l’empreinte est encore plus claire dans la Passion des Soixante Martyrs de Jérusalem, composée dans la deuxième moitié du viiie siècle. L’adoption d’une même trame narrative explique le motif de l’apostasie de sept entre eux ainsi que de la mort de trois autres, pendant que ce groupe d’archontes byzantins est transféré de la prison de Césarée à Jérusalem. Soixante au total y trouvent la mort glorieuse.

L’origine byzantine des saints, leur statut social élevé et la confession de leur foi sous forme de déclaration devant le gouverneur arabe de Palestine constituent des motifs que l’on retrouve, sous une forme beaucoup plus développée, dans la série des Passions qui exaltent la résistance des officiers militaires byzantins face à leurs geôleis arabes. Il s’agit des Quarante-Deux Martyrs d’Amorium, qui, faits prisonniers lors de la défaite de l’armée byzantine dans cette ville de Phrygie, refusent d’abjurer leur foi après avoir exposé des arguments empruntés à la théologie antimusulmane. Il est à noter que, en tant qu’apologètes, les officiers byzantins sont pourvus d’une armature théorique remarquable, qui non seulement condamne à l’échec toute tentative de prosélytisme de leur interlocuteur mais qui fait aussi du dialogue théologique le point central du récit entier.

Le retentissement de ce désastre militaire que fut la chute d’Amorium, l’implication de hauts dignitaires issus de familles renommées et l’héroïsation du combat contre un adversaire politique et militaire qui, à cette époque-là, s’identifiait aussi avec l’ennemi par excellence de la foi, constituent de bonnes raisons pour justifier l’écriture d’une série de Passions qui, quoique sous des angles divers, traitent du même héroïsme vis-à-vis de toute incitation à l’apostasie. En fait, quelle que soit la perspective adoptée par tel ou tel hagiographe (anonyme ou non), les pièces dédiées aux Quarante-Deux Martyrs d’Amorium représentent le niveau d’élaboration le plus élevé du traitement littéraire des néo-martyrs pendant la période considérée ici.

Dans une perspective plus large, cette élaboration est certes le résultat d’une « appropriation » constantinopolitaine d’un discours hagiographique qui s’est d’abord répandu au sein des communautés chrétiennes de Palestine et de Syrie et qui, initialement, exaltait l’héroïsme individuel et non collectif. L’exception à cette tendance prépondérante se limite au cas des Vingt Martyrs de Mar-Saba, moines de la laure de Saint-Sabas en Palestine, victimes d’une incursion de la part des Sarrasins qui, en quête d’or, pillèrent le monastère. La Passion, qui rend hommage à ces victimes et dénonce leurs assassins,
emprunte à la fois au panégyrique et à la chronique, prétant attention à la datation des faits décrits. Composé vers l’an 800, ce texte étendu, marqué par des scènes de violence qu’on ne rencontre pas chez d’autres hagiographes, suggère la fin d’une période de tolérance envers la population chrétienne qui, de la part des autorités arabes, a duré plus d’un siècle et demi. On y reconnaît la plume érudite d’Étienne Mansour, le seul hagiographe actif dans cette région dont on connait le nom et auquel on doit un autre texte, composé également en grec mais conservé en géorgien, la *Vie* de Romain le Néomartyr. Son héros principal est un moine byzantin, prisonnier des Arabes, emporté à la cour du calife d’où, suite à son refus de se convertir à l’islam, il est conduit à l’échafaud et la décapitation. L’auteur introduit des allusions polémiques contre les iconoclastes aussi pointues que celles qu’il réserve aux musulmans.

Cette ouverture palestinienne vers le monde byzantin et ses disputes est entreprise en sens inverse dans une œuvre dont des indices intratextuels permettent de placer la composition à Constantinople, bien qu’elle se déroule entièrement en Palestine. Il s’agit de la *Vie* de S. Bacchos le Jeune, un adolescent converti de la foi musulmane au christianisme, fait qui s’avère fatal pour la perte violente de sa vie. Par ce récit, qui relève à la fois de la biographie et de la *Passion*, Constantinople suggérait que l’espoir d’un retour à la foi chrétienne n’était pas perdu.

En guise de conclusion, cette hagiographie des nouveaux martyrs, qu’elle soit palestinienne et orientale ou constantinopolitaine, ne cache pas son intérêt pour le discours héroïque qui caractérise les *Passions* des premiers martyrs, sans pour autant en imiter les excès de caractère épique. Ses priorités étaient plutôt de souligner la qualité morale des chrétiens conduits au supplice et de montrer la supériorité de la doctrine chrétienne à ceux qui la contestaient.
Les saintes femmes, mariées et battues par leur époux, sont-elles des néomartyres ?

Deux Vies de saintes mariées, qui meurent plus ou moins sous les coups de leur mari, apparaissent dans la littérature hagiographique des Xe-XIe siècles, Marie la Jeune et Thomaïs de Lesbos. Marie serait née à Constantinople vers 875, épousa un officier de l'armée et passa le reste de sa vie à Bizye en Thrace où, après avoir eu quatre enfants, elle meurt à la suite des coups de son mari vers 903. Thomaïs, dont l'existence supposée est plus difficile à dater, dans la première moitié du Xe siècle, née à Lesbos, est venue très tôt avec sa famille à Constantinople; à 24 ans, elle épouse un marin, et meurt à 38 ans sous les coups de celui-ci.

Le dossier hagiographique de Marie la Jeune est fort simple, puisque nous disposons d'un seul texte, BHG 1164, connu par deux manuscrits du XIVe siècle. Le caractère comparativement tardif de ceux-ci interdit de connaître exactement la date de composition de la Vie; une référence à Basile II dans le c. 2 de la Vie constitue à l'évidence au moins une interpolation, voire la marque d'une réécriture. L'auteur est un lettré, sans doute lié à la ville de Bizye. Vu l'importance des récits de miracles posthumes et le transfert final de la relique dans un monastère de Bizye fondé par les fils de la sainte, il est clair que la Vie est écrite pour promouvoir le culte, mais de celui-ci nous n'avons gardé aucune trace.

Le dossier de Thomaïs est plus complexe. Nous avons une Vie anonyme (BHG 2454), publiée dans les Acta sanctorum de novembre, dont la tradition manuscrite remonte au XIe ou au XIVe siècle, même si elle a pu être composée dans la première moitié du Xe siècle, une deuxième Vie de date inconnue (BHG 2455) publiée par F. Halkin, un synaxaire métrique de 87 dodécasyllabes conservé dans un manuscrit athénien (BHG 2456) publié par I. Foundoulis (que je n'ai pas vu), et un éloge par Constantin Akropolite (BHG 2457), publié dans les mêmes AASS. Sa dépouille a été ensevelie au monastère de τὰ μικρὰ Ῥωμαίου, proche de Saint-Mokios, dont sa mère était l'higoumène; placée d'abord, selon la prescription de la sainte, dans l'avant-cour (τὰ προαύλια) du monastère, elle est transférée dans l'église par les moniales dès que s'accomplit le premier miracle post mortem. La Vie comporte une série de quatorze miracles, six de son vivant et huit posthumes. Il est donc vraisemblable que sa Vie ait été composée à l'instigation des moniales de τὰ μικρὰ Ῥωμαίου afin de promouvoir le culte. La relative importance du dossier hagiographique montre que le but est atteint, et nous avons le témoignage qu'à l'époque Paléologue, les pèlerins se rendaient toujours auprès de ces reliques.

Bien que les deux Vies présentent en apparence des points communs, l'hypothèse mise en avant par certains, qu'elles fussent en relation, ne semble pas soutenable. D'abord, le processus du décès est sensiblement différent. Ensuite, la Vie de Marie est une histoire d'amour qui finit mal et sa mort résulte de la réaction épidermique de son époux à une accusation calomnieuse d'adultère; la sainte a d'ailleurs plusieurs enfants, dont deux jumeaux qui lui survivent et vont promouvoir son
culte. Thomaïs n’a pas d’enfant et son mariage est une longue suite de souffrances causées par un mari qui la frappe constamment ; son mariage n’est fait que de quatorze années de coups incessants. Tandis que l’époux de Marie est présenté comme plein de remords, celui de Thomaïs disparaît dès la sainte morte. Enfin, Marie a vécu toute sa vie d’épouse dans une ville de province qui, sans doute, est encore un simple évêché, mais deviendra un archevêché autonome, comme dans beaucoup de ces villes moyennes de Thrace. La Vie de Thomaïs nous montre fréquemment certains des multiples sanctuaires de Constantinople. La native de Lesbos devient une habitante de la capitale sachant profiter au moins spirituellement des avantages que procure cette situation, tandis que Marie, la Constantinopolitaine, est devenue provinciale.

La Vie de Marie commence par une étonnante proclamation de l’égalité des sexes devant la sainteté. « Le stade de la vertu n’est pas moins ouvert aux femmes qu’aux hommes et Dieu, l’arbitre, distribue généreusement les récompenses et les couronnes de victoire aux deux sexes de façon égale […] Car, en ce lieu, un homme n’est pas accepté tandis qu’une femme serait écartée […] L’organisateur n’accepte pas ceux qui ont choisi le célibat tandis qu’il refuserait ceux qui se sont soumis au joug du mariage, mais au contraire il accepte dans cette belle compétition tout genre, toute dignité, tout âge, tout genre de vie… Bien qu’elle [Marie] fût une femme, bien qu’elle fût mariée et eût porté des enfants, rien en aucune façon ne l’empêchait de rencontrer la faveur de Dieu : ni la faiblesse féminine, ni les contraintes du lien conjugal, ni les nécessités et les soins qu’appelait l’éducation des enfants. » Marie habite Constantinople ; elle épouse un homme d’origine arménienne comme elle, nommé Nicéphore, frère du mari de sa sœur. Sous Léon VI, au début de la guerre bulgare, Nicéphore est promu tourmarque et envoyé à Bizye où se déroule le reste de la Vie. Tout va bien, jusqu’à ce que des parents de son mari calomnient Marie en l’accusant d’avoir trompé Nicéphore, qui plus est avec un esclave, et de dilapider l’argent du ménage. Elle nie évidemment. Nicéphore tente en vain d’obtenir le témoignage d’une esclave. Pourtant, il rompt tout contact avec Marie et la fait placer aux arrêts sous la contrainte d’un de ses hommes. De plus en plus furieux, Nicéphore commence à la battre, même quand elle est malade et tient leur nourrisson dans les bras. On les sépare, mais Marie s’enfuit dans la maison et tombe sur la tête. Son chagrin, sa maladie et ses blessures la conduisent tout droit à la mort. Son mal s’aggrave, elle prévoit sa mort et en avertit son mari. Les femmes de la bonne société viennent à son chevet. Juste avant de mourir, elle a ces mots : « voilà, le ciel s’ouvre, je vois une lumière ineffable et une couronne suspendue ».

La couronne entrevue peut être interprétée comme celle du martyr, ou peut-être comme celle de la sainteté. Il faut donc chercher ailleurs dans la Vie pour choisir. Lorsqu’un possédé accourt auprès de la tombe de Marie, quatre mois après sa mort, et qu’il est délivré, l’évêque refuse de croire au miracle. « Nous savons que c’était une femme de bien, qui a vécu une vie vertueuse ; mais nous ne pouvons pas croire qu’elle ait mérité une telle grâce. Dieu a accordé la capacité d’accomplir des miracles à des hommes chastes, des saints moines et des martyrs. Elle, au contraire, a partagé la vie d’un homme, n’a pas changé de mode de vie et n’a jamais accompli rien d’exceptionnel ni de grand. D’où viendrait son pouvoir d’accomplir des miracles ? » Donc, pour le chef de l’Église de Bizye, elle n’est pas une martyre. Dans sa péroraison, l’hagiographe ne s’écartera pas du point de vue épiscopal : « Apporte-nous, nous qui n’en sommes pas dignes, la miséricorde du Seigneur qui pardonne, tolérant et patient. Tu as pour t’accompagner et t’aider dans ton intercession la multitude des saints, la communauté des martyrs, l’armée des justes, le chœur des anges, la phalange des apôtres, l’ensemble des prophètes et le bataillon des Pères ». Bref, même pour son hagiographe, elle n’est pas une martyre.
Nous nous tournerons maintenant vers Thomaïs de Lesbos. Elle a en commun avec Marie d’avoir accompli des miracles de son vivant comme après sa mort. Mais elle ne se marie qu’à vingt-quatre ans, ce qui est tardif pour cette époque. La Vie expose qu’elle fut forcée par ses parents à se marier, bien qu’elle préférât rester vierge. « Mais elle devait à la fois conserver sa virginité et respecter le mariage, ce que tout le monde apprécie et révère. Elle obéit à ses parents ». Elle épouse un nommé Étienne à Lesbos, puis tout le monde, le couple et les parents de Thomaïs, part pour les bords du Bosphore ; le père de Thomaïs meurt et sa mère entre au monastère. Thomaïs persiste dans ses vertus. Aussi, l’on pouvait voir dans ces circonstances un couple marié peu usuel : « une femme d’une virile masculinité dans son zèle pour la vertu, qui dépassait sa nature dans la recherche zélée de la vertu ». Dès les débuts du mariage, dont on ne nous montre aucun enfant, Étienne a l’habitude de battre sa femme, se moquant d’elle d’un rire sarcastique tandis qu’elle reste ferme comme une tour de fer. Et l’hagiographe dès lors s’exprime : « Mais dressez vos oreilles vers moi et observez la vie divine de la sainte martyre (τῷ τῆς ὁσιομάρτυρος θείῳ βίῳ προσέχετε). Ce discours ne veut pas la séparer du chœur des martyrs, car elle reçut de nombreux coups et fut fouettée de façon insupportable par souci des divines révélations de notre Seigneur.». Son mari ayant appris qu’elle se livrait à des distributions aux pauvres, elle fut battue par Étienne de façon qu’elle pût obtenir du Christ la couronne du Seigneur ; elle supporte les coups « comme un martyr qui se réjouit en Christ ». Plus loin, Thomaïs est présentée comme « égale aux apôtres ». Son mari l’empêche de fréquenter les églises et de faire l’aumône.

Dès lors, l’hagiographe peut commencer à présenter les miracles de la sainte vivante, au nombre de quatre. L’hagiographe s’arrête pour présenter encore la vie difficile de Thomaïs avec son mari, par ailleurs marin, qui compte l’argent pour l’empêcher de le distribuer aux pauvres, vérifie ces comptes à chaque retour au port et, bien sûr, continue à la battre. Elle le provoque : « Frappe mon corps qui va bientôt périr et se corrompra pour se dissoudre à nouveau dans la terre dont il provient », ce qui dévoile son don de prophétie. « Elle vécut ainsi treize ans et mourut à trente-huit ans un premier janvier », sans que la Vie donne de détails qui fassent un lien simple et direct avec les coups du mari. Elle a demandé à l’avance qu’on l’enterre dans l’avant-cour d’un monastère, en l’occurrence celui de τὰ μικρὰ Ῥωμαίου dont sa mère est l’higoumène, jusqu’à ce que la divine providence accomplisse des miracles à travers elle. Il faut attendre quarante jours et l’auteur va maintenant raconter dix autres miracles dont le dernier est la guérison d’Étienne, son mari et tortionnaire, possédé par un démon, mais qui vient imploser sa défunte épouse de l’en délivrer, ce qui se produit.

Classiquement, l’hagiographe explique qu’il ne peut pas raconter tous les miracles et qu’un échantillon suffira à en faire connaître la portée. Et il ajoute que douze ans se sont maintenant écoulés, ce qui semble signifier qu’il écrit douze ans après la mort de Thomaïs, priée de protéger le porphyrogénète Romain (959-963). L’auteur rappelle alors qu’elle est morte le 1er janvier, comme Basile de Césarée. Et il s’adresse ainsi à la sainte, d’une façon qui n’a peut-être été pas assez remarquée : « Avec lui [Basile], puisses-tu intercéder toujours en faveur de notre guide, le très puissant et pieux autokratôr, et te tenir à ses côtés ». Cet élément de datation, puisqu’un seul empereur est évoqué, permet de préciser, car Romain II est seul empereur depuis le 10 novembre 959 jusqu’au couronnement de Basile II le 22 avril 960. Encore faut-il supposer que l’auteur soit aussi exact dans la façon de désigner l’empereur qu’un document d’archive ou un chroniqueur averti. Dans ces conditions, si les douze ans depuis la mort de la sainte sont exacts, Thomaïs serait morte le 1er janvier 948 et donc née en 910, mariée au marin Étienne en 934 ou 935.

Et naturellement, la sainte se voit demander de prier pour lui, l’auteur, qui sort exténué de cette écriture.
Si le terme martyr est bien employé et soutenu par de fortes phrases, il faut s'interroger sur la notion de martyr appliquée à Thomaïs. Un martyr est une personne qui va jusqu'à se laisser tuer pour témoigner de sa foi plutôt que d'y renoncer. L'hagiographe cite Matthieu 5/11 : « Heureux serez-vous, lorsqu'on vous outragera, qu'on vous persécutera et qu'on dira faussement de vous toute sorte de mal, à cause de moi. » Étienne est certes présenté comme un odieux personnage, mais il ne demande pas à sa femme de renoncer à sa foi, il entend seulement l'empêcher de vivre d'une façon qui plaie à Dieu, en l'occurrence de donner ses biens aux pauvres. Mais, à part un vêtement donné à un pauvre hère qui allait nu et qui l'aurait contrainte à rentrer nue à son tour, sur ce qui entraîne la colère de son mari, les détails manquent cruellement. Plus loin, la vie répète que son mari l'empêche de fréquenter les églises et d'exercer la bienfaisance envers les pauvres (φιλοπτωχεία). Et la vie répète les mêmes points inlassablement avant d'en venir aux miracles, qui montrent d'aillleurs qu'elle ne cesse pas de fréquenter les églises. Une fois ces quatre premiers miracles accomplis, la Vie revient à la façon dont Étienne veut empêcher le pieux comportement de son épouse, prière et méditation ; suit une nouvelle allusion à la façon dont elle gaspille leurs moyens d'existence, tandis que lui les gagne sur la mer. Quelques allusions à ses dons généreux, par exemple le don à un sans-abri de quoi payer ses dettes, sans plus de détails, précèdent le récit de la mort. Au reste, la générosité et les miracles accomplis auraient suffi à établir la sainteté du personnage, sans aller jusqu'au martyre. Si l'hagiographe emploie le terme de martyr, c'est évidemment avec l'intention de faire entrer Thomaïs dans cette catégorie.

Pour essayer de mieux comprendre, il faut donc se tourner vers l'hagiographe, et surtout vers son commanditaire. À la mort de Thomaïs, sa mère est encore vivante, higoumène du monastère de τὰ μικρὰ Ῥωμαίου ; elle accueille la dépouille qui va s'avérer miraculeuse. Il est probable que la mère, Kalè, soit la commanditaire de la Vie. Comme dans beaucoup de Vies, les deux parents de la sainte ont droit à une présentation : le père, Michel, aime la vie angélique, la mère, Kalè, est surtout belle par sa vertu. La Vie ne donne aucun détail sur leur état de fortune. En revanche, le couple est infécond et supplie Dieu de leur donner un enfant. La Vierge apparaît en rêve à Kalè et lui annonce qu'elle sera bientôt enceinte d'une fille. Les parents se réjouissent, mais, contrairement au topos des Vies de saints, ne promettent pas de la consacrer à Dieu. À la mort de son mari, Kalè se retire dans un monastère, mais la Vie, décidément bien imprécise, ne nous dit pas où ; nous ne la retrouvons qu'à la mort de sa fille, higoumène d'un monastère dédié à la Vierge qui n'a donc pas été mentionné. Gageons que, pour être devenue higoumène d'un monastère de Constantinople, Kalè n'était pas d'humble extraction. Pour autant, nous ne savons rien de l'état de fortune de la famille, et donc de Thomaïs. Nous constatons qu'Étienne reproche à celle-ci de distribuer aux pauvres ce qu'il gagne par son métier, non pas sa propre fortune. Une fille de l'aristocratie n'aurait pas épousé un homme qui « gagnait son pain quotidien en naviguant sur la mer (τῇ ναυτιλίᾳ προστετήκότος) et jouissait d'un niveau de vie moyen (τῆς μέσης τύχης ἐπαπολαύοντος) ». Le monastère est presque inconnu par ailleurs. Sans doute modeste, il a besoin de mettre en avant la relique d'une martyre ; c'est l'explication la plus simple, pas forcément la meilleure, de cette affirmation du martyre. Et la survie du culte de la relique jusqu'à l'époque paléologue montre le succès de l'opération.
Rewriting on the Martyrs of the Iconoclast Period during the Palaiologan Time

Almost all the literati of the Palaiologan period tried at least once their hand to pen a hagiographical text. Several hagiographers of the time displayed a keen interest in rewriting on martyrs from earlier Byzantine times. Recalling the earlier Byzantine past was a fundamental component used as a widespread pattern firmly entrenched in the Byzantine ideology of the last centuries that inspired politics and cultural expressions.

As restorer of C/ple in 1261 Michael VIII Palaiologos reinforced the concept of the continuity with the Byzantine past for dynastic and political reasons. In the context of the close correlation between past and present we may ascribe the rewriting texts on a specific subject matter: the martyrs from earlier Byzantine periods. Other motivations also spurred the hagiographers on this special literary activity. They were connected with particular activities and events, such as the restoration of a church especially after the recovery of Constantinople in 1261, the revival of the cult of old saints after the Latin occupation, the benefit of miracles, the praise of a namesake of the author, or a commission for an oration on the saint’s feast.

Let us examine how the issue of iconoclasm was elaborated upon by the hagiographers of the time, since some martyrs from the iconoclast epoch aroused the interest of the authors. These texts in their repetitive style could be regarded as tedious and uninteresting narrations, however their content, often enclosing hidden issues, invite us to trace their real meaning.

Some specific questions arise. Why did the hagiographers particularly direct their attention to the martyrs of the iconoclast period? What was the purpose of this literary activity? Who are specifically the martyrs whose deeds and patterns of life inspired the hagiographers of the period? Who were the hagiographers who devoted a part of their rhetorical production to those martyrs?

Let’s start from the last question by examining the work of the polymath scholar of the 14th c. Nikephoros Gregoras. He was the only one from his epoch who wrote a hagiographical text in honor of an iconophile saint, Michael Synkellos. Gregoras used his oratory style reproducing fixed patterns on iconoclasm. He drew from an earlier Life of Michael, but simplified the stream of events by condensing them or omitting controversial points. Gregoras created a different text focusing on points he wished. He placed great emphasis throughout the text on Michael’s wide spectrum of education. His hero’s knowledge and virtue were the reasons for which he had gained the trust of the political authorities. Gregoras made special mention to his hero’s familiarity with astronomy, reminding us not exactly of his hero, but of the erudition of his mentor Theodoros Metochites. The author came to the point, when he spoke about the repair of the derelict monastery of Chora. He disregarded its earlier foundation and assigned it to Michael Synkellos, whereas the reiterated quotations to the hero’s wisdom seem to address to Theodoros Metochites. He was the renovator of the monastery, to whom Gregoras dedicated an encomion in the last part of his text, although the author does not mention him by name. As it seems, the clue to his reason to rewrite this text was Theodoros Metochites, in the face of whom Gregoras saw his hero.
If the issue of iconoclasm had been rather slightly touched upon by Gregoras by including rather indifferent references to the imperial iconoclast policy and its consequences to the Church and the Byzantine society, the same cannot be said for the hagiographers of his previous generation.

Probably around 1274 Theodora Raoulaina reworked the Life of Theodore and Theophanes, the Graptoi. Her text functioned as a parallel reminding the cruel abuse of her two brothers in law, Manuel and Isaac Raoul, in the hands of Emperor Michael VIII, due to their opposition over the Church Union.

In the introductory part of her text Raoulaina declared that the content of her work will constitute a model which “like a live coal, a spark, will set fire to the audience” underlining thus the aggressive character of her work.

What follows in her story is based on interweaving the two historical periods in an exceptionally figurative way. The same tendency is also detected in other hagiographical texts of this period, though processed in a different frequency and technique that hinged on the time of writing and the hagiographer’s status.

From the very beginning Raoulaina clearly placed the timing of her literary composition in a turbulent phase and directed the reader’s attention to the reason: “the confusion which afflicted the Church now on account of the agreement between the emperor and Rome”, that is the controversy over the Lyons Council and the Church Union (1274). Though the name of the emperor is not mentioned it is quite obvious, whereas her phrasing gives us an inkling of her hostile tone against him. Furthermore, Raoulaina’s phraseology introduced the correlation between her own time and the epoch of iconoclasm when the plot of the storyline unfolds: “The same has been done now by those who set aside the godly dogma”. With this narrative method the hagiographer put together the two epochs, sometimes openly and sometimes by hints.

We must acknowledge that she directly referred to her own time only twice not with an open censorious vocabulary, but with nuances of criticism. Raoulaina enriched her narration by introducing events and situations that took place in the iconoclast past, whereas they are rather related to her own time. For instance, the case of the noble women who were exiled by the iconoclast emperor Leo V, constituted an invented information for the iconoclast period. This detail likely corresponded to the writer’s own time and particularly matching to her fate as well as her mother’s. They had been at the core of opposition with their anti-unionist ideas preserving traditional Orthodoxy, therefore they both were imprisoned.

The bluestocking princess skillfully played with the word “now” which is used 22 times in her work. Sometimes she applied it in its literal meaning and sometimes with an ambiguous significance, related to the sequence of narrative events, which nevertheless with suitable connotations pointing to events of her own time. Her purpose was to remind the deceitful procedures that Michael VIII had adopted in order to make the Byzantine clergy sign the Lyons Council. Phrases relevant to the concept of Orthodoxy run throughout her account and matched perfectly both with the iconoclast epoch and the years of Michael VIII.

From a socio-political perspective Byzantium was living in “hard times”. There were difficulties in freely articulating an opinion, which was opposite to the official policy. Openly expressing political thoughts was a risky matter for “men, who were created free” as Pachymeres specified.
Therefore, Raoulaina penned a narration on the iconoclast past that tended to remind of her own troubled days. By addressing the issue of iconoclasm she could speak openly about Orthodoxy and generally the ecclesiastical policy established by the emperor and condemn his involvement in dogmatic affairs. Returning to the iconoclastic heritage Raoulaina could promote her own ideas, which opposed the official policy aiming at sending concrete messages to her followers, as she had forewarned in the beginning of her work.

Another hagiographical item that carries the same range of meanings is the anonymous text on saint Theodosia, in all probability written about the same period. The anonymous hagiographer is deeply conscious of the danger that will cause to him his text. It was written in an environment of political abuse, in which openly expressing viewpoints or negative political comments caused harm to the opponents. The nature of the arguments, the aggressive style of the hagiographical text and some of the historical inaccuracies point to a date in the reign of Michael VIII. Many of the referred reports have been distorted, emended or altered to fit in with late Byzantine perceptions. For instance, the anonymous placed the destruction of the Icon of Christ over the Chalke Gate in the reign of Constantine V, although this event was charged to his father Leo III. My feeling regarding this alteration is that the author deliberately chose this version in order to defame an emperor bearing the name Constantine. The author seems to disgrace the iconoclast emperor by mentioning him only with his nickname *Kopronymos*, as if he did not deserve to bear the glorious name of the first Byzantine emperor Constantine to whom his distant successor Michael VIII purported to be identified as the New Constantine. The textual content gravitated around the imperial power whereas *Kaiserkritik* occupied considerable space, given that our hagiographer dismantled one by one all the characteristic elements of imperial portrayal.

The writer censured the illegal way by which the emperor had ascended the throne. The phrase was certainly unrelated to the iconoclast emperor Constantine, but it was a cryptic remark about Michael VIII's rise to the throne after the overthrow of the legitimate successor John IV Lascaris. So, it is evident that the orator expressed his opposing political view through iconoclastic perceptions from which he developed the polemical stance prevailing in the text on St Theodosia.

Theodosia held a unique place among her contemporary martyrs for several reasons: she was connected to the first anti-iconoclast act according to a certain tradition; she had suffered an extraordinary martyrdom; and the basic point which, as I perceive it, had a great deal of influence among the late Byzantine hagiographers, is that St Theodosia represented the epitome of Orthodoxy and moreover symbolised the resistance and opposition to the imperial innovation over dogma.

The biting style of the narration justifies its anonymity. Analysing the context of imperial nomenclature used in the most negative form by the anonymous hagiographer, I have already put forward my view that the paternity of this strange text belongs to Manuel Holobolos. Therefore Theodosia and the issue of iconoclasm was a cleverly contrived trick in order for Holobolos to express his dissent by means of hagiographical codes from the past. Thus, he attained his goal: to avoid dealing openly with precarious religious matters that dominated the reign of Michael VIII. I think likely that the anonymous author – Holobolos – was the first among the Palaiologan writers who resuscitated the Iconoclast era and prompted the setting up of the iconoclast ambience again in his days, blazing a trail for others to follow. This approach enabled him to painlessly criticize the imperial policy.
Depending on available evidence, St Theodosia as the nonpareil model of Orthodoxy was praised twice more in literary form by the hagiographers who lived during this troubled period. John Staurakios first and then Constantine Akropolites dedicated a piece of their literary production to the female martyr of iconoclasm after the rejection of the Lyons Council by Andronicos II. Not surprisingly, both texts omit every mention with respect to the iconoclast council.

Each of the hagiographers composed an entirely different version of the text of St. Theodosia in comparison of that we have discussed before. The excessive Kaiserkritik as found in the anonymous text is missing. Moreover, they both have chosen the same version according to which St Theodosia martyred in the reign of Leo III.

Staurakios produced an encomium in high rhetoric style in order to “fire with enthusiasm” his audience for Orthodoxy and Theodosia was by definition the appropriate model. Therefore, he introduced his narration by calling her the “pillar of Orthodoxy”, who “through the furrows of the whips functioned as an arable land where the pattern of Orthodoxy was set”. Emphasizing on the construction of the martyr’s perfect hagiographical portrayal Staurakios proceeded to analyse the terrible situation that the Orthodox Church had reached.

Akropolites in his turn eulogized the martyr as “being the spark of piety within a heap of ashes that covered the Church with darkness and though she was ignored for a time, then she became immediately a flambeau guiding towards salvation”. His words depicted the cultic evolution of St Theodosia pointing out her reappearance during his days, considering her as fundamental to the process of reestablishment of Orthodoxy. As Raoulaina and Holobolos had previously done in their relevant works, Akropolites also presented in his oration particular patterns referring to his own time. He criticised the efforts of the iconoclast emperor to coerce the citizens to change their viewpoint over dogma, something that finally failed to achieve. The same happened during the reign of Michael VIII, who made every effort to change high clergy’s mind about the union of the Churches.

Appalled by the cruelty of Michael VIII against the intellectuals of his time, Staurakios and Akropolites incorporated in their narration on St Theodosia an excursus about the oikoumenikos didaskalos, a story fabricated by the iconophile party in the 9th c. This legend aimed at reminding to the audience that scholars of indomitable spirit, such as Holobolos and Raoulaina, acted as “towers of strength and solid walls” maintaining the Orthodox tradition firmly fixed.

Towards which other martyrs from the iconoclast era the hagiographers of the time turned their gaze?

Akropolites wrote about John of Damascus the strong defender of icons and martyr Barbaros who lived in the second phase of iconoclasm.

John of Damascus best known for his teachings and dogmatic works produced fundamental texts on systematizing the Orthodox doctrine, therefore he is called by our hagiographer “the beacon of God’s knowledge”. From this perspective the interest of Akropolites in composing this long text is unsurprising given the prevailing political and religious situation of the time as well as the scholarly status of the writer. Akropolites was a statesman and a highly educated person with anti-unionist beliefs. The core topic of his discourse focused on John’s wisdom that allowed him to formulate his theoretical ideas on Orthodoxy in language. Akropolites mentioned the first iconoclast emperors
Leo III and Constantine in his narration with the most unfavourable characteristics. He also attached to his account the later legend about the severed hand of John of Damascus in order to present him as a martyr of iconoclastic persecution. Our hagiographer did not neglect to comment on his own time. He declared that political conditions of his epoch shared characteristics with the iconoclast one by comparing both of them as a “field casted to the winds”. His text constitutes a hymn to the theoretical formulation of the Orthodox tradition by highlighting the value of rational discourse.

Akropolites’s speech on St Barbaros includes an entirely different content. He chose to speak about Barbaros who became a “martyr and prestigious winner in the race of Christ”, though previously was considered a Barbarian judged by his language, origins, laws and habits. These earlier “barbarian” perception of the martyr urged Akropolites to compose his oration with the purpose to beg him to intervene to stop the attacks of the contemporary enemies of Byzantium, regarded also as barbarians, as his hero had been. Matters pertaining to iconoclasm are parenthetically mentioned in his oration and were used in order to help the writer to make incisive political comments understandable enough by a statesman. Akropolites declared that internal crisis lead the state to political instability and vulnerable position, therefore an easy target for its enemies.

The hagiographical sources of this period do not touch, as might be reasonably expected, big names, the famous martyrs of the iconoclastic period, who got down in history as the fervent defenders of the icons, for instance Theodore Stoudite, Nikephoros the Patriarch, Theophanes the Confessor. As it seems, they were not the type of martyrs that the prevailing contemporary political and religious order would wish to promote. They had not suffered an eccentric martyrdom like the one of Theodosia and the Graptoi, providing a model of fervent opposition to the official religious policy.

The hagiographers of the time certainly illustrated the prevailing contemporary features of the political scene and society with their unique way. The hagiographical sources of the time allow us to unveil ways of thinking, detect purposes and decode social concerns and literary practices.

During the reign of Michael VIII the discussions over the Union of the Churches and the Arsenite schism had sparked off social unrest. Writing in a rhetorical scheme for persons and events of iconoclast past, the hagiographers used the ideological spectrum of iconoclasm in a misleading fashion. Living in times of political turmoil their primary aim was to criticise the current reality and disseminate their messages. The contemporary political situation had excellent affinity to the earlier years of iconoclasm and the skillful scholars elaborated iconoclastic issues in order to address those pertaining to their own time. Thus, taking as a pretext martyrdom imposed by the iconoclast emperors to heroes of the distant past, they stigmatized the contemporary policy of Michael VIII. As it seems, the revival of the iconoclast era initiated from his time within a censorious context and continued in the reign of his son Andronicos II but in a different view, by praising Orthodoxy. Hagiography of the time should be understood as a social and communicative system, as it had always been, but in the early Palaiologan times it took on a further purpose: to promote opposition, to contain veiled Kaiserkritik and to convey definite Orthodox response to questions over dogma.
Nouveaux martyrs dans la piété serbe du Moyen Âge tardif

La naissance du modèle

Les cultes des néo-martyrs naissent dans les Balkans dans le cadre du danger turc et de l'occupation ottomane qui s'ensuit. C'est précisément dans ce contexte qu'on doit les analyser, tout en tenant compte de leur évolution, c'est-à-dire du fait qu'ils résultent d'un processus d'appropriation de la tradition des cultes balkaniques déjà existants. La matrice de ces cultes est en partie créée dans la période prénémanide : la grande popularité du culte de saint Jean Vladimir (mort en 1016) représente l'un des témoignages éclatants de la première étape de l'évolution des cultes des saints souverains en martyrs de la foi. La deuxième étape, plus importante, est relative à la création du premier culte national – celui de saint Syméon, forgé à l'exemple de saint Démétrius, martyr et myroblite. Ce modèle particulier du martyr sans versement du sang, trouvant son illustration exemplaire dans le culte de saint Syméon, souligne la pratique de l'imitation du modèle dans le procédé de la création du personnage du saint.

C'est dans les écrits littéraires du « cercle de Studenica » datant du début du XIIIe siècle que Syméon est désigné comme saint myroblite pour la première fois et que ses reliques sont qualifiées de saintes et miraculeuses. De surcroît, dans la Louange qui clôture sa Vie, Stefan le Protocouronné ajoute au nom de Syméon l'épithète de martyr, à l'instar de saint Démétrius. Le premier saint national serbe acquiert cette distinction conformément à la notion de martyr définie dans les premières œuvres exégétiques. Il s'agit des écrits de saint Basile et de saint Jean Chrysostome, connus dans les milieux érudits serbes, où le martyr est défini comme acte volontaire (fait « de son plein gré, sans feu ni force »), choisi consciemment (« car ce n'est pas uniquement la mort, mais aussi la volonté, qui fait le véritable martyr »).

Les caractéristiques de la matrice ainsi créée ont largement influé sur les cultes des néo-martyrs ultérieurs, nés sur le même sol. Qui plus est, le concept de saint martyr est enraciné de longue date parmi les Serbes, la création des cultes particuliers des néo-martyrs est liée à la période suivant la bataille de Kosovo (1389). Dans le présent travail nous ferons abstraction des exemples et modèles préexistants pour nous consacrer à l'étude des spécificités serbes des néo-martyrs apparus à l'aube de l'occupation ottomane et fortement influencés par la tradition hagiographique. La création du culte du saint prince Lazar, héros de Kosovo, dont la mort, lors de la bataille décisive contre les Turcs, sert de base au modèle du saint guerrier, représente sans nul doute le point crucial de la consolidation du culte des néo-martyrs. Dans l'histoire de la littérature serbe médiévale, on a remarqué depuis fort longtemps le lien essentiel entre les différents écrits dits « de Kosovo », créés après la tragédie du prince Lazar et des chevaliers serbes sur le champ de bataille, et les compositions écrites pour les besoins de deux nouveaux cultes des martyrs – le saint prince Lazar et le saint roi Stefan de Dečani.

Nous nous donnons pour tâche de présenter dans ce travail la genèse de ces cultes, ainsi que les modèles et instruments littéraires utilisés dans leur définition. Le portrait hagiographique du néo-martyr dans la tradition serbe se distingue par deux motifs particuliers : celui de la couronne céleste.
que le saint souverain obtient dans l’au-delà en guise de récompense pour la lutte contre l’ennemi de la patrie, et celui du triomphe de l’orthodoxie sur la menace musulmane. Étant donné la défaite évidente des forces chrétiennes dans la réalité, ces motifs littéraires deviennent porteurs d’un sens nouveau, dérivé de deux processus parallèles. D’abord, la défaite et la mort sont translatées dans l’au-delà par le biais de la récompense céleste, pour se sublimer ensuite dans l’idée de la protection céleste que les saints néo-martyrs assurent en veillant sur leur peuple souffrant.

L’analyse des cultes des néo-martyrs du bas Moyen Âge balkanique ouvre deux problématiques particulières. D’un côté, il s’agit d’étudier les genres littéraires contribuant à la définition de ces cultes – outre les formes traditionnelles des écrits de célébration, de nouveaux types de textes voient le jour, par exemple celui des « pleurs ». C’est le corps du martyr qui se trouve au centre de ces nouveaux cultes. Que ce soit le corps du saint thaumaturge (Stefan de Dečani), juste souffrant au nom du Christ qu’il vénère, ou celui du martyr mort à la bataille (le saint prince Lazar), les textes de célébration des saints tels que les hagiographies, les offices, les « pleurs » ou les louanges, revêtiront une valeur et un sens différents si l’on choisit d’en placer l’analyse dans le contexte des liens tissés entre l’hagiographie du saint et sa dépouille, dont l’action miraculeuse ajoute une dimension nouvelle tant au récit hagiographique qu’à la pratique du culte. Pour cette raison, la question du lien entre le texte, les reliques et la mémoire est cruciale pour une compréhension approfondie de la longévité, mais aussi des rôles spécifiques des cultes des saints dans les Balkans. Bien entendu, ces spécificités proviennent essentiellement des cadres politiques dans lesquels les cultes ont été engendrés et ont perduré par la suite. Les souverains, en quête de la légitimité, cherchaient dans les reliques des protecteurs surnaturels qui pouvaient justifier leur action politique et sacraliser leur pouvoir. Un second versant de la problématique est centré sur les modifications du contexte et de la fonction des cultes durant la longue occupation ottomane. Nous nous concentrerons sur les cultes nés au cours des xve et xviie siècles, sans aborder la question très intéressante de leur évolution et de leur fonction durant l’âge baroque et l’époque de la naissance de l’État national au xixe siècle.

L’apogée du culte des néo-martyrs : nouvelle identité de la sainteté

Le nouveau type de saint roi martyr est instauré pour les besoins du culte du prince Lazar. Il servira ensuite de modèle au culte de Stefan de Dečani, qui fut créé à l’initiative des moines du monastère du Pantocrator de Dečani et de leur higoumène, Grégoire Camblak. Ce dernier est aussi l’auteur d’une Vie du saint roi qu’il composa à son retour de Moldavie en 1402, alors qu’il se trouvait à la tête du monastère de Dečani. Il quitta la Serbie à la suite du décès de son oncle Cyprien, le métropolite de Kiev en 1414. L’œuvre de Camblak (la Vie du saint ainsi qu’un office du roi martyr) a incontestablement instauré le culte de Stefan de Dečani en tant que roi néo-martyr. Les reliques du roi avaient été déposées au sein du monastère avant que Camblak n’en devienne l’higoumène et son culte s’était déjà répandu. Cependant, cette Vie ne correspondait pas tout à fait aux Vies des saints « dynastiques » du recueil de l’archevêque Daniel II, une sorte de « synaxe » des saints serbes née dans les années vingt du xive siècle (où la versio prima de la Vie de Stefan de Dečani paraît pour la première fois). La figure hagiographique de Stefan de Dečani se démarque de tous les types habituels des saints rois. En outre, l’importance qu’on lui accorde, comme en témoigne entre autres la durée de son culte, n’a d’égal en Serbie que celle de saint Syméon. Pourtant, le culte de Stefan a d’abord été un culte typiquement dynastique.

Avec l’arrivée au pouvoir de la dynastie des Lazarević, héritiers du prince Lazar, s’opère une véritable transformation du culte existant du saint roi, représentant de la sainteté dynastique, en
celui de martyr. Le nouveau culte de Stefan de Dečani, né de l’initiative des moines de Dečani qui souhaitaient inscrire le fondateur de leur monastère dans le calendrier liturgique, emploie la même matrice que celle créée pour le prince Lazar après la bataille de Kosovo. D’autre part, on remarque à ce moment-là une intensification des liens entre l’État dirigé par la régenté, la princesse Milica (la moniale Eugénie), et le monastère de Dečani. La princesse accorda en effet plusieurs donations au monastère et promulgua un chrysobulle en 1397. Introduit par le psaume de David 25.8, ce document élevait Dečani au rang de demeure divine unissant deux mémoires saintes indépendantes : celle de saint Stefan de Dečani, fondateur du monastère, et celle, nouvellement créée, du prince Lazar, « mort en sainteté ». Ces aspirations d’Eugénie à fortifier le nouveau culte par des textes à caractère martyrologique correspondaient à l’intention de la communauté de la Grande Laure de Dečani de rédiger, pour les besoins du culte du fondateur, des textes de célébration qui le définiraient comme néo-martyr.

L’ère qui s’ouvrait nécessitait une nouvelle forme de célébration. Les moines de Dečani profitèrent de l’unanimité des hautes sphères de l’État et de l’Église pour promouvoir le culte du martyr de Dečani. La promulgation du chrysobulle était également une façon de montrer la volonté de la princesse d’être comptée, avec ses fils, Vukan et Stefan (futur prince et despote), au rang prestigieux des « fondateurs » de Dečani. Le préambule représente en effet une sorte de prière pour les fils et une sollicitation à servir le Seigneur. On notera qu’être le « second fondateur » de l’influent monastère de Dečani parait le règne d’un haut prestige et permettait à la dynastie d’asseoir sa légitimité. Aussi la moniale Eugénie, s’efforçant d’être aussi bienveillante que ses prédécesseurs, restaura-t-elle la fondation de Stefan de Dečani. Il nous semble par conséquent que le document témoigne d’une refonte de son culte, de son façonnement en martyr et de l’apparition d’une nouvelle figure du saint roi.

Le culte de martyr rendu à Stefan s’articule principalement autour des textes composés par Camblak. Il s’agit de deux rédactions de sa Vie – une longue et une autre, abrégée – ainsi que d’un office liturgique où figure le motif reconnaissable du roi hésitant entre la vie éternelle et l’empire terrestre périssable. Le dilemme se conclut par le choix de la couronne éternelle du martyr ; ce dont se sert Camblak dans la Vie et l’Office évoque le motif central des écrits de célébration du culte du néo-martyr rendu au prince Lazar. Cette entrée dans l’histoire sainte place le saint roi au niveau des empereurs et prophètes de l’Ancien Testament, notamment Job, symbole des martyrs vétérotestamentaires, archétype des néo-martyrs. Stefan est l’incarnation d’un idéal complexe : l’auteur de l’Office le décrit comme un aigle doté de toutes les vertus du roi « très chrétien ». C’est pourquoi il reçoit l’épithète de « martyr invincible » attestant sa vaillance au combat, ainsi que son rôle de « pilier de la patrie » et de « défense infranchissable » de la communauté monastique. L’Office met en valeur sa qualité d’intercesseur auprès des fidèles, protégeant son peuple et lui rendant des visites « invisibles », tel un « bon berger ». Le « reliquaire du saint roi » occupe une place centrale dans son culte. À cette relique précieuse on attribue, tout comme à la main du roi, la capacité de « source vivifiante » de guérir le corps et l’âme de ceux qui souffrent.

À prêter attention aux procédés littéraires caractéristiques pour la création du portrait de martyr, on peut en remarquer plusieurs composantes. Conformément au type du saint martyr, sa mort est terrible et violente, causée par des mains assassines. Alors que ses exploits sont la preuve de « l’endurance de (son) âme », l’hagiographe affirme lui-même être saisi d’horreur devant « l’injuste spectacle de sa mort ». Camblak mentionne également qu’un pouvoir miraculeux « s’écoule » de
la sainte tombe du roi, qui lui paraît « plus précieux que l’or et la topaze ». L’hagiographe compare ses reliques aux rayons du soleil illuminant l’église et formant un halo de lumière autour du martyr nommé strasotrpac (soufre-passion), à l’instar des saints Boris et Gleb, populaires dans la tradition serbe. On retrouve la même émanation dans un épisode du texte de l’hagiographie, où Stefan sort de la tente dans laquelle il a passé toute la nuit à prier avant la bataille de Velbužd. Son visage est alors baigné de lumière comme celui de Moïse quittant le Tabernacle. Il s’agit d’un moment de rupture dans le récit puisque cette force surnaturelle annonce « la lumière qui arrive ». On retrouve le motif de la lumière – symbole de la pureté – dans la scène de l’apparition de saint Nicolas dans le monastère du Christ Pantocrator à Constantinople, où Stefan avait été enfermé dans sa jeunesse. Stefan ôte alors, par un geste hautement symbolique, le tissu recouvrant ses yeux pour montrer à tous son « visage de saint ». Enfin, l’hagiographe emploie la métaphore solaire pour parler de son règne sur terre. Selon un principe hésychaste, la lumière est un lien avec le divin et l’annonce posthume de la sainteté du roi. D’autre part, l’Hymne dont il faut souligner la teneur eschatologique fut écrit « à la onzième heure avant la fin du temps » dans une attente heureuse. La fin proche était annoncée par les moines tournant autour de la châsse du saint, chantant les louanges et baisant les saintes reliques en les mouillant de larmes.

Ces textes donnaient un caractère merveilleux au rituel liturgique du culte du saint roi dont les reliques sacrées faisaient la réputation de la Grande Laure. Le culte du saint roi Stefan fut célébré dès le jour de sa mort, le 11 novembre 1330, soit avant que Camblak ne compose son Hymne, comme l’atteste le typikon de Chilandar du milieu du xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle. Ce fait semble prouver que la première période du culte n’a pas lieu à l’initiative du monastère de Dečani. Ainsi les textes qui voient le jour à l’aube du xv<sup>e</sup> siècle marquent-ils autant une nouvelle étape dans le culte qu’une nouvelle forme de célébration. Le « défunt célèbre », auréolé de sa couronne de martyr, ne répond plus seulement à un culte dynastique dont la vocation est de sauver la patrie et de protéger les héritiers, mais devient le fondement sacré de l’identité du peuple élu dans la communauté des Chrétiens. Afin de créer une mémoire officielle, on dota bien évidemment le nouveau culte d’images, de symboles et de rituels particuliers.

Un dernier élément que Camblak cite dans l’Hymne illustre l’évolution du culte de Stefan de Dečani. Il s’agit de la comparaison de sa sépulture royale avec le ruisseau de Siloam qui prend sa source sur la colline de Sion et qui, à travers un tunnel, approvisionne en eau la vieille ville de Jérusalem (« la ville basse de David »). Était donné que seul le lac de Siloam était en mesure de sauver la ville en cas de siège, ce parallèle possède deux significations : il souligne le caractère prophylactique de la tombe de Dečani et situe le culte du roi serbe en relation avec la mythique Jérusalem. On mesure d’autant plus la portée de cette comparaison que le passage en question vise à mettre en relief le culte des reliques de l’église de Dečani. La célébration du saint roi élaborée par les textes de Camblak reposait par conséquent essentiellement sur une acceptation volontaire des souffrances et de la mort. C’est là le fondement de l’idée de transcendance symbolisée par le tombeau en terre sainte et celui du souvenir éternel assuré par l’office liturgique quotidien et les pèlerinages. De cette façon, la mémoire du défunt se rattachait à un lieu particulier, qu’il s’agisse du lieu de la bataille où le martyr s’était illustré ou bien de son tombeau, qui, lui, était le lien entre la victime, le désir de rédemption et la possible résurrection.

Comme on l’a mentionné supra, c’est le corps du saint roi qui occupe la place centrale dans la seconde période de la célébration du culte de Stefan. Les sources mettent en valeur l’incorruptibilité...
et la douce odeur émanant de son tombeau ainsi que le miracle opéré à son contact. Le rite de baiser les reliques donnait lieu à une « transmission » du miracle qui se déroulait généralement dans une effusion de larmes. Il est remarquable que le « don de larmes » exalté par la pratique ascétique revienne de façon récurrente chez Camblak : par exemple, au moment où le héros retrouve la vue ou bien quand il est comparé à Tobit et à Job. L’hagiographe précise que, durant les deux années qui s’écoulèrent entre le moment où il recouvre la vue et celui où il regagne sa patrie, Stefan vécut en ascète « dans les larmes et une humble sagesse ». Même lorsqu’il combat pour l’empire, il est décrit en pénitent « mouillant de larmes son lit, non seulement la nuit comme le clame le prophète mais aussi le jour pour laver la conscience ». Les actions qui témoignent de la piété du roi s’accompagnent également du don de larmes. Dans son éloge au saint Camblak affirme que Stefan fait partie des saints les plus illustres en raison de la pureté de ses prières, de sa mort en martyr et des larmes qu’il versait quotidiennement.

Quant au « corps saint du roi », il représente « le précieux héritage de sa patrie ». On constate que la dépouille du roi avait un caractère sacré. Le corps était sanctifié au cours de la cérémonie de l’onction où le roi, investi des insignes symboliques du pouvoir terrestre, devenait l’auxiliaire du pouvoir divin grâce à sa relation directe avec le Christ. C’est pourquoi, dans certains royaumes d’Occident, les guérisons avaient parfois lieu du vivant du roi, par simple contact. Il n’y a pas eu de tels exemples en Serbie, où, en revanche, les souverains de la sainte lignée étaient capables de protéger et de sauver leurs sujets par les exploits et les prières. Après la mort, leur corps saint continuait d’agir sur le plan individuel et collectif. C’est dans ce sens qu’il faut considérer l’expression précitée de Camblak au sujet du corps du roi (« héritage de sa patrie »). La mémoire de Stefan de Dečani continua de vivre dans les siècles suivants selon cette même conception de la sainteté, reposant sur la transmission du charisme royal issu à la fois de sa fonction royale et de l’action miraculeuse de son corps saint.

Réorganisation du modèle : nouvelle forme de représentation

La fin du xve et le début du xviè siècle marquent un retour au modèle des saints fondateurs de l’État et de l’Église serbes. Ce regain d’intérêt pour la tradition médiévale correspond à la reconstitution du patriarcat de Peć (1555-57) bien que la tradition orthodoxe et le culte des saints rois se soient maintenus durant toute la période ottomane. L’héritage artistique et liturgique du Moyen Âge s’enrichit de nouvelles formes de représentation iconographique. De tous les cultes de saints, ceux de Syméon/Sava et de Stefan de Dečani étaient les plus célèbres auprès de la population. La diversité des textes liturgiques consacrés à Stefan de Dečani montre à quel point son culte était répandu dans le royaume. Il est néanmoins surprenant que la hiérarchie ecclésiastique ait désigné ce saint dynastique, dont le culte était somme toute local, comme modèle de sainteté à la place du martyr emblématique du Kosovo, saint Lazar. Il faut sans doute y lire le succès de la nouvelle forme de sa célébration. Le portrait hagiographique de Stefan établi par Camblak révèle en effet deux aspects cultuels capables d’expliquer cet engouement. Il s’agit de la dévotion extraordinaire du roi, qui ne lui fit pas défaut même dans les moments les plus difficiles de la vie, et sa qualité de martyr. C’est donc son appartenance à la sainte dynastie des Némanides qui assure la continuité de la tradition serbe durant l’époque ottomane, mais c’est surtout à sa qualité exacerbée de martyr qu’il doit une telle popularité. On tentera de définir ici le nouveau type de représentation du roi martyr et la forme de sainteté qui lui correspondait.

Sur le mur oriental du pronaos de Peć se trouvait la fresque de Georges le Nouveau (Georges de Kratovo), jeune orfèvre condamné au bûcher à Sofia en 1515 pour avoir refusé de se convertir à l’islam. L’introduction de ce nouveau saint dans le programme pictural prouve que le culte des martyrs était un moyen de parer à toute éventuelle islamisation. Georges le Nouveau avait en effet été proclamé mégalomartyr et son culte fut inscrit dans l’Office et la Passion, œuvres de l’école littéraire de Sofia. Cette opposition à l’Islam fut véhiculée par une littérature martyrologique. La Passion de George de Kratovo, écrite entre 1516 et 1539, témoigne du lien très fort avec les cultes des martyrs serbes anciens. À la différence de l’Office, créé dans le style de l’ancienne hymnographie serbe et des chants byzantins traditionnels, ce long texte représente une vie tout à fait particulière, échappant à la définition générique. Il renouvelle sur le plan rhétorique et panégyrique la tradition des acta martyrum du christianisme primitif. Son dessein principal était de diffuser un message politique et religieux, cherchant à sauvegarder l’identité orthodoxe d’une civilisation en danger et à renforcer la résistance à l’islamisation de plus en plus forcée des Balkans en glorifiant la lutte des martyrs méritant la récompense céleste. À partir des années quarante du xve siècle déjà, on peut retrouver un nombre plus important des martyrs glorifiés par les Vies grecques, bulgares et serbes, morts dans les pires souffrances, le plus souvent brûlés ; ces passions servent de base à toute
une série de nouvelles compositions polémiques, similaires au niveau générique et thématique, aux conséquences politiques de longue portée. En témoignent de nombreuses compositions nées dans les *scriptoria* de Kratovo et du monastère de Rila au xviᵉ siècle. Leur forte activité permit de doter les nouveaux cultes de textes liturgiques.

La *passion de Georges de Kratovo*, texte comprenant un écho très vif de différents cultes de néo-martyrs serbes, offre un exemple particulièremment intéressant pour notre sujet. D'une certaine manière, il rassemble les motifs littéraires figurant dans de nombreux textes nés sur l'ensemble des territoires ethniques serbes, bordés de lieux sacrés abritant les précieuses reliques des martyrs. Ces motifs partent des considérations sur la nature providentielle du sacrifice de Lazar dans la bataille de Kosovo pour aboutir à d'autres sur les plus hauts buts spirituels contenus dans la célébration commune des saints despotes serbes enterrés dans la région de Srem. Dans cette *Vie* singulière se rejoignent les traces de cultes différents, de celui du saint prince Lazar de Ravanica jusqu'aux cultes du monastère de Krušedol où se trouvaient les reliques des despotes Stefan, Georges-Maxime, Jovan (Jean) Branković et d'Angelina, l'épouse de Georges, membres canonisés de la dernière dynastie princière serbe des Branković.

Pendant la période ottomane, outre le monastère athonite de Chilandar, le monastère de Mileševa fut le centre de la culture et de la religion orthodoxe. Il joua un rôle déterminant dans la reconstitution du patriarcat de Peć (1557), dont l'artisan principal fut le vizir Mehmed Pacha Sokolović. Ce dernier avait été un temps le protecteur du monastère et l'avait intégré au système de maillage administratif impérial fondé sur un « réseau familial et amical ». Il convient de préciser que cette restauration intervint dans le contexte politique particulier des réformes morales et de la mise en valeur du message religieux sur le plan artistique proné par le catholicisme à la suite du Concile de Trente. Les moines de Mileševa s'employèrent à introduire des réformes tout en maintenant leurs traditions locales. À ce titre, ils recueillirent de nombreux textes liturgiques consacrés aux saints serbes. Le monastère avait de bonnes relations avec l'Église russe et participa au Concile de Moscou (1547-1549) qui décida de la canonisation de plusieurs saints et envisagea la lutte contre les hérétiques. Mais il était également proche de l'Église grecque, notamment grâce à ses liens avec les moines du Mont Athos. Enfin, Mileševa était le siège du métropolite d'Herzégovine, dont le détenteur était généralement promu à la fonction de patriarche. C'était aussi un centre d'imprimerie très actif (1544-1557). Les récits des voyageurs occidentaux du xviᵉ siècle nous rappellent que le culte de saint Sava était très fort à Mileševa et que les offrandes en son nom aidèrent la population musulmane locale aussi. Le seul culte de cette ampleur fut celui abrité par le monastère de Dečani.

Malgré la velléité des conquêtes souvent destructrices, les Ottomans, sans doute par crainte d'une répression divine, épargnèrent les grands centres religieux orthodoxes tels que Dečani, Peć ou bien Gračanica. L'importance de Dečani est visible dans l'opulence de son trésor monastique. Le grand nombre de documents turcs qui y sont conservés prouve que le monastère avait au milieu du xviᵉ siècle un statut de fauconnier et bénéficiait par conséquent des facilités de paiement des impôts. Le nombre de moines – ils n'étaient pas plus d'une douzaine à la fin du xve siècle – s'accrut pendant cette période. Au cours des xviᵉ et xviiᵉ siècles, le monastère fut un centre religieux à l'intense production iconographique. On en connaît d'ailleurs plusieurs artistes célèbres, parmi lesquels le maître Longin. Les diverses variantes iconographiques relatives à Stefan de Dečani sont nées au sein de son monastère et illustraient généralement la Vie écrite par Camblak. Ce n'est pourtant qu'à la fin du xviᵉ siècle que son image se popularise. On constate que l'expansion du culte du saint roi
dans cette seconde moitié du XVIe siècle va de pair avec la place grandissante de Dečani dans la culture serbe. L’omniprésence des portraits de Stefan dans les décorations picturales d’églises et la multiplication de ses icônes correspondent à une nouvelle étape dans la célébration de son culte. Introduit dans les synaxaires du patriarcat, Stefan est dès lors au premier plan dans les peintures et on le retrouve aux côtés des plus grands saints.

En même temps, l’essor du culte des saints rois est renforcé au moyen des livres imprimés qui en propageaient les images dans les pays serbes. Les monastères dans lesquels existait une activité importante d’apôtres et qui abritèrent ensuite des imprimeries, diffusaient des livres d’heures en grand nombre. La première imprimerie fut ouverte par Georges Crnojević ; elle vit le jour à Cetinje en 1493. Aucun n’égala toutefois le centre d’imprimerie vénitien fondé en 1519 par Božidar Vuković de Podgorica et repris à sa mort par son fils Vicenzo. C’est là que les livres serbes furent imprimés jusqu’à la fin du XVIe siècle (1597). Les Livres d’Heures (Ménaion), ouvrages liturgiques représentatifs, réédités à plusieurs reprises sur les territoires peuplées par les Serbes dans les siècles à venir, devaient leur popularité entre autres aux nombreuses illustrations de saints et jouaient partant un rôle de premier rang dans la sauvegarde de l’identité nationale et religieuse.

Les changements considérables survenus au plan politique ont influencé le sort des cultes des néo-martyrs serbes, ainsi que l’évolution de la littérature destinée à célébrer les nouveaux saints sur tout le territoire balkanique. Le sultan plaça Macarius Sokolović à la tête du patriarcat restauré de Peć (1557). Ce dernier était sans doute le neveu et l’homme de confiance de Mehmed Pacha. Mais qu’il ait occupé auparavant la fonction d’apôtre du monastère de Chilandar n’est peut-être qu’une donnée apocryphe. À la mort de Macarius (1574), le titre de patriarche continua de se transmettre au sein de la famille des Sokolović. La reconstitution du patriarcat était en fait un retour aux lois du temps de Soliman le Magnifique. Il convient de souligner qu’elle ne fut pas motivée par les origines serbes de Mehmed Pacha mais par les intérêts politiques du moment. Mais le meurtre de Mehmed Pacha en 1579 mit un terme à cet élan. L’éclat de l’étoile qui brillait au-dessus de la Sublime Porte et préservait la Serbie s’assombrit. Une nouvelle menace apparut avec les Albanais conduits par Sinan Pacha qui, après avoir détruit le monastère de Mileševa, donnèrent l’ordre, hautement symbolique, de brûler les reliques de saint Sava (1594). L’atteinte au culte des reliques porta un coup fatal aux relations entre l’Église serbe et le pouvoir turc.

Bien que le culte du saint roi se soit maintenu dans la culture serbe principalement grâce aux icônes et à la peinture murale, les premiers livres d’histoire qui voient le jour au XVIIe siècle préservèrent eux aussi de l’oubli le passé serbe. Le slavisme baroque, qui accompagnait le mouvement général du réveil brusque des nations européennes et l’opposition des chrétiens à la présence turque en Europe, eut une influence considérable sur l’historiographie serbe. Considérant l’histoire comme un principe rhétorique, voire poétique, ce courant littéraire et artistique au caractère savant et engagé passe de la doctrine ut pictura poesis à celle ut pictura sermones, ce qui influencera considérablement la perception de l’histoire. Elle devrait être « utile » tout en restant intéressante auprès du public par l’exaltation de la magnificence et des vertus, l’inspiration légendaire et anecdotique des épisodes spectaculaire. Mais elle se devait aussi de continuer d’offrir un modèle d’héroïsme et d’élever un message moral en imitant les grands exemples du passé.
Il existe une unité littéraire entre les écrits de Kosovo et les compositions rédigées pour les besoins des cultes du saint prince Lazar et du saint roi Stefan de Dečani. La littérature serbe d'inspiration martyrologique après la bataille de Kosovo résulterait de la motivation historique et spirituelle de l'existence parallèle des deux cultes. C'est à ce moment d'ailleurs qu'apparaissent les premières généalogies historiques et les premières chroniques serbes, faites sur un schéma chronographique. L'arrière-plan historique du culte du nouveau martyr serbe montre l'importance de la mémoire historique et culturelle que l'on donne au saint roi. Les sources narratives et liturgiques permettent de reconstituer le phénomène et son évolution. Parmi tous les textes hagiographiques du patrimoine serbe, la *Vie de Stefan de Dečani* est le meilleur témoin de l'évolution au terme de laquelle le culte dynastique du saint roi martyr sera complètement intégré au programme politique et religieux dans les circonstances modifiées d'une nouvelle époque.

Dans la période qui suit, les chefs de l'Église serbe mettent en œuvre un programme idéologique minutieusement ruminé, au centre duquel figurent les cultes des saints serbes, particulièrement des néo-martyrs. La période baroque entretenait en effet un rapport spécifique au passé. L'historicisme, apparu en Europe dès le xvi\textsuperscript{e} siècle, fondé sur une réinterprétation du passé au profit du présent, accordait à l'étude historique une fonction utilitaire. C'est ce courant qui permit à l'élite intellectuelle serbe, au sein de la monarchie, de mettre en avant l'histoire médiévale serbe et de l'employer dans la lutte pour la conservation de la tradition et de la religion. L'Histoire devenait *exemplum* et servait l'action politique. De nombreux cultes des saints souverains serbes reposaient en premier lieu sur les textes de célébration. Ces écrits s'adaptent aussi bien aux nouvelles circonstances et aux nouveaux objectifs idéologiques qu'à la perception de l'Histoire et de son usage au xvii\textsuperscript{e} siècle. D'une autre part, les lieux sacrés, points focaux des cultes des saints serbes, deviennent des *topoi* qui définissent à leur tour le territoire auquel prétendaient les patriarches serbes par les droits historiques ; c'est ainsi que les terres serbes, démembrées entre les mains des forces étrangères, se trouvent unifiées sur le plan territorial et sacré. Le pouvoir du chef d'Église pendant les siècles suivants, jusqu'à la création de l'état national après les résurrections du début du xix\textsuperscript{e} siècle, se concrétise politiquement dans la figure du patriarche, médiateur entre le ciel et la terre. L'idée de corrélation céleste/terrestre est illustrée par les notions de *Serbia sacra* et *Serbia sancta* : la céleste Serbia sancta se trouve de cette manière au service de la notion historique de la terre serbe sainte – Serbia sacra.
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Introduction

Byzantine law owes its existence per definition in a change, in a transformation. The fact that Justinian had promulgated his legislation mostly in Latin, whereas the dominant language in his empire was Greek led to the actual genesis of Byzantine law. The legislation of Justinian had to be transformed in order to be understood. Shortly after the promulgation of Justinian’s legislation, Greek texts appeared which summarized, translated and commented upon this legislation. This marks the beginning of Byzantine law. In the second half of the 9th century the Macedonian emperors wanted to bring a change into law. Their aim was the anakatharsis, the “purge” of laws, which led finally to the promulgation of a new law, “the imperial laws”, the Basilica. The Basilica was new but at the same time it was not, since it was based on Justinian’s legislation, but then in Greek. Sometime later, comments dating mainly in the 6th century were added to the text of the Basilica in order to help the interpretation. These are the so-called “old” Basilica scholia. For someone who does not realize the content of the Basilica, this action would also seem a paradox. Why use old comments to interpret the “new law”? The 11th century marks the last revival of Byzantine law with the establishment of a law school in Constantinople. The Byzantine jurists of this period wrote comments on the Basilica which are known as the younger, the “new” Basilica scholia. It seems however, that the Byzantine jurists of this period did not only use the Basilica. Sometimes, they too, consulted Justinian’s legislation. In short, it seems that in Byzantine law there is a change, but at the same time there is not. Boundaries between “old” and “new” are not always easy to define. Law is being transformed, but how and why? Goal of this round table is to discuss questions related to the transformations of Byzantine law throughout its history and the use of law as a means of change.

The present Round Table offers a variety of subjects reflecting on these issues from the age of Justinian up to the Palaiologan era. Beginning with the actual genesis of Byzantine law, the language issues and the role of the antecessors, G. Falcone discusses questions related to the Greek translation of the constitutio Imperatoriam. By re-examining the subscriptio of the Florentine Index auctorum T. van Bochove addresses problems caused by scribes of Byzantine legal texts and traces down a small piece of the making of the Digest. F. Brandsma explores the actual transformation of Roman law into Byzantine law based on examples from the “old” Basilica scholia. The question of the actual application of Byzantine law in legal practice and the differences between “law in books” and “law in action” is beautifully reflected in the papers of E. Papagianni, D. Papadatou and M. Tantalos. E. Papagianni discusses the development of Byzantine legislation on divorce as an attempt of changing social practices and perceptions and examines how Church and society influenced in practice imperial legislation on divorce. Using a range of examples, D. Papadatou focuses on the influence of society and customs in the making of Byzantine laws and in legal practice. In the same line, M. Tantalos examines how Byzantine legislation on the alienation of dowry was actually applied and how the Senatus Consultum Velleianum was used in Byzantine legal documents, including
legal decisions and notarial acts. L. Paparriga-Artemiadi addresses the issue of the application of Byzantine law through the interpretation of Byzantine jurists; she uses rich material of Byzantine jurists and highlights some of their methods of interpretation. Finally, L. Benou traces down the relation between continuity and transformation in Byzantine law by examining a variety of sources including imperial *prostagma*ta, documents from monastery archives and other sources related to the administration of justice during the Palaiologan period.
The Greek Translation of the Constitutio Imperatoriam

The Greek version of the *Constitutio Imperatoriam* is, in my opinion, the result of a stratification. It seems an ‘official’ translation, disposed by Justinian in order to render immediately comprehensible to the students the important ideological message of the *Constitutio Imperatoriam*, with the addition of some explications and observations from an antecessor who has used the official translation for the introductory lesson of his course on Institutes. There is no clue which allows to confirm or to exclude that this antecessor was Theophilus.
Old and Less Old Light on an Old Issue
The Subscriptio of the Florentine Index Auctorum Revisited

1. In const. Tanta / Δέδωκεν § 20, the emperor Justinian (527-565) ruled that it ought to be known on the basis of which and how many books of the old iurisprudentes his Digest was compiled. Justinian ordered this information to be given at the beginning of the Digest. The codex Florentinus – viz. the oldest manuscript of the Digest, written in the sixth century, most probably in Constantinople – does indeed transmit a seemingly official list of sources underlying the text of the Digest. It concerns the Index Florentinus, or rather, the so-called Florentine Index auctorum. In the manuscript, this Index auctorum bears the heading Ἐξ ὧσων ἀρχαίων καὶ τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτῶν γενομένων βιβλίων σύγκειται τὸ παρὸν τῶν Digeston ἤτοι τοῦ Πανδέκτου τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου βασιλέως Ἰουστινιανοῦ σύνταγμα. This heading seems to echo Justinian’s ruling in const. Tanta / Δέδωκεν § 20. However, even though the Index auctorum enumerates old Roman iurisprudentes while listing the titles of their works accompanied by the number of books of each work, it is not very likely that the Index can be identified as the official list of sources underlying the text of the Digest. For, in that case one would expect complete concurrence between the authors and works enumerated in the Index auctorum and the fragments of the writings of the iurisprudentes incorporated into the text of the Digest. As it is, there are marked inconsistencies: the Index lists authors and works not occurring in the Digest, and vice versa. (Krüger, Index librorum, in: Mommsen 1870 [2001], 59*-67*; Wenger 1953 [2000], 588-589 with the nn. 105-108).

2. At its very end the Index auctorum contains a tantalizing subscriptio indicating the total number of lines of all the books of the authors referred to. The subscriptio reads: Ἐχουσι στίχ(ων) ὅλ(ας) μυριάδας τριακοσίας. (Mommsen 1868 [2001], LVI*/14). This note was written by scribe / Manus I, viz. the scribe responsible for the Index auctorum in its entirety. In the codex Florentinus, this scribe inter alia also copied the const. Deo auctore, Tanta, Omnen, the Index titulorum, and the first four books of the Digest. (Kaiser 2001, 137, 143-144, 146). Sadly, the subscriptio omits the actual number of lines, viz. 3.000.000: in the manuscript, the text of the note breaks off after ολ. However, Mommsen’s supplement μυριάδας τριακοσίας is no coincidence, for this is the number that occurs in const. Tanta / Δέδωκεν § 1 in order to indicate the total amount of lines of the works of the iurisprudentes: (…), a praefato viro excelso suggestum est duo paene milia librorum esse conscripta et plus quam trecenties decem milia versuum a veteribus effusa, (…) / (…). οὐκ δὲ τὰς ἀπάντων τῶν ἐμπροσθεν νομοθετησάντων συναγαγόντες γνώμας ἐκ τοῦ πλήθους ἀπὸ τῶν βιβλίων, ἀπερ ἦν μὲν ἀμφὶ τὰ δισχίλια, ἄριστον δὲ εἰχε στίχων οὐκ ἐλάττω μυριάδων τριακοσίων, (…). Mommsen’s supplement in the text of the subscriptio is based on the phrase trecenties decem milia versuum / στίχων οὐκ ἐλάττω μυριάδων τριακοσίων in this passage. The evidential value of the subscriptio seems to be rather limited, the more so because the text as established by Mommsen is not beyond dispute.

3. According to Röhle, the scribe of the Index auctorum had no reason to write a note indicating the total amount of lines of the works of the iurisprudentes. Instead, it would have been his intention to
indicate something far more elementary, as was already observed by Henrik Brenkman (1681-1736). In his day, Brenkman read \( \sigma \lambda \) instead of \( \omega \lambda \) in the text of the subscriptio, and he regarded this number 230 as a reference to the total amount of lines of the Index auctorum itself. On this basis, Röhle recounted the lines of the Index, and reached a total number of 231 lines. Therefore, Röhle proposed to read the text of the subscriptio as \( \epsilon \chi o u s i \ \sigma \tau \chi (\omega i) \ \sigma \lambda \), and provided it with the Latin translation extant versus ducenti triginta. Following Brenkman, Röhle argued that the number 230 would refer to the total amount of lines of the Index. The scribe who copied the Index would have produced the subscriptio as the basis for his payment per line for his copying work. (Röhle 1976, 310-311).

4. Sadly, the exact reading of the final part of the text of the subscriptio in the codex Florentinus cannot be ascertained: both \( \sigma \lambda \) and \( \omega \lambda \) appear to be possible. The reading \( \lambda \) seems reasonably certain; however, regarding the letter directly preceding the \( \lambda \) – either \( \omega \) or \( \sigma \) –, only traces of ink are discernible. (Facsimile 1902, f. 5r). Nevertheless, there is a number of reasons to hold on to Mommsen’s reading of the text, including his supplement:

(1) Near the text of the subscriptio, the parchment of f. 5r is damaged which in all probability caused the loss of the final part of that text. However, both directly above and below the line, the subscriptio is accompanied by four horizontal strokes framing the text. Exactly between the final two strokes, there is an angled gap which caused Röhle to observe that it cannot be decided whether or not the text continues (Röhle 1976, 310), despite the fact that these final two strokes are still quite clearly visible along the frayed border of the parchment. It was this fact that caused Mommsen to argue that after \( \omega \lambda \) at least one letter got lost, and possibly more, up to a maximum of six. (Mommsen 1868 [2001], LVI* app. ad l. 14). Röhle’s proposition to read the text of the subscriptio as \( \epsilon \chi o u s i \ \sigma \tau \chi (\omega i) \ \sigma \lambda \) does not take into account the distinct possibility – suggested by the frame of the horizontal dashes accompanying the subscriptio – that its text may have been longer than can presently be discerned in the manuscript.

(2) In the context suggested by Röhle, the use of \( \epsilon \chi o u s i \) in the meaning extant ‘there are’ (viz. 230 lines) is rather unusual, to say the least of it. If the scribe who copied the Index auctorum had really intended to say: ‘I have written 230 lines’ in order to indicate the basis for his payment, he would have done better to use a phrase like \( \epsilon \gamma r a s a \ \sigma \tau \chi o u s i \ \omega \lambda \), or \( \epsilon i o i \ \sigma \tau \chi o i \ \sigma \lambda \). Instead, the scribe was almost predestined to confuse both his client and future readers besides. For, by writing \( \epsilon \chi o u s i \ \sigma \tau \chi \ \sigma \lambda \) without clearly indicating the subject of \( \epsilon \chi o u s i \) – \( \sigma \tau \chi \) is an abbreviation –, he may easily have led them to believe that the \( \beta \beta \xi \alpha \alpha \) written by the iurisprudentes were the subject of \( \epsilon \chi o u s i \), and that these books counted 230 lines: \( \sigma \tau \chi \ \sigma \lambda \) serving as the object of \( \epsilon \chi o u s i \). This would hardly have served the purpose of the scribe of the Index, if it was really his intention to indicate the basis for his payment.

(3) As already observed, the Index auctorum was copied by scribe / Manus I, who also copied the const. Deo auctore, Tanta, Omnem, the Index titulorum, and the first four books of the Digest. (Kaiser 2001, 137, 143-144, 146). Why would this scribe only have referred to the number of lines of the Index auctorum as the basis for his payment, while his copying assignment was far more extensive than the Index alone?

(4) In view of the fact that scribe / Manus I copied both the Index auctorum including its subscriptio and const. Tanta with its mention of the 3.000.000 lines, it is no more than logical to suppose that it was indeed his intention to have his subscriptio refer to the total amount of lines of
the works of the *iusprudentes* as listed in the *Index*: thus, the βιβλία mentioned in the main text of the *Index* indeed serving as the subject of ἔχουσι. In view of the room available in the manuscript – again suggested by the frame of the horizontal dashes surrounding the subscriptio –, it is quite possible that scribe / Manus I did indeed write 3.000.000 in the form of an abbreviation, as already supposed by Mommsen. (Mommsen 1868 [2001], LVI* app. ad l. 14). The scribe may have written – or copied from his exemplar – MT, with the letter τ (standing for τριακοσίας) written directly above the letter μ (standing for μυρίας), despite the fact that Justinian had repeatedly forbidden the use of abbreviations, e.g. in const. *Deo auctore* § 13, *Omnem* § 8, and *Cordi* § 5.

5. On the basis of the above, it can be concluded that the words ἔχουσι στίχ(ων) ὅλ(ας) indicate that the information provided by the *Index auctorum* and const. *Tanta / Δέδωκεν* ought at least to be taken seriously. The subscriptio of the *Index auctorum* and the reference to the 3.000.000 lines in the above passage from const. *Tanta / Δέδωκεν* § 1 show that the *Index* and *Tanta / Δέδωκεν* are somehow connected, even though the *Index* cannot be regarded as the official list of the sources of the *Digest* as announced in *Tanta / Δέδωκεν* § 20, and as the heading of the *Index* would have us believe.

### Legenda

**Facsimile 1902:** *Iustiniani Augusti Digestorum seu Pandectarum codex Florentinus olim Pisanus phototypice expressus*, a cura della Commissione ministeriale per la riproduzione delle Pandette, Vol. I, fasc. I, Roma 1902


**Krüger, Index librorum:** P. Krüger, *Index librorum ex quibus Digesta compilata sunt*


The Spider Weaves the Curtains in the Palace of the Caesars

Byzantine law has a good deal to say about Roman law. Especially the “old” scholia to the *Basilica* contain a lot of contemporaneous material, i.e. Justinianic material. Did the Byzantines contaminate the classical material or did they preserve it? Various texts offer material to answer these questions. For instance the question about the requirements of the divorce of a Roman marriage has been debated. These and other questions will be discussed throughout this contribution to the round table.
Η βυζαντινή νομοθεσία για το διαζύγιο ως προσπάθεια αλλαγής κοινωνικών πρακτικών και αντιλήψεων

Μελετώντας τη σχέση ανάμεσα στη νομοθεσία και στην κοινωνική εξέλιξη μπορεί να διαπιστώσει κανείς είτε την προσαρμογή των νόμων στις κοινωνικές αντιλήψεις, είτε τη σταδιακή μεταβολή των τελευταίων μέσω της άνωθεν επιβολής κανόνων δικαίου. Οι ιστορικοί του δικαίου γνωρίζουμε άλλωστε καλύτερα από τον καθένα, ότι το δίκαιο δεν είναι έννοια στατική, αλλά μεταβάλλεται με βάση παράγοντες, που κατά καιρούς δημιουργούν το περιβάλλον μέσα στο οποίο διαμορφώνεται. Το φαινόμενο αυτό εμφανίζεται με ιδιαίτερη ενάρετη στην περίπτωση του βυζαντινού δικαίου, που αποτέλεσε μεν μεταβληθηκή του ρωμαϊκού σφραγίσθηκε όμως έντονα από την ελληνιστική δικαίωμα της Ανατολής και από την χριστιανική θρησκεία. Προνομιακός χώρος για την επίδραση της τελευταίας υπήρξε το οικογενειακό δίκαιο, το οποίο ήδη από πολύ νωρίς άρχισε να προσαρμόζεται στους κανόνες της χριστιανικής ηθικής. Δεν υπάρχει αμφιβολία, ότι και η κοινωνία μεταβλήθηκε σταδιακά σε «χριστιανική», η μεταβολή ωστε αυτή δεν σήμανε και την πλήρη εκρίζωση παλαιών πρακτικών και αντιλήψεων. Χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα επιβιώσεως περασμένων νοοτροπιών αποτέλεσε το ζήτημα του διαζύγιου, που αποτέλεσε, σίγουρα υπό την επίδραση της Εκκλησίας, αντικείμενο επαναλαμβανόμενων νομοθετικών ρυθμίσεων, οι οποίες, κατά τη γνώμη μου τουλάχιστον, δεν μπόρεσαν εν τέλει να μεταβάλλουν ρίζικα την αντίληψη της κοινωνίας, για τις προϋποθέσεις παραμονής σε μια γαμήλια σχέση.

Τόσο στον ελληνικό κόσμο όσο και στη Ρώμη, επικρατούσε η αντίληψη για ελεύθερη λύση του γάμου. Το ρωμαϊκό δίκαιο, μάλιστα, στήριζε τη συζυγική σχέση κατά κύριο λόγο στη «γαμική διάθεση». Έτσι όπως ο γάμος καταρτιζόταν καταρχήν μόνον με τη συναίνεση των συζύγων, λυνόταν και αυτόματα, όταν η συναίνεση εξελίχθηκε είτε στο πρόσωπο και των δύο συζύγων είτε του ενός. Η παράδοση αυτή εμπόδισε την υιοθέτηση από το πολιτειακό δίκαιο της ευαγγελικής επιταγής, ότι το διαζύγιο ήταν επιτρεπτό μόνον σε περίπτωση μοιχείας, η οποία καταγράφηκε και στον κανόνα 9 του Μεγάλου Βασιλείου. Η υποχώρηση της Εκκλησίας στο συγκεκριμένο ζήτημα είναι ίσως μοναδική και σίγουρα αξιοσημείωτη· δεν σήμανε πάντως και την πλήρη προσαρμογή της στις κρατούσες αντιλήψεις. Ήδη, λοιπόν, επί Μεγάλου Κωνσταντίνου, το έτος 331, αρχίζουν να προβλέπονται συγκεκριμένοι λόγοι, τους οποίους μπορούσε να επικαλεσθεί ο ένας από τους συζύγους για να λύσει μονομερώς τον γάμο του. Το 449, επί Θεοδοσίου Β’, οι λόγοι αυτοί αυξήθηκαν, αλλά τελικά ο Ιουστινιανός με τη Νεαρά 117 του 542 τους καθόρισε για μια ακόμη φορά, περιορίζοντάς τους και διακρίνοντάς τους σε εκείνους που αφορούσαν τον άνδρα και εκείνους που αφορούσαν τη γυναίκα.

Σύμφωνα λοιπόν με τη Νεαρά 117, ο άνδρας για να διαζευχθεί τη σύζυγό του μπορούσε να επικαλεσθεί: α) η ανάμειξη της σε εγκλήμα επαγγελματικής προκαταρκτικής β) επιβολή της ζωής του γ) καταδίκη της για μοιχεία και δ) συμπεριφορά ηθικώς επιλήψημη (π.χ. συμμετοχή σε συμπόσια και λουτρά με άνδρες παρά τη θέληση του συζύγου της). Από τους τέσσερις παραπάνω λόγους, οι δύο πρώτοι ήταν δυνατό να προβληθούν και από τη σύζυγο. Κατά τα λοιπά, η γυναίκα μπορούσε
να επικαλεσθεί α) προσβολή της ηθικής της προσωπικότητας (π.χ. έκδοσή της σε πορνεία από τον σύζυγο ή συκοφαντία για μοιχεία) και β) μόνιμη εξωσυζύγικη σχέση του άνδρα, την οποία αυτός αρνείται να διαλύσει, παρά τις παρακλήσεις και προτροπές της συζύγου του και συγγενών. Χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα για την υποχρέωση διατήρησης ακόμη και ενός αφόρητου γάμου αποτελεί μάλιστα το κεφάλαιο 14 της Νεαράς, σύμφωνα με το οποίο —αντίθετα με τη ρύθμιση του Θεοδοσίου Β’— η κακοποίηση της συζύγου «μάστιγαν» ή «έξυλοι», δεν της εδίνει δικαιώματα για λύση του γάμου αλλά μόνον για χρηματική αποζημίωση, η οποία όμως αποκλείοταν, όταν eκείνη είχε συμπεριφερθεί με τρόπο που συνιστούσε αυτία διαζύγιου. Εκτός από τους παραπάνω λόγους λύσης του γάμου, που οφείλονταν σε υπαίτια εναντιωφορών του ενός από τους δύο συζύγους, με τη Νεαρά 117 προβλέφθηκαν και τρεις λόγοι που δεν οφείλονταν σε υπαίτια εναντίον του άνδρα ή της γυναίκας και οι οποίοι ήταν α) ανικανότητα του άνδρα για συνουσία που υπήρχε από την αρχή του γάμου β) επιλογή του μοναχικού βίου από τον έναν ή και τους δύο συζύγους γ) μακροχρόνια αιχμαλωσία χωρίς ειδήσεις, πως ζεί ο αιχμάλωτος.

Παρά τον δραστικό περιορισμό που επέφερε με τη Νεαρά 117 στο διαζύγιο, ο Ιωστινιανός δεν απέστει από την αντίληψη, ότι η αποβολή της γαμικής διάθεσης καθιστούσε αδύνατη τη διατήρηση του. Έτσι, ακόμη και όταν γινόταν παρά τον νόμο, η λύση του γάμου ήταν έγκυρη, συνοδευόταν όμως από επιβολή περιουσιακών κυρώσεων και ειδικά για τη γυναίκα με εγκλείσιμο σε μοναστήρι. Την τελευταία αυτή ποινή επέζετει ο αυτοκράτορας με τη Νεαρά 134, το έτος 556, και στους άνδρες. Η ελευθερία διαζύγιος ουσιαστικά λοιπόν καταργήθηκε, γιατί δύσκολα μπορεί να φανταστεί κανείς τι είδος γάμου θα ήταν αυτός, από τον οποίο θα προτιμούσε κανείς τον εγκλείσιμο σε μοναστήρι.

Παρά την εικονομαχική τους πολιτική, οι Ισαουρινοί αυτοκράτορες ακολουθούσαν στο οικογενειακό δίκαιο της Εκκλησίας (ἐτ. 741) πολιτική έντονα επηρεασμένη από τις επιταγές της Εκκλησίας. Έτσι δεν προβλέπονταν παρά μόνον τρεις λόγοι διαζύγιου: α) εξώγαμες σχέσεις της γυναίκας ή ανικανότητα του άνδρα β) επιβολή της ζωής και γ) λέπρα, ενώ ρητά αναφέρεται, ότι αποκλείεται η λύση του γάμου λόγω παραφροσύνης του ενός συζύγου. Η υπερβολικά περιοριστική αυτή πολιτική, πάντως, δεν επικράτησε. Φαίνεται ότι από τη διάρκεια του 8ου αιώνα το Εκκλησιαστικό δικαίο αποτελεί πολλές κανόνες ρυθμίσεις της σχέσεως των ανθρώπων. Ενώ όμως αυτό ακόμη και στα περισσότερα κανόνες ρυθμίσεων σε μοναστήρι, του ότι ο ξένος εις την προσφορά της γυναίκας ή του αρσενικού συζύγου αποθέτει κανείς την ουσιαστικά λύση του γάμου, η οποία έναι πολύ συχνά άδεια.

Όλοι οι λόγοι διαζύγιου που προαναφέρθηκαν —με εξαίρεση τη μοναχική κουρά και των δύο συζύγων— είτε ήταν υπαίτιοι είτε ανυπαίτιοι, αφορούσαν το πρόσωπο του ενός από αυτούς. Έτσι
όμως δυνατό, η γαμική διάθεση να είχε εκλείψει και από τους δύο συζύγους, οπότε το διαζύγιο θα
ήταν συναινετικό. Το ρωμαϊκό δίκαιο διέκρινε μάλιστα και ορολογικά τις δύο διαφορετικές αυτές
περιπτώσεις, χαρακτηρίζοντας τη μονομερή λύση του γάμου ως repudium και την από κοινού ως
divortium. Η συναινετική λύση του γάμου γινόταν δεκτή μέχρι το 546, οπότε με τη Νεαρά 117
προβλέφθηκαν σοβαρές περιουσιακές κυρώσεις για όσους την επιχειρούσαν, οι οποίες όμως μάλλον
αποδείχθηκαν ατελέσφορες, γιατί 10 χρόνια αργότερα επιβλήθηκε, με τη Νεαρά 134, εγκλεισμός
των δύο πρώην συζύγων σε μονή. Η ρύθμιση αυτή προκάλεσε αναμφιβόλως δυσαρέσκεια και έτσι
ο διάδοχος του Ιουστινιανού, Ιουστίνος Β΄, επέτρεψε το έτος 566 και πάλι το συναινετικό διαζύγιο.
Προφανώς για να προλάβει αντιδράσεις της Εκκλησίας, ο αυτοκράτορας ανέφερε στο προοίμιο
της σχετικής Νεαράς του, ότι υπήρχαν περιπτώσεις κατά τις οποίες, χωρίς να συντρέχει κάποιος
νόμιμος λόγος διαζυγίου, μεταξύ των συζύγων επενέβαινε ο «σκαιός δαίμων» και τους προκαλούσε
«αδιάλλακτον μίσος», που καθιστούσε αναγκαία τη λύση του γάμου.
Όπως προκύπτει από διάφορες πηγές, η Νεαρά του Ιουστίνου πρέπει να ίσχυσε για
περισσότερα από 100 χρόνια. Το έτος 691/692 όμως, η Πενθέκτη Οικουμενική Σύνοδος απείλησε
με βαριές εκκλησιαστικές πηγές όσους έλυναν τον γάμο τους χωρίς συγκεκριμένο νόμιμο λόγο,
ενώ, 50 περίπου χρόνια αργότερα, η Εκλογή με τον αυστηρότατο περιορισμό της δυνατότητας για
διάζευξη, δεν άφηνε περιθώρια για συναινετική λύση του γάμου. Οι άνθρωποι της εποχής όμως
βρήκαν ένα τέχνασμα για να παρακάμπτουν τα εμπόδια του νόμου. Άρχισαν, λοιπόν, να γίνονται
ανάδοχοι των παιδιών τους, δημιουργώντας έτσι μεταξύ τους κώλυμα από πνευματική συγγένεια,
που οδηγούσε σε λύση του γάμου. Η πρακτική αυτή φαίνεται πως έγινε ανεκτή, τουλάχιστον από
το Κράτος, για ικανό χρόνο. Με μία Νεαρά όμως είτε του Λέοντος Ε΄ (έτ. 819/820) είτε —κατά την
άποψη που διατύπωσε σε μία από τις τελευταίες εργασίες του ο αείμνηστος Andreas Schminck—
του Λέοντος ΣΤ΄ (έτ. 911/912), θεσπίστηκαν βαρύτατες κυρώσεις για όσους κατέφευγαν στο
παραπάνω τέχνασμα ή, γενικότερα, συνήπταν δεύτερο γάμο, έχοντας κατορθώσει να λύσουν τον
προηγούμενο με οποιονδήποτε τρόπο σχετιζόταν με κοινή συναίνεση. Παρά την αυτοκρατορική
αυτή αντίδραση, δεν έλειψε από τη νομοθεσία της μέσης περιόδου και μια προσπάθεια εκ νέου
καθιέρωσης του συναινετικού διαζυγίου με διάταξη της Εισαγωγής, η οποία όμως δεν απαντά στον
Πρόχειρο Νόμο και μάλλον δεν ίσχυσε. Το γεγονός, πάντως, ότι το κείμενο αυτό —με επιπλέον
αναφορές στον «μισάνθρωπο δαίμονα», που θυμίζουν τη Νεαρά του Ιουστίνου— εμφανίζεται
σε χειρόγραφα ως Νεαρά κάποιου μη κατανομαζόμενου αυτοκράτορα, αποδεικνύει, κατά τη
γνώμη μου τουλάχιστον, ότι η κοινωνική πίεση για τη δυνατότητα συναινετικής λύσης του γάμου
παρέμενε ισχυρή, παρά τις αλλεπάλληλες νομοθετικές απαγορεύσεις. Όπως πάντως και να είχαν
τα πράγματα, από τον 12ο αιώνα σώζεται η μαρτυρία του κανονολόγου Αλεξίου Αριστηνού, ότι
στην εποχή του το συναινετικό διαζύγιο ήταν απαγορευμένο.
Από τη μέχρι τώρα ανάπτυξη αποκομίζει κανείς την εντύπωση, πως από τη μέση βυζαντινή
περίοδο και μετά το διαζύγιο είχε περιορισθεί οριστικά στα στενά πλαίσια που προέβλεπαν οι
Νεαρές 117 και 134 του Ιουστινιανού. Προκαλεί λοιπόν έκπληξη το γεγονός, ότι —όπως προκύπτει
κατά κύριο λόγο από τη μελέτη του νομολογιακού έργου του αρχιεπισκόπου Αχρίδας Δημητρίου
Χωματηνού και του μητροπολίτη Ναυπάκτου Ιωάννη Αποκαύκου— η Εκκλησία —στην οποία είχε
περιέλθει μετά τον 11ο αιώνα η αρμοδιότητα για την επίλυση διαφορών από τη σχέση του γάμου—
αρχίζει να δείχνει αρκετή ελαστικότητα σε σχέση με το διαζύγιο. Συγκεκριμένα, γάμοι λύονται
μετά από πολύ ευρεία ερμηνεία των διατάξεων του νόμου. Ακόμη δεν λείπουν και περιπτώσεις,
κατά τις οποίες δεν αναζητείται καν νόμιμος λόγος, αλλά το διαζύγιο χορηγείται με το επιχείρημα,
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ότι η συμπεριφορά ή η κατάσταση του ενός από τους δύο συζύγους είχε προκαλέσει στον άλλον «ακατάλλακτο μίσος», που καθιστούσε αδύνατη τη διατήρηση του γάμου. Τόσο ο παραπάνω όρος —που θυμίζει τη φρασεολογία της Νεαράς του Ιουστίνου— όσο και τα πραγματικά περιστατικά που περιγράφονται στο σκεπτικό των αποφάσεων οδηγούν μάλιστα κάποτε στη σκέψη, ότι σε κάποια από αυτά τα διαζύγια οι προβαλλόμενοι λόγοι ήταν προσχηματικοί και η διάζευξη επερχόταν τελικά με κοινή συναίνεση. Βλέπουμε ότι η ίδια η Εκκλησία, που είχε προβάλλει τόσες αντιδράσεις για την ελεύθερη λύση του γάμου, ήταν εκείνη που τελικά προχώρησε ακόμη και πέρα από τις προβλέψεις της πολιτειακής νομοθεσίας.

Πώς μπορεί να εξηγηθεί το γεγονός αυτό; Εκ πρώτης άποψης αποτελεί μιά ήττα κατά κύριο λόγο της Εκκλησίας —η οποία δεν κατόρθωσε να περιορίσει τη λύση γάμου μεταξύ ζώντων στα πλαίσια της ευαγγελικής επιταγής— αλλά και της Πολιτείας, που —μετά από μακράς νομοθετικές προσπάθειες— δεν επέβαλε ένα γενικά αποδεκτό πλαίσιο για το διαζύγιο. Κατά τη γνώμη μου, η παραπάνω αποτυχία η οποία δεν κατόρθωσε να περιορίσει τη λύση γάμου μεταξύ ζώντων στα πλαίσια της ευαγγελικής επιταγής, η οποία δεν κατόρθωσε να περιορίσει τη λύση γάμου μεταξύ ζώντων στα πλαίσια της ευαγγελικής επιταγής, ήταν εκείνη που τελικά προχώρησε ακόμη και πέρα από τις προβλέψεις της πολιτειακής νομοθεσίας.

Πάντως, ακόμη και κατά τη γνώμη μου, από τη στιγμή κατά την οποία τα δικαιοδοτικά όργανα ήταν εκείνα που θα αποφάσιζαν, ποιος γάμος έπρεπε να λυθεί και ποιος όχι και δεν μπορούσαν να βρεθούν προ τετελεσμένων γεγονότων από ενέργειες της κοσμικής αρχής, το νομοθετικό πλαίσιο αποκτούσε μειωμένη σημασία. Ηττημένη υπήρξε λοιπόν σίγουρα η αυτοκρατορική πολιτική και νικήτρια η κοινωνία —που διατήρησε την αντίληψή της ότι ο γάμος αποτελούσε εκδήλωση ελεύθερης βούλησης— ενώ —με βάση αυτή τη θεώρηση των πραγμάτων— η Εκκλησία κράτησε για τον εαυτό της το ρόλο του νηφάλιου κριτή για τη γνησιότητα ή μη αυτής της βούλησης, εξασφαλίζοντας κατά το δυνατόν ειρήνη στο ποιμνίο της αλλά και τη δική της κυριαρχία.
Renewing the Law in Byzantium: The Emperor’s Law and Society’s Law

We know that in the Byzantine Empire, the law was inextricably linked with the person of the emperor. He was νόμος ἔμψυχος and ἔννομος ἐπιστασία, and for this reason possessed the exclusive right to create laws that would deal with actual situations which pre-classical, classical and post-classical Roman law was unable to regulate or resolve appropriately. First codified in the sixth century AD, the ‘old’ law was an entrenched legal framework whose ‘Romanness’ rendered it an incontestable dogma and which — alongside the subsequent legislative production of the Byzantine emperors — reflected the Empire’s ‘established legal system’. Therefore, any ‘change’ made to the Byzantine legal order was recorded not in the anachronistic ‘old’ law of Rome, but rather in the ‘new’ law, that is the Novels and Chrysobulls.

Through the legislation they enacted, the Byzantine emperors sought to organise the state, the Church and government agencies, to advance the government’s domestic and foreign policy, to settle specific private disputes and to regulate private life. Justification for the introduction of new measures — over and above the general formula of the emperor’s justice, a virtue which he ought to possess and which was actualised by issuing just laws — did, in some rather rare instances, rest upon earlier legislation. Thus, a Novel could be used explicitly to abolish an earlier law, as was the case with Novels 21, 53 and 66 promulgated by Leo the Wise, or to revive an older law that had fallen into disuse, such as the oath taken by the judges that was put back to force with a θέσπισμα issued by Andronicus II Palaeologus. There are nevertheless also other Novels in which, with the emperor’s explicit or implicit acceptance, the regulations introduced stem not from his individual will, but rather from society.

Thus, some customs, which may have even run counter to the provisions of Roman law, were given legal status by imperial decree. One such example is the Novel issued by John Comnenus, the emperor of Trebizond, which explicitly abolished the Roman collatio dotis and established the customary practice of excluding daughters that had received a dowry from their father’s inheritance.

From the moment that they gained Novel status, such customs were seen as a rule of law originating ‘from above’ that reflected and identified with the emperor’s will. The primary aim behind their incorporation into official legislation seems to have been to underline the emperor’s authority and to show him to be the sole shaper of juridical life, since it was he who controlled any other source of rules of law that could, if not produced under his aegis, render his legislative monopoly null and void.

In other instances, imperial laws may have legislated established practices that derived from case law. One such example is the recognition by thirteenth-century ecclesiastical judge Demetrius Chomatianus, in certain specific cases, of inheritance rights both to the relatives of a deceased person as well as to his/her surviving spouse — something which was ruled out entirely in Justinian’s Novel 118. Some decades later, this practice originating from case law attained the status of imperial law through the Novel issued by Andronicus II Palaeologus. This Novel came into being in 1306 and established trimoiria, or the tripartite division of an inheritance.
The question which arises is the following: was imperial law a vehicle for legislative as well as juridical change? Did the regulations it introduced ultimately provide solutions that reflected real-life needs?

To answer this question, one will have to approach the concept of law from a different perspective: that is, not as any rule of law which, irrespective of its origins, forms part of imperial legislation (the formal conception of law), but rather as any rule of law that consolidates in real life widespread practices that do not always correspond to an imperial Novel (the substantive conception of law).

Such ‘substantive laws’ are to be found — once again — both in social and in judicial practice.

An example from the sphere of social practice is that of concubinage: despite its explicit legislative abolition in Leo’s Novel 91, it continued to thrive as a social institution. At least, that is what the civil and ecclesiastical case laws subsequent to Novel 91 reveal. Here we see the judges recognising these relationships as actual situations, and thereby basing their rulings on pre-Novel 91 legislation that accepted such relationships and regulated the results arising from them.

The same applies to divorce by mutual consent. This method of dissolving a marriage continued to be practised despite its legislative abolition and the criminalisation of the practices that spouses employed to conceal their true motives and to separate by mutual consent (the practice of one of the spouses becoming their child’s godparent: this would have created a retrospective impediment to marriage to the other parent, resulting in the immediate dissolution of the marriage).

It appears, given their wide acceptance, that the above practices proved to be more tenacious than their legislative abolition.

Case law is yet another source of established practices that may have conflicted with the content of official law. An example: Provision 1,13,20 of the Hexabiblos (which replicates title 24,16 of Eustathius Romanus’ Peira) declares null and void any sale effected by a married woman for as long as she is married. Here, Eustathius (and Harmenopoulos) acknowledge the legislative regulations, according to which the sale of dowries is forbidden and is only permitted in exceptional, restrictive cases mentioned in the law. However, the comment that follows this provision in the Hexabiblos tells us that this regulation was not adhered to by the courts, which were in the habit of ruling differently. In other words, they ruled that a woman could sell her dowry herself and the sale would be valid, subject to certain conditions. Namely, that: a) the sale took place with the written consent of her spouse, b) it was accompanied by a notarial document and c) the reason for the sale, which had to be mentioned in the contract, must not have been proven false. Under these conditions, the case law held that the sale of a dowry was valid and could not be revoked for any reason, even if the woman’s spouse was to later become impoverished.

The above examples, which — owing to the especially limited time allocated to this presentation — are only a small sample, ultimately lead to the following conclusions as regards the Byzantine legal order on the one hand, and juridical life on the other:

In the Byzantine Empire, adaptation of social life to the laws in force was not always a given. Imperial law was neither the sole, nor the indisputable vehicle for introducing changes that also corresponded to real life. Attaleiates comments to that effect, admitting that of all the Novels Leo the Wise issued, the only ones implemented were those that filled gaps left in earlier legislation. On the other hand, it is a fact that in some cases juridical life was determined and evolved based
on the practices stemming from other mechanisms producing rules of law which, given that they were more successful in meeting real-life needs, shaped juridical life while ignoring the provisions of imperial law.

Ultimately, in Byzantine juridical life, the adaptation of real life to a regulatory framework and the ability of legislation to meet real-life needs should be considered neither self-evident nor a given. For us, too, nowadays, it is not always clear where their boundaries lie.
On the Alienation of the Dowry. Some Remarks about the Application of the Senatus Consultum Velleianum and the Term διδασκαλία τοῦ νόμου in Byzantine Law

Justinian’s 530 A.D. constitutio CJ 5.13.1.15 prohibited the alienation of the unassessed dowry by the husband even with the wife’s consent. Novel 61, issued seven years later, stipulated that for a transaction involving prenuptial gifts to be valid, the wife needed to give her consent twice in a period of two years after the initial agreement.

However, because Novel 61 cites the aforesaid Justinianic constitutio (CJ 5.13.1.15) and because the same Novel shows similarities to the constitutio CJ 4.29.22 concerning the Senatus Consultum Velleianum (hereafter SCV), the Byzantines were led to believe that not only the alienation of prenuptial gifts but also that of dowry were governed by the same legal framework and that they were both somehow connected to the SCV. Therefore, in the Byzantines’ point of view, the alienation of dowry was subject to the same rules and restrictions that governed the alienation of prenuptial gifts, i.e. the transfer of the dowry was only allowed if women were to reiterate their consent two years after the initial transaction. The aforementioned Justinianic regulations were explicitly reproduced in the imperial legislation and included in numerous legal collections and compilations of the middle and late Byzantine period. However, as the studies of A. Christophilopoulos and Helen Saradi-Mendelovici have shown, these regulations were in fact never enforced.

In Byzantine law there were many provisions safeguarding the dowry. The dotal property was considered a separate property unit, that in many occasions was a substantial part of the family estate. The wife had legal ownership of the dotal property while the husband was its administrator. There was also the competing need for the transactions involving the alienation of dowry to be secure and streamlined to protect the interests of any bona fide purchaser. Therefore, in all transactions involving alienation of any piece of dotal property two competing interests were at play and needed to be balanced: on one hand, the need to safeguard women’s interests in their own property ensuring that women knowingly and freely consented to its disposition, and on the other hand, the need to protect the interests of any potential purchaser. One can imagine the legal problems that would arise if, for example, the initial buyer of dotal property decided to sell it to a bona fide purchaser and the original owner, the endowed woman, at the end of the two-year period changed her mind and contested the initial agreement. If the law was enforced, then the initial transaction would be void and the dotal property would be rendered inalienable.

Therefore, due to the two competing interests, Justinian’s legal provisions, that prohibited the alienation of the unassessed dowry by the husband even with the wife’s consent as they were interpreted by the Byzantines, were never enforced. However, in order to counterbalance and protect the women’s rights, it was deemed necessary to ensure that in cases of alienation of dotal property women should give their informed consent. This is the reason why in some notarial documents
from the middle and mainly the late Byzantine period related to the alienation of dotal property, as well as in decisions of the Patriarchal court, the “law aiding women” is repeatedly mentioned, along with the woman’s declaration that knowingly and out of her own free will renounce her right to invoke its protection.

Undoubtedly, in the Byzantine’s point of view the “law aiding women” was related to, or more precisely, was identified with the SCV. The SCV, enacted in the mid-first century A.D., determined that women should not intercede on behalf of anyone. Intercedere means to intervene, interpose oneself between a debtor and a creditor and undertake a debt on someone’s behalf. Therefore, a woman who was sued in respect to an intercessio of any kind could plead the exceptio senatus consulti Velleiani.

In Byzantine law, however, the SCV was not limited to intercessio cases, like in Roman law, but it was broadly applied. In my view, the SCV’s broader application was not, at least initially, merely the result of misinterpretation due to the Byzantines’ lack of understanding of the Roman doctrine of the decree. It was rather used to counteract the non-application of the Justinianic legal provisions, which if enforced, would have led to insecure transactions.

What is the identity of the “law aiding women” after all? And what exactly do we mean with the term “teaching”? Undoubtedly, Byzantines when referring to the “law aiding women” did not have in mind a specific regulation, but the SCV, which they regarded as a law protecting women in general. The term “teaching” did not mean that women were actively informed about their rights according to a particular legal provision that as we saw did not exist as such. Rather, “teaching” was another way to denote that a woman received consideration and knowingly and explicitly renounced the benefit, afforded by the SCV, to challenge later the transaction. In this way, the involved transactions are secured. This is the reason why a woman could only renounce this right if she has attained the age of majority.

The broad application of the SCV attested in notarial practice and the mutation of its Roman core led in turn to misinterpretations. The Byzantines’ lack of knowledge regarding the legal matters that the SCV was designed to settle is also obvious in Peira. Revealing is the legal reasoning in Peira 12.1 concerning the regulation “that the SCV comes to the assistance of women who have guaranteed, but if they paid money for others have no right to recover it.” The true meaning of the regulation is that women can invoke the SCV when their debt is still outstanding, not if they have already paid it. In contrast, Eustathios Rhomaios seems to believe women can invoke the SCV when they act as guarantors since their ignorance of the law is excused due to the weakness of their sex, but not when they have fulfilled their obligation since they have committed two errors: not only they ignored the relevant law but also they did not raise an objection before making any payments.

The “law aiding women” was not only applied in the judicial practice of the late Byzantine period. It is even mentioned by Michael Psellus (Oratones Forenses et Acta, ed. G. T. Dennis, actum no.3) in March 1049 in a case concerning alienation of dotal property. The legal proceedings took place presumably in Asia Minor. It is not clear if Psellus was the judge or simply the recorder of the case, the pertinent parts of which are as follows: in virtue of a chrysobull issued by the emperor Basil II in 1006/1007 to his grandparents, protospatharios and vestiarites John Iveritzes claimed ownership of a suburban property named Vivarion, which was actually occupied by the manglabites Basil. Basil, in rebuttal, asserted that the land had been sold in October 1000 by the grandfather of the
petitioner, Stephanos Iveritzes, to Michael, brother of the kouboukleisios Leon. The transaction was perfectly legal, since Vivarion had already been donated to Stephanos Iveritzes in 995/996. Michael conveyed Vivarion as a dowry to his daughter Maria, who in turn, jointly with her husband, sold the land to the father of the respondent manglabites Basil, Pikrides. However, after her husband's death, Maria contested the initial transaction and the transfer of the Vivarion to Pikrides, pleading «τὸν βοηθοῦντα νόμον». Before the judge came to a decision, the two litigants, Maria and Pikrides, agreed to settle the case with a settlement sanctioned by the court. According to their settlement, Maria in exchange for an additional amount of money consented to sell her dotal property.

Psellos's account is noteworthy for a number of reasons. It clearly shows that during the 11th century not only the alienation of the dotal property was allowed, but also the women's right to invalidate such a transaction invoking «τὸν βοηθοῦντα νόμον» was established. Furthermore, it points out the flexible and practical way the Byzantines were able to settle problems that would arise if the original transaction of the dotal property was challenged. The two parties came to an agreement before the judge and the woman was “compensated” with a certain amount of money. In exchange, she consented once again to the sale of her dotal property to the same buyer. It is important to note that in classical Roman law the SCV is attached to the promissory transaction, granting women a «defensive» exceptio in order to avoid the fulfillment of a debt that they commit themselves propter infirmitas sexus. According to the interpretation that prevailed in Byzantine law, however, not only the promissory transaction but also the alienation of the dotal property could be invalidated, regardless of the given price. A woman who did not knowingly and explicitly renounce the benefit that the “law aiding women” afforded her in the first place, could raise an «offensive» actio, claiming back her dotal property, even if the transfer of her dowry had already been completed.

Nevertheless, the need for the alienation of dotal property to remain secure and valid led to different legal solutions. According to a scholion cited in Hexabiblos (ad H. 1.13.20) that can safely be dated shortly before 1345, the prohibition of the alienation of dotal property is not legally binding. The legal practice which is instead valid and reflects local customary law, is described as follows: If a woman: a) during the marriage, b) sells her dowry, c) with the consent of her husband d) declaring that the sale is absolutely necessary and justified and e) the proceeds from the sale are given directly in the woman's hands, the transaction is perfectly legal and the woman cannot reclaim her dotal property, even if her husband dies without any property.

Thus, we see customary law emerging, which explains the legal formulation in some notarial documents. It is not coincidental that in, at least, two documents from the region of Thessaloniki (Actes de Docheiariou 3, 42) dated in 1102 and 1373 respectively, in which the renouncement of the SCV is mentioned, all the criteria set out by the scholion are met. The women, both of an aristocratic background, appear as sole owners and main contracting parties while their husbands consent to the sale with their signature. The protection of the women is secured by the fact that the proceeds from the sale are given directly in the woman's hands.

In the document dated 1102, it is even mentioned that because of the legal ban of the alienation of dotal property and the understandable fear of any potential buyer, the vendor Eudokia requests the praetor and doux of Thessaloniki to grant her permission to sell her dotal property. The judge recognizes her claim as perfectly legal referring to the law of Basilica 28.8.20, which is interpreted broadly on the legal grounds that her husband had no income, and allows to sell her property. The warranty of her husband protospatharios Stephanos Rasopoles, which follows the deed of sale, proves, however, that he was all but destitute and that the whole procedure was a device to circumvent the law.
At the end of the 14th century the need for the “teaching” of the “law aiding women” to be prescribed was felt as pressing since it seemed that it was used as a loophole in cases where women changed their minds and wanted to withdraw from a transaction. A *hypotyposis* of the Patriarch Matthew I in 1398 attempted to prescribe the process of “teaching”. He decreed that the *exokatakoiloī archontes* in charge of “teaching” should explain to women their rights only after the Patriarch had been informed. Furthermore, the document renouncing the woman's right to invoke later the “law aiding women”, was to be drafted by a secretary of the church other than the ecclesiastic who explained the law to them. The presence of witnesses was also mandated.

It is worth noting that the *hypotyposis* was issued at a time of political instability and confusion when Constantinople was under siege by the Turks with its people suffering by famine and deprivation. It is perhaps related to the drafting of the *Hexabiblos aucta*, a legal compilation seeking the return to the Roman origins. This *hypotyposis* as well as the Byzantines’ view, especially in the late Byzantine period, that the SCV applies to any transaction that involves women, explains why the SCV was mentioned in numerous notarial documents even in a notarial template regarding adoption.

The above discussion reveals the different picture that emerges from the normative texts («law in books») and from the documentary evidence («law in action»). It also illustrates that the alteration of the Byzantine law in comparison to the Roman legal tradition is not always a result of misunderstandings or poor knowledge of its doctrines. The non-implementation of the Justinianic regulations in legal practice, despite their inclusion in the Byzantine legal books, was -at least in my view- deliberate, intending to serve social purposes, in our case, the necessity for the dotal property to be alienated and liquidated under certain circumstances. On the other hand, the regulations of Justinian led to a broader application of the SCV, confusion regarding its origin and even to the emergence of local customary law. In Byzantium, law can at the same time serve as a means of change and stability.
« Τομαί » dans les ambigüités (« ἀμφίβολα ») des lois byzantines. Éléments des approches interprétatives des scoliastes byzants

En dépit de l’étendue limitée du matériel jurisprudentiel de la période byzantine qui est parvenu jusqu’à nous, matériel provenant surtout de hautes cours de justice, d’éminents historiens du droit ont fréquemment souligné le rôle créateur de règles du droit de la jurisprudence byzantine temporelle et ecclésiastique. Particulièrement au cours de la période médiobyzantine (ixe-xiième siècle), la « plasticité » des notions juridiques et, par conséquent, les évolutions dans le domaine de l’interprétation juridique vont être favorisées par les pratiques qui prolongent la vigueur (ou bien l’élargissent ou la rétablissent) de réglementations plus anciennes qui étaient entretemps tombées en désuétude d’une part, d’autre part par les fréquentes divergences législatives de l’application de positions de doctrines juridiques encore en formation, puis par le nombre plutôt réduit d’ordonnances d’abolition formelle ainsi que par l’application d’institutions particulières directement issues dans la structure politique et le fonctionnement de l’Empire byzantin.

Pourtant, une plus grande souplesse des limites de l’action du juge byzantin ne voulait pas forcément dire absence totale de directions législatives sur l’approche interprétative des règles du droit, qu’il soit impérial ou coutumier. Des passages afférents 2.1.33 des Basiliques, 51.32 de la Peira et des scolies byzantines (Synopsis des Basiliques N. VI.19 sc. (h), Ecloga Librorum I-X Basilicorum (désormais EB) sur B.9.1.38), il ressort que celui qui applique le droit ne doit en aucun cas procéder à des solutions d’interprétation contra legem, à savoir, ainsi qu’il est précisément rapporté, « déformer » (μεταποιεῖ) ou « interpréter contre le sens » (παρερμηνεύει) la loi écrite en divergeant de l’interprétation qui, de toute évidence, s’accorde à la formulation grammaticale. Dans sa scolie du passage B.9.1.38 (365, 14-18), le rédacteur anonyme de EB va formuler un principe directeur de l’interprétation qui s’adresse non seulement aux plaidants « récalcitrants » (ἀπειθεῖς) et « sans vergogne » (ἀναίσχυντοι) qui contournent la procédure régulière au moyen de « suppliques » (δεήσεις), mais aussi à l’empereur byzantin lui-même, à celui qui possède le privilège de l’interprétation authentique des lois. Ainsi qu’il le souligne, les questions que la loi définit avec clarté ne doivent pas être « interprétées contre leur sens » par les rescris royaux (ἀντιγραφές, rescripta), mais on ne doit pas non plus tenter des approches qui changeraient complètement l’interprétation (μετατυπούσι) issue de la formulation grammaticale claire d’une disposition législative.

Quels sont donc les cas qui donnent lieu à ces divergences du principe interprétatif qui invoque l’interprétation manifeste (πρόδηλον) des règles juridiques, à savoir l’interprétation qui découle de la lettre de la loi à l’aide des règles d’usage syntaxique et lexical ? Outre ces cas où le législateur byzantin définit d’avance le mode pleinement approprié d’interprétation des déclarations imprécises de volonté des parties en litige ou des actions juridiques peu claires (ἀγωγή, ἐπερώτησις), par souci de protection sociale particulière de certaines institutions (comme par exemple celle de la dot ou de l’emancipatio) ou afin de protéger l’intérêt public ou la sécurité des échanges (interprétation
des accords d’achat, de location etc.), les sources de la littérature juridique byzantine mettent en relief la question plus large des contradictions byzantines du droit découlant particulièrement de l’interprétation par la mise en relation de dispositions anciennes et nouvelles. Dans tous ces cas de contradictions qui surgissaient aisément, cela s’entend, dans le cadre d’une législation aussi étendue et minutieuse que celle de Byzance, le législateur suggère à celui qui applique la loi dans sa pratique de ne pas aboutir légèrement à la conclusion qu’il existe une antinomie réelle entre des prescriptions plus anciennes et nouvelles, sauf en cas d’évidence absolue (B.2.1.34, B.2.1.36, Peira 51.32, Prochiron auctum (Ηοξημένον Πρόχειρον) 40.30, Hexabible d’Arménopoulos 1.1.36). Dans la plupart des cas, ainsi que le prétendent les Byzantins, il s’agit simplement d’une « contradiction apparente » (ἐναντιοφάνεια), à savoir d’une opposition d’aspect, non réelle, entre une règle de droit ancienne et nouvelle. D’autre part, cette « imperfection » du système judiciaire devait être égalisée, non par l’interprétation de chaque disposition législative une à une, mais en corrélant de façon appropriée des règles du droit, corrélation qui présuppose l’insertion de chaque notion juridique dans une relation d’appartenance systématique et télologique avec l’ensemble du système légal.

Des exemples caractéristiques de résolution des contradictions apparentes (ἐναντιοφάνειες) par le biais d’un tel raisonnement juridique à Byzance sont offerts par les passages suivants :

1) Le passage 53.1 de la Peira, dans lequel est examinée l’antinomie entre B.5.1.8 et B.47.1.66, sur la question de l’exemption de la soumission de la forme écrite du mémoire (υπόμνημα) de certains types de donations, et surtout des donations pour raison de piété (destiné à des œuvres caritatives) qui dépassaient la somme de 500 pièces d’or. Dans son « apologie » (ἀπολογία), à savoir la défense de la loi à laquelle se livre Eustathe Romaios, les passages cités comprennent des règlementations qui ne sont contradictoires qu’en apparence. Et ce car, conformément à l’interprétation du magister (μάγιστρος) qui s’appuie sur la nature juridique particulière de ces donations, ainsi qu’il ressort également d’autres passages afférents et de scolies de la littérature juridique byzantine (voir sc. (1) de Théodore et (2) d’Isidore de B.47.1.66 (BS 2778-27779/, 2779-2780/2 et la scolie (2) d’Isidore de B.47.1.68 (BS 2782/2), les donations qui visent à des objectifs caritatifs diffèrent de celles destinées à des institutions de charité (qui sont soumises à la forme écrite du mémoire) en raison d’une part de l’élément de permanence qui d’ordinaire est absent des donations pour causes de piété, et d’autre part du mode de versement des aides financières destinées aux objectifs caritatifs. En effet ces dons, en règle générale du moins, sont effectués par versements partiels ou périodiques, et il n’y a pas – ou on ne peut le constater – de bénéfice (utilitas, ωφέλεια) du donataire, qui constitue la seule somme revendiquée par l’assignation (B.47.1.66 et scolie (2) d’Isidore (BS 2779/2, 27.29).

2) Le passage 51.16 (215, 7.12.15.19) de la Peira où Eustathe Romaios examine la contradiction apparente entre B.7.1.18 et B.9.3.36, sur la question de la vigueur de l’opinion de la majorité des juges en tant que décision de justice définitive. Conformément aux vues d’Eustathe Romaios, la loi qui stipule que, en cas de division de l’opinion des juges, il faut que celle de la majorité comme de la minorité soit formulée par écrit dans des « notes » (σημειώσεις) séparées, ne contrevient pas à la règle législative plus ancienne du Pandecte justinien (D.42.1.3=B. 9.3.36) qui stipulait que l’emporte l’opinion de la majorité. Si, par conséquent, il y a division de l’opinion parmi les membres du tribunal en formation collégiale, tous doivent alors donner un vote écrit, c’est-à-dire qu’ils doivent rédiger deux « notes » séparées. Dans ce cas, il n’y a aucun doute comme quoi l’opinion de la majorité constitue la décision de justice définitive, et elle seule est soumise à l’appel.
3) La scolie de EB de B.2.1.41,1 et surtout la scolie de Théodore Balsamon du Nomocanon en 14 titres (Nomocanon σε 14 Τίτλους=Nomocanon XIV titulorum, G. RALLÈS–M. POTLÈS (éd)s), Σύνταγμα [Collection par ordre alphabétique], t.1, Athènes 1852, titre A, chap. Τ, Ἑτερον σχόλιον, 41, 19–14, 42, 1–2), où se pose la question de l'antinomie née de la validité simultanée de plusieurs dispositions législatives sur l'« invalidation » de la loi écrite par une règle de droit coutumier. L'interprétation qu'entrepris l'ocurrence le rédacteur anonyme de EB, mais aussi le canoniste du xiie siècle Théodore Balsamon, montre que cette contradiction est purement apparente puisque elle est levée si l'on incorpore l'interprétation de ces dispositions dans l'ensemble du système légal byzantin. Selon Balsamon, qui fonde son interprétation sur la corrélation des dispositions apparemment opposées avec la disposition de B.2.1.28 et avec une scolie sur le même sujet de l'antecessor Stéphane, la désuétude, à savoir la non-application pendant longtemps d'une règle de droit écrit, invalide le contenu de la loi écrite « pour des raisons d’humanité » (δἰὰ τὸ φιλάνθρωπον) ; de la même façon, la longe application d’une coutume peut aussi supprimer une règle de droit écrit, mais seulement lorsque, pour des « raisons d’humanité », cette coutume a été validée par des décisions de justice. Ce nouvel élément, purement axiologique, avancé par Balsamon pour lever la contradiction apparente (εναντιοφάνεια) entre plusieurs réglementations juridiques sur le processus de « validité » (θέσις) et de l’« invalidation » (ἀναίρεσις) des lois écrites de l’Empire, porte sur le devant de la scène la question des évaluations individuelles permises au juge byzantin au cours de l’interprétation de la loi.

L’assouplissement des obligations juridiques : notions et limites légales

En effet, le cas de la contradiction apparente (εναντιοφάνεια) entre différentes règles de droit n’est pas le seul où le législateur byzantin renvoie sciemment à la notion d’humanité (τὸ φιλάνθρωπον, amour du bien, « τὸ φιλάνθρωπον », bienveillance envers ses semblables, « τὸ καλοθελές », bénévolence, « ἰαγώνα ἀγάπη », amour envers le juste) pour parvenir à une approche interprétative plus juste des questions juridiques particulièrement ambiguës. Ainsi qu’il ressort particulièrement des textes législatifs byzantins et des scolies (voir B.2.3.155, 2 et scolie (1) des Basiliques (BS 18/1), B.60.51.39 et scolie (1) des Basiliques (BS 3897/1), B.2.1.28, Abrégé des lois (Ἐπιτομὴ Νόμων) I.16, EB Eis. 2.8–9, B.2.3.56 et scolie de EB (108, 28–33, 109, 1–5), dans les cas de questions juridiques ambiguës, celui qui appliquait le droit devait, en se guidant sur le principe supérieur d’humanité, préciser l’intention (du législateur ou de la partie en litige) afin d’élaborer de façon appropriée la règle de droit applicable à laquelle était ensuite être soumis le litige porté devant lui. Se fondant sur cette donnée, le passage 9.3.38 des Basiliques stipule que, lorsque sont jugées des affaires pénales, des affaires d'affranchissement ou de versement d'une somme d'argent pour dettes, dans le cas de suffrage égal l'empire celui qui est en faveur du plaignant, puisque ce vote réalise au plus juste le principe d’humanité. C'est cette formulation assez « condensée » de ce passage des Basiliques, qu'analyse plus avant la scolie afférente de EB, qui ajoute les catégories d'affaires auxquelles était appliqué ce principe (400, 22–23, 401, 1–5), ainsi que sa motivation.

Mais un nouvel élément, qui semble renverser même ce principe a priori admis de l'avis majoritaire des juges [sur ce sujet, voir principalement B.9.3.39 et la scolie afférente de EB (401, 9–18) ; Peira 51.16] est introduit par l'ordonnance II, λ’ du manuel didactique du droit Opusculum de jure (Ποίημα (Πόνημα) Νομικόν) attribué au juge Michel Attaliote, qui date de l'an 1073/1074. Suivant ce passage, une nouvelle loi (il s'agit probablement de l'ordonnance de Nov.(Iust.) 125 c. 1 (=B.7.1.18), plus récente que D.42.1.39 (=B.9.3.39) ; cf. Peira 51.16) avait consacré la formulation écrite de l'avis des juges afin, selon l'opinion du rédacteur du Opusculum de jure, que la décision judiciaire finale
puisse s'appuyer sur l'avis « le plus juste » même si ce dernier avait reçu le plus petit nombre de suffrages. Mais le passage Ε, πβ' de la Synopsis Minor (Νόμμων κατά στοιχείων ou Μικρὰ Σύνοψις, fin du XIXe siècle), se range aussi en faveur du renversement du principe de majorité lors des décisions de justice. Dans ce passage, nous observons également que, lorsqu'est jugée une question d'affranchissement mais aussi des affaires de dettes, c'est le vote des juges le plus favorable qui prévaut, car c'est celui qui réalise les injonctions du principe d'humanité. Le rédacteur du passage précise tout d'abord que, dans les affaires où se juge la question de l'affranchissement devant n'importe quel tribunal byzantin, et à la condition qu'il s'agisse de juges « égaux par le rang et en autres pouvoirs » (ἰσοί κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν δύναμιν), l'emporte, pour des raisons d’humanité toujours, le suffrage le plus favorable à l'affranchissement. Par la suite, il va souligner d'autre part que, lorsque qu'une question d'affranchissement est jugée, l'opinion de la minorité qui s'est rangée en faveur de l'affranchissement l'emporte aussi pour les mêmes raisons face à l'opinion opposée de la majorité, à la condition que cette minorité ne soit pas très éloignée de la majorité en nombre de votes. Cela vaut aussi pour les affaires civiles où le tribunal est appelé à déterminer le montant d'une dette privée. Ainsi qu’il est spécifié, non seulement en cas de suffrage égal, mais même de légère majorité des juges qui reconnaissent l'existence d'une dette un peu moins élevée, leur suffrage l'emporte « pour des raisons d’humanité » (διὰ φιλανθρωπίαν) sur celui des juges qui ont fixé la dette à une somme plus haute.

Outre ce cas particulier exposé ci-dessus, l'usage de la notion axiologique d'humanité est très largement répandu, tant dans le domaine du droit pénal que privé. Il ressort de ces passages afférents que le législateur byzantin abandonne à celui qui applique le droit une large marge d'action législative afin qu'il applique cette imprécise mais précieuse notion à la particularité du cas individuel soumis à la justice. Dans le domaine du droit pénal particulièrement, il est des cas significatifs où la loi prévoit d'une part une peine applicable à un crime donné, conformément au principe général du passage 2.2.126 des Basiliques (cf. aussi B.60.1.10 ; Hexabible d’Arménopoulos, App. III, scolie 44), mais où elle confère aussi, par exception à cette règle générale, la possibilité à celui qui juge d'augmenter ou de diminuer la peine prévue à sa discrétion [scolie (2) de Thalélée de l'ordonnance 21.3.3 des Basiliques (BS 1315/2), scolie (2) de l'ordonnance 60.51.13 (BS 3886/2) des Basiliques]. En ce qui concerne la possibilité d'atténuation de la peine, la scolie (1) du passage 60.51.39 (Pé) (BS 3897/1) des Basiliques ainsi que la scolie du rédacteur anonyme de EB jettent une lumière particulièrement intéressante. Conformément à ces scolies, si la loi indique la peine capitale sans cependant préciser le mode de cette punition, le juge devra imposer la punition la plus légère « en vertu de la bénévolence et de l'amour du bien » (πρὸς τὸ καλοθελὲς καὶ φιλαγαθῶτερον), c'est-à-dire qu'il doit énoncer la peine nécessaire dictée par l'estimation prudente de la relation entre justice et indulgence. De la même façon, conformément à la scolie (k) de l'ordonnance de la Synopsis des Basiliques K, II, 19, en cas de doute pesant sur le contenu exact de la punition prévue, le juge doit imposer la peine la plus légère.

De surcroît, la punition la plus légère doit être imposée à l'auteur d'un acte criminel dans les cas où le juge dispose de la possibilité de mettre en rapport, et par suite de les y soumettre, les circonstances réelles de l'acte à plusieurs règles de droit qui décrivent les éléments objectifs de différents crimes suscitant des conséquences légales (des peines) différentes. Suivant un passage de la Peira (51.22), dans lequel est estimé que l'acte de destruction d'une reconnaissance de dette peut relever aussi bien des circonstances réelles du crime de faux en écritures que de vol, le juge devait adopter le terme légal le plus indulgent pour caractériser l'acte criminel en question et, se fondant
sur ce dernier, imposer la peine la plus légère. Également, un autre cas révélateur de changement de terme légal de l’acte criminel – passant dans ce cas précis du crime de défloration (παρθενοφθορία) à celui d’hybris (ὕβρις), afin d’imposer non pas une peine plus légère, mais une peine plus conforme à la gravité du crime – est l’affaire judiciaire à laquelle se réfèrent tant le passage 49.4 de la Peira que la scolie (7) du passage 60.37.78 (BS 3738-3739/7) des Basiliques. Il s’agit d’un cas caractéristique où deux lois sont applicables pour un même crime : selon Eusthate, celle d’hybris couvre plus justement le mépris (social) manifesté par le comportement de l’auteur du crime.

Bien plus large encore, par rapport à ce qu’ont d’être rapporté, apparaît le pouvoir discrétionnaire dont disposait le juge dans le cas de crimes appelés « extraordinaires » (ἐξτραορδινάρια), à savoir des crimes privés ou publics pour lesquels la loi décrivait exactement les éléments objectifs du crime sans déterminer de peine spéciale [cf. la scolie (2) de B.60.1.24 (BS 3072/20), la scolie 1 de B.60.51.13 (BS 3885/1), la scolie 1 de B.7.1.17 BS 38/1]. Conformément à la scolie (2) des Basiliques du passage 60.28.1 (BS 3606/2), dans les cas de crimes pour lesquels nulle peine particulière n’a été déterminée, le juge de l’affaire est convié à émettre contre l’auteur du crime la peine que lui commande son pouvoir discrétionnaire. On devra cependant noter que, même dans les cas où le juge byzantin pouvait, suivant la loi, « émettre la peine qu’il voulait » (ἐπάγει ἣν βούλεται ποινήν), ce pouvoir discrétionnaire n’était pas illimité, et qu’il devait aussi se mouvoir conformément à la distinctio (μετὰ τῆς ἐνταῦθα κειμένης διαστίξεως). La distinctio (διάκρισις, διάστιξις), qui ressort également d’autres passages, se forme à l’intérieur des limites fixées par la symétrie (συμμετρία), principe général qui imposait le sens des proportions entre la peine et la gravité du crime « extraordinaire » à punir (voir à ce sujet B.60.51.13 ainsi que la scolie (22) mot pour mot identique de Constantin de Nicée sur B.21.2.13 (BS 1306/22).
L’administration de la justice à l’époque des Paléologues : continuité et transformations

La question posée à cette table ronde serait, d’une part, la difficulté de la délimitation entre ancien et nouveau droit byzantin et, de l’autre part, qu’elle pourrait être la procédure de la transformation de ce droit.

Justinien décrit que : « Afin que la loi puisse rester inébranlable et étant donné que la nature humaine et les faits qui se produisent varient, – car, à quoi cela servirait-il si rien ne change et reste inébranlable concernant les humains, le fond de leur nature étant en mouvement perpétuel - nous avons considéré qu’il est nécessaire d’introduire à la loi quelques exceptions …, afin que, avec leur concours, la loi ne soit nullement ébranlée » (N. 7.2).

Je pense que, par ce décret, Justinien nous fournit la réponse à la question posée. L’ancien et le nouveau ne sont qu’une unité, – le droit byzantin –, et les transformations ne sont autres que ces « exceptions » introduites afin de respecter la nature humaine étant en mouvement perpétuel, – la société –, sans toutefois que la loi soit ébranlée. En d’autres termes, le législateur byzantin doit assurer la continuité de la légalité byzantine fondée sur la codification justinienne tout en introduisant des nouvelles dispositions afin de régler les nouveaux problèmes qui se posent par une société changeante.

L’exemple de l’époque des Paléologues révèle, je pense, d’une façon claire cette relation entre l’ancien et le nouveau, entre la continuité et la transformation, entre la théorie et la pratique.

Cependant je voudrais préciser que pendant l’époque de la conquête latine, la légalité byzantine a été interrompue et ce n’est qu’en 1261 que Michel XIII Paléologue, a pu la rétablir.


En guise d’exemple, je propose la présentation d’un dossier de cinq documents sur la même affaire des archives de Kutlumus, qui comporte un contrat de vente, deux décisions des juges généraux,
une de la métropole de Serrès et une consultation du grand chartophylax de Thessalonique. L’objet du contentieux est la possession d’un potager situé à Klopotica revendiqué d’une part par les moines du monastère d’Alôpou et, de l’autre, par Korésis et les siens. Le contrat de vente date de 1287. La première décision date de 1341 et la dernière de 1375.

Étant donné que les actes de ce dossier s’étendent de la fin du XIIIᵉ siècle à la fin du XIVᵉ siècle, ils nous présentent les institutions des plus anciennes aux plus récentes de l’époque, en d’autres termes la continuité et la transformation.

Par ailleurs, il comporte plusieurs sujets concernant, entre autres, des questions sur le droit contractuel, de propriété, des délais, sur l’application des canons de l’église, le droit d’appel contre une décision d’un juge général, la validité des décisions des juges arbitres. Bref, autour d’un contentieux se déploie le système juridique byzantin, tel qu’il se présente pendant l’époque des Paléologues.
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Introduction

In existing scholarship on the social dimension of Byzantine literature, texts are often interpreted as merely reflecting the social class of the author, according to a fixed and rather crude hierarchy. A more subtle approach could be envisaged, which also takes into account strategies of representation. This leads us to the following questions. What is the social status of authors, and what strategies did they use to further or negotiate this status? How did they tailor their self-image to expectations from society at large, and to their own interests? How do specific social institutions (e.g., education, career options, reading groups, the court) shape the field of literary production and consumption? How do texts help to define and distinguish social groups, and how do they propagate the interests of these social groups?

The papers of this round table tackle these and other pertinent questions from various angles and for different periods. Eric Limousin proposes an addressee-based typology of Byzantine literature (particularly of the 11th c.) which accounts for its stylistic and generic variety. Claudia Rapp traces the emergence and development of hagiography within changing socio-political contexts in early Byzantium. Niels Gaul inquires into the “revival” of rhetorical theatron and performance in the post-iconoclast period. Stavroula Constantinou highlights the interaction between the genre of Miracle Story Collection and socio-religious practices (in particular, pilgrimage), and examines how authorial agency and the audience’s horizon of expectations shape this genre. Krystina Kubina emphasizes in her case study on Manuel Philes’ epistolary poems that social status is both relational and flexible. Charis Messis’s paper contextualizes early Palaiologan engagement with Lucianic satire and the contemporaneous resurgence of fictional literature within specific scholarly circles and their literary tastes.
La société de Constantinople à travers la littérature byzantine

Introduction

De nombreux historiens se sont penchés sur la place et les motivations des auteurs byzantins, ils essayent d'en préciser les modalités et les caractères dans la littérature byzantine. Depuis trente ans, de nombreux articles à la suite de J. Ljubarskij, S. Papaioannou ou le colloque The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature paru en 2014 explorent ces champs de recherche. Il s'agit ici, non de s'aventurer dans des thématiques non maîtrisées, mais de proposer un objectif programmatique : utiliser la littérature comme un outil pour mieux percevoir et comprendre la société byzantine.

Il s'agit, après de nombreux auteurs, de poser la question de la variété des styles et des genres chez les auteurs byzantins. Depuis Ihor Ševčenko, déjà au Congrès International des Études Byzantines de 1981 à Vienne, qui posait la question du choix de style chez les auteurs byzantins, on sait que les Byzantins privilégient et mettent en avant le niveau de style le plus élevé. Ševčenko posait également la question de la conservation des manuscrits. Toutefois, comme l'a développé F. Bernard, les auteurs byzantins préfèrent le style le plus élevé tout en proclamant, à la suite des auteurs classiques, qu'ils utilisent une écriture modeste refusant les effets de style a priori. Cette variété de styles est connue pour un certain nombre d'auteurs comme Théodore Stoudite, Photios et bien d'autres. Pour le XIe siècle qui nous intéresse ici, une première génération d'auteurs est représentée par Jean Mauropous qui a laissé une œuvre comprenant des lettres, des discours et des poèmes. La dernière génération est illustrée par les discours et lettres de Théophylacte d'Ochrida. Ces deux auteurs encadrent le maître de la variété, le polygraphe, Michel Psellos dont l'œuvre littéraire est tellement vaste que l'on a tendance à lui attribuer plus que ce qu'il a réellement écrit.

A varier les styles, les genres, il arrive à ces auteurs, en particulier à Michel Psellos de se contredire, mais il ne s'agit pas de poser ici la question de la sincérité de l'auteur. En effet, cela ne nous apprendrait rien des auteurs car ils maîtrisent tous les genres et les variations de style. Pour ce qui est du fond comme de la forme, ils choisissent ce qu'ils écrivent en fonction d'objectifs littéraires ou de visées sociales. Ainsi, Psellos écrit de manière très recherchée dans certaines de ses lettres mais pas dans toutes. Par conséquent, la question du genre et du style nous apprend moins sur les capacités des auteurs que sur les compétences des lecteurs à en tirer tous les enseignements et les profits.

Ainsi, la typologie des œuvres littéraires doit être également repensée en fonction des destinataires et Michel Psellos est le champ de recherche idéal pour cette exploration. En effet toutes les variétés de genre et de style s'y trouvent, ce qui permet, encore une fois, de montrer que Michel Psellos, comme tous les auteurs byzantins, écrit en fonction des destinataires.
Littérature impériale

Il existe, tout d’abord, une littérature impériale : adressée directement ou indirectement aux empereurs et aux impératrices, ce genre forme la quintessence de ce que l’on peut appeler la littérature officielle utilisant un style et un vocabulaire bien précis et surtout bien attendu. Elle comprend principalement les discours officiels dont Jean Mauropos, Michel Pséllos, Théophylacte d’Ochrida ont été des auteurs remarqués au XIe siècle. En effet, prononcés en présence de l’empereur et de la famille impériale, ces discours mettent en scène un pouvoir parfaitement « impérial » : l’idéologie impériale est omniprésente et toutes les autres instances de pouvoir, toutes les autres institutions sont subordonnées au pouvoir impérial. A l’image des réceptions officielles, tout le personnel du palais est ordonnancé, est rangé à sa place dans le discours comme dans le palais. Véritable langue et littérature officielles, les historiens y trouvent bien ce que longtemps on a cru dominant, c’est-à-dire une description du pouvoir incarné par un empereur et d’inspiration chrétienne.

Etonnamment, c’est plutôt dans ce type de littérature que l’auteur peut exprimer le plus ses idées personnelles. En effet, détenteur de la parole officielle, il peut y glisser les idées et propositions qui sont les siennes ou celles du groupe qu’il représente. Dans le même ordre d’idées, les panégyriques et les éloges à destination de la famille impériale, ainsi que certaines lettres à destination de la famille impériale, sont à classer dans le même type de littérature et l’historien trouve une description de la société byzantine vue par le haut. Dans la production de Michel Pséllos, certaines œuvres didactiques à destination de Michel VII Doukas font également partie de ce même ensemble. En effet, par exemple, l’Historia Syntomos, entre autres, ne se place que du point de vue impérial faisant défiler les règnes avec pour chacun d’eux l’apophthegme qui permet de le caractériser dans l’esprit du jeune empereur.

Les œuvres à destination de la famille impériale se situent en lisière de cette littérature impériale et posent quelques questions spécifiques : écrit-on ou parle-t-on de la même manière à l’empereur qu’à un membre de la famille impériale ? Formellement, les éléments ne sont pas clairs. En effet, les discours officiels sont relativement rares et les éloges funèbres appartiennent à ce genre spécifique. Les lettres, quant à elles, n’obéissent pas à la même logique. Comme il a été montré par ailleurs, les lettres aux impératrices, aux parents de l’empereur sont utilisées par les auteurs pour développer des relations personnelles pour faire aboutir des demandes de services, par exemple, les lettres de Michel Pséllos à Jean Doukas ou aux impératrices puis, plus tard, les lettres de Théophylacte d’Ochrida à Jean et Adrien Comnène. Elles sont à ranger du point de vue du destinataire dans la même catégorie que les œuvres rédigées par les jeunes lettrés du XIIe siècle étudiées par Margaret Mullet. Outils au service des intellectuels, elles sont utilisées pour constituer des réseaux pour les auteurs mais elles montrent également les qualités intellectuelles des impératrices et des membres de la famille impériale que l’on doit ranger dans la catégorie des σπουδαῖοι c’est-à-dire capables de comprendre la plus grande partie des références utilisées par l’auteur.

Littérature curiale et mondaine

A côté de cette littérature de cour officielle, Michel Pséllos est également l’auteur d’une littérature que l’on peut qualifier de curiale ou de mondaine : curiale car le public correspond à cette société de cour en plein développement au XIe siècle. Depuis les travaux fondateurs de Paul
Lemerle, les historiens tentent de mieux appréhender ce groupe social. En effet, il est clair que cette société de Constantinople connaît, au XIe siècle, de profonds changements dont les mécanismes restent difficiles à percevoir. Cette société est diverse : aristocrates issus de l'armée, anciennes et nouvelles familles de Constantinople peuplant les bureaux du palais et de Sainte-Sophie, nouvelles familles issues des élites économiques. Il est difficile pour les historiens de bien cerner les clivages et les oppositions à l'intérieur de ce groupe. Les sources historiques classiques sont bien insuffisantes et depuis longtemps analysées : un passage de Michel Attaleiatès, quelques extraits très partiaux de la *Chronographie* de Michel Psellos ne permettent pas de bien décrire toutes les évolutions de ces familles. L'étude de la littérature curiale est donc indispensable pour mieux définir les critères de différenciation à l'intérieur de ce groupe.

Cette littérature comprend bien évidemment la poésie qui met en avant les qualités de l'auteur et celles de l'auditoire mais elle nécessite un travail de décryptage de la part des historiens. Plus faciles à utiliser, les éloges funèbres et les discours apologetiques décrivent plus directement les vertus attendues chez ces hommes par leurs homologues. La description des vertus des défunts, lors des éloges funèbres permet d'en dresser un catalogue où le goût de la culture (λογιώτατος) tient une bonne place.

Ainsi la monodie en l'honneur d'Anastase Lizix, rédigée par Michel Psellos, complétée par un poème de Basile Kékauménos mentionne la vaste culture classique de cet élève de Psellos, doué pour la rhétorique, la philosophie. Certes, c'est un passage attendu, obligé même par les lois du genre mais il est absent de la monodie de Radènos qui a bien d'autres vertus mais pas celle-là et avec qui Psellos n'a pas les mêmes rapports. Le goût de la culture, l'amour des belles lettres, deviennent, à côté d'autres, une des qualités attendues du πολιτικὸς γένος. Succinctement traités pour les hommes qui n'appartiennent pas au cercle de l'auteur (Jean de Méliète), ils sont le centre du discours pour les condisciples et les anciens élèves de Michel Psellos comme ceux de Constantin Leichoudès ou Nicolas de la Belle Source par exemple. Cela permet de mieux comprendre le positionnement de l'aristocratie lettrée de Constantinople qui décalque en société les relations entre maîtres et élèves qui fait de l'école un lieu important dans la construction des relations sociales.

De même, la correspondance, si difficile à utiliser, permet de préciser les relations interpersonnelles à l'intérieur du groupe. Toutefois, poser la question de l'utilité de la correspondance montre déjà une partie du problème. En effet, cette littérature n'a jamais eu bonne presse et malgré les efforts récents pour en développer l'étude, on constate avec regrets que de nombreux historiens se sont cassés les dents sur l'epistolographie psellienne. En étudiant les lettres à l'intérieur de ce groupe, les historiens montrent qu'ils existent des sentiments d'égalité, des positions de déférence. D'ailleurs, il existe une piste de recherche à exploiter : les relations entre les manuscrits et la typologie des lettres. En effet, ces lettres qui nouent des relations à l'intérieur du milieu de cour se trouvent principalement dans certains manuscrits. Si l'on sait que Jean Mauropous a travaillé à la préparation du manuscrit qui contient ses œuvres, nous ignorons beaucoup de la manière dont les œuvres de Michel Psellos, en particulier ses lettres, ont été conservées.

Ces lettres entre intellectuels, caractéristiques de cette littérature curiale, contiennent de longues digressions philosophico-littéraires, construites autour de références aux auteurs classiques, en particulier à Grégoire de Naziance. Ces lettres, obscures le plus souvent, sont donc une illustration des qualités des μαντεῖα, ces virtuoses de la langue capables de saisir et d'apprécier toutes les subtilités de ces textes.
Il est donc impossible de prendre les lettres de Michel Pselllos comme un tout. Selon moi, la vision par les historiens moderne de cette collection de lettres est à repenser. Il est nécessaire dans un premier d'en expurger les correspondances impériales ou pseudo-impériales qui ne sont pas des lettres, ensuite de bien délimiter les contours des correspondances curiales et enfin de mieux définir les correspondances utilitaires.

* * *

**Littérature utilitaire**

L'épistolographie psellienne comprend une autre partie importante, stylistiquement moins prestigieuse, littérairement moins intéressante. C'est ce que l'on peut appeler une épistolographie utilitaire faite principalement de lettres de recommandation, de demandes de services à ses correspondants.

En appliquant à cette catégorie, la grille de lecture des niveaux de style, on voit bien que ces lettres appartiennent à un niveau intermédiaire : parsemées de références très classiques et peu développées, ces lettres montrent que les correspondants ont une culture qui ne vaut pas celle des περριτοί καὶ λογιώτατοι. Mais, comme l'écrit par ailleurs Pselllos, ces lecteurs-destinataires appartiennent aux σπουδαῖοι c'est-à-dire qu'ils ont fréquentés les écoles de la paideia mais pas jusqu'au bout, pas au point de maîtriser tous les nuances de la rhétorique psellienne. Beaucoup plus courtes, plus concrètes, si c'est possible pour des lettres, elles nous plongent directement dans le fonctionnement de la société byzantine.

Ces anciens élèves de Pselllos pour certains, une fois munis des éléments indispensables à la pratique de la culture bureaucratique, font carrière dans les administrations. Jeunes aristocrates, bureaucrates débutants, ils ne peuvent développer avec Pselllos, les mêmes relations que les meilleurs élèves ou les rejetons des meilleures familles comme les Sklèroi. On trouve également comme destinataires de cette correspondance tous les obligés de Michel Pselllos qui forment un défilé de dépendants.

* * *

**Conclusion**

Reste un problème dans l'œuvre de Pselllos et de taille, dans quelle catégorie classer la *Chronographie* ? Récit des aventures de Michel Pselllos au sein du milieu impérial, elle résiste à toute tentative de catégorisation. A la différence de l'œuvre de Jean Skylitzès, parfaitement analysée par Catherine Holmes, nous ne parvenons pas à définir qui est le ou les destinataires de la *Chronographie*. Que l'on permette une hypothèse : nous disposons selon les éditeurs, traducteurs de Jean Skylitzès de neuf manuscrits du XIIᵉ au XIVᵉ siècle sans compter les manuscrits ne contenant que des extraits ou la chronique de Cedrenos, preuve du succès, relatif, de l'œuvre. Pour la Chronographie, sur les six manuscrits, un seul date du XIIᵉ siècle et un autre du XIVᵉ siècle. On peut donc penser que le public destinataire de la Chronographie n'a pas contribué à la renommée du texte, seul Nicéphore Bryennios en utilise des passages dans son œuvre historique. En terme de marketing, Michel Pselllos a raté sa cible.

Au terme de cette étude sommaire de la littérature comme outil au service de la connaissance de la société byzantine, deux pistes de recherches sont à explorer : une étude de la correspondance de Pselllos en partant non de l'auteur mais des destinataires comme base de la distinction ; une étude des manuscrits de l'œuvre de Pselllos, sachant que dans son cas, se pose la question de la postérité et de l'utilisation ultérieure de l'œuvre.
The Sociology of Rhetorical Performance in the Post-Iconoclast Period

As is well known, rhetorical theatron emerged over the course of late antiquity; its rise was tied into highly competitive and mobile deuterosophistic performance culture. As Eunapios remarked about Libanios, ‘in addition to his [public] orations he would confidently undertake and easily compose certain other works more suited towards “theatrical” pleasure’ (v. phil. 16.2.7, ed. Giangrande, 84). Theatre buildings began housing rhetorical performances, especially of so-called meletai of the travelling sophists who on the theatre stage, ‘through gesture and voice, almost imitated the dramatic action of a show: the reader could, therefore, turn into an actor sometimes’ (Cavallo 2007: 153). The term theatron was thence transferred to lecturing, teaching, and assembly halls in public buildings suitable for rhetorical performances, such as the so-called odeia (originally, rooms for musical performances or competitions) or Antioch’s city hall; the latter possessed “a covered theatron and four colonnades, which surrounded a courtyard that had been turned into a garden” and featured different kinds of trees. Thus possibly, the string of limestone rooms recently discovered in ancient Alexandria or those attested for fourth-century Berytos (Beirut) qualify the description: commonly, there seems to have been a fixed chair (thronos) for the rhetor/didaskalos at the far wall opposite the entrance and rows of seats, one above the other, for the students along the walls. Finally, the term denoted small theatra in the lodgings of deutero- and late antique sophists: Eunapios speaks of ‘private theatres’ (ἰδιωτικὰ θέατρα). Himerios exemplifies this transition, narratively performing his return from the theatra of the large cities to his own, small ‘theatron of the Muses’, in which he had acquired, and was now teaching, rhetoric: ‘Come, then, since I have met with you here again for rhetorical purposes after having contended in many great theatra, let me address this small one. O precinct of the Muses and of Hermes! O sacred and most lovely place, which first welcomed the fruits of my eloquence.’ (Himerios, or. 64.24–29, ed. Colonna, 231) There is no doubt that epistolography became closely tied into ‘theatrical’ performance culture; most major letter collections of late antiquity make mention of this. Alternatively and in the absence of a formal theatron, a letter could be carried, in this case by three friends of the addressee, ‘through the whole city’ (πᾶσαν … τὴν πόλιν) and be shown ‘to those well-disposed’ to the latter ‘and those who are not’ (Libanios, ep. 1004, ed. Foerster, 11:333).

Such rhetorical theatra are attested through the early sixth century but then seem to have fallen into oblivion during the period of transition from the polycentric cultural world of the late antique Roman empire to the Constantinopolitanic middle Byzantine empire. While Ioannes Sardianos’s commentary on Aphthonios's progymnasmata is a forceful reminder that classical learning was seemingly flourishing in early ninth century Constantinople (Alpers 2009), it nevertheless remains an open question to which degree, if at all, rhetorical performances between the end of late antiquity and the tenth/eleventh centuries were conceptualised as theatra. Performances certainly existed in the ecclesial sphere but otherwise, even at the emperor’s court, there is very limited
evidence; occurrences of the term *theatron* during these centuries seem to exclusively denote the Constantinopolitan hippodrome or mime plays, i.e., practices frowned upon by the church. Down to the rule of Leo VI (r. 886–912) and beyond, homilies remained the predominant performative genre. And although not conceptionalised as *theatra* they did retain many features of the *theatron*-style rhetoric from which patristic homiletics had originated, partially in very personal bonds: e.g., with Gregory Nazianzen and Basil of Caesarea as students of Himerios in Athens. Theodore Daphnopates’ homily on the occasion of the peace with the Bulgarians and the marriage of Romanos Lekapenos’s daughter Maria with Peter of Bulgaria (927) offers a pertinent example of homiletic performance in the early tenth century (Dujčev 1978): or note Leo VI’s fourteenth homily styled as an *epitaphios logos*. As is well known, there is certainly no mention of *theatron*-style performances in the *Book of Ceremonies* (which does contain theatrical elements such as dances and mime-plays). Epistology of the ninth and tenth centuries remains generally silent with regard to its performative setup.

This post-iconoclast performative focus on homilies and the slow ‘revival’ of the *theatron* from the late ninth century onward have not yet received the attention they deserve. One of the earliest surviving references to *theatron* can be found in Konstantinos Sikeliotes’ apologetic verses against those who accused him of calumniating against Leo the *mathēmatikos* after the latter’s death (vv. 41–46): καὶ συγκαλῶ θέατρον ἀνθρώπων μέγα, | καὶ προσκαλοῦμαι τοὺς ἐμοὺς κατηγόρους, | μέσον παρελθὼν ὡς τις ὀπλίτης νέος, | οὐκ εἰς ἀγώνα φημι τῶν Ὁλυμπίων, | ἐκκλησίων δὲ τῶν ἀνω καὶ τῶν κάτω, | μέτειμι λοιπὸν ἐν κονίστρῳ τῶν λόγων (ed. Spadaro 1971; cf. Lauxtermann 2003: 98–107). In a more playful manner, such poetic rivalry becomes visible from the surviving fragments in the Palatine Anthology (XV, 13–14) showing Konstantinos and Theophanes the grammarian jesting over Konstantinos’s *thronos* (chair), while the interest in ancient epigrams further testifies to the classical subcurrent of the ninth century (Lauxtermann 1999). Konstantinos’s verses will be read in the context of performative practices of the time, taking into account recent research on the circle of Photios and the intellectual climate of the ninth century more generally (e.g., Ronconi 2013, 2015).

Finally, my contribution will make an attempt to correlate the (limited) data on rhetorical performances with the social backgrounds of literati in the period under consideration. On the one hand it is clear that remnants of the late antique senatorial élite, exposed to increasing competition from *homines novi*, survived into the later ninth century (Haldon 2004): it is well known that Tarasios and Photios hailed from a metropolitan family that could trace its senatorial origins back for several centuries, while other members of the ‘generation of 787’ as well as their intellectual heirs, were of provincial origin yet from regions largely unaffected by Muslim raids. On the other hand it is now widely recognised that the intellectual currents of the eleventh and, following the Komnenian arrival on the scene, twelfth centuries were precipitated by the rise of a new urban, often provincial elite (Bernard 2014: 155–207; Papaioannou 2013; Gaul 2014). However, the chronological and social details of this shift remain somewhat unclear, including the question of how far back such influx from the provinces is to be dated, whether it was ever interrupted, or whether one ought to assume any substantial change over the course of the ninth and tenth centuries. The background of, e.g., Methodios, the later patriarch (843–847), Konstantinos Sikeliotes himself, or, somewhat later, of Arethas from Patras and Niketas Paphlagon, the ‘New David’, seem to suggest that (limited) social rise could be achieved through *paideia* in this period.
Alpers, K. (2009) *Untersuchungen zu Johannes Sardianos und seinem Kommentar zu den Progymnasmata des Aphthonios* (Braunschweig)


Débats intellectuels et choix littéraires :
itinéraire dans la Constantinople de la première moitié du XIVe siècle

Si la cour byzantine est d'habitude entourée de savants qui sont les protagonistes des luttes politiques et des débats intellectuels marquants de leur temps, la majorité des savants, ceux qui s'imposent par leur nombre et donnent la cadence à la culture ambienne, n'ont pas cette chance. Une place dans l'administration de l'État et de l'Église est ce que les plus chanceux d'entre eux peuvent espérer. Les autres, quant à eux, cherchent à attirer l'attention de personnes fortunées, jouissant d'une certaine influence politique et sociale, afin de pouvoir obtenir capital économique et prestige social. Dans le cadre de notre présentation nous jetterons un regard, à titre indicatif, sur la formation d'un cercle savant qui participe, à sa manière, aux débats culturels et pédagogiques pendant la première moitié du XIVe siècle qui affiche les goûts esthétiques et littéraires des intellectuels « ordinaires ». Parlant de cercle, il faut imaginer une configuration assez éphémère, rassemblée autour d'une figure influente, dont les membres se composent et se recomposent en groupe de manière occasionnelle. À partir de certaines des préoccupations de ce cercle, nous ouvrirons ensuite la discussion sur les modalités du renouveau de la fiction durant cette même période.

À travers une interrogation sur la perception de Lucien à Byzance au XIVe siècle, nous avons pu identifier, gravitant dans l'ombre de figures imposantes telles que celles de Théodore Métochités ou Nicéphore Grégoras, un cercle de savants « moyens », des enseignants d'écoles privées ou des professionnels de la versification – métier que nous imaginons assez profitable, qui répondait à une réelle demande sociale (offre d'objets, épitaphes etc.)-, dont le point commun, outre l'intérêt pour l'œuvre de Lucien, est le rapport que ses membres entretiennent avec un homme riche, Théodore Patrikiotès (PLP 22077), qui avait secondé Jean Cantacuzène dans l'organisation de la distribution de biens matériels à des vétérans de la guerre. Destinataire de plusieurs lettres et de références élogieuses, tant poétiques que prosaïques, cette personne semble avoir eu un goût prononcé pour la culture littéraire, ancienne et contemporaine. Les intellectuels qui ont été en rapport avec lui, lui construisant, implicitement ou explicitement, une image de mécène, sont Théodore Hyrtakenos (PLP 29507), Manuel Pilès (PLP 29817), Michel Gabras (PLP 3372) et Alexios Makrembolitès (PLP 16352).

Alors que tous quatre s'adressent, d'une manière ou d'une autre, à Patrikiotès, rien n'indique qu'ils se connaissent ou qu'ils ont des rapports quelconques entre eux ; la seule exception est constituée par les deux lettres que Gabras adresse à Philes (Fatouros, 233, 415). Peut-être ces hommes sont-ils des rivaux qui s'ignorent de manière ostensible, chacun visant à gagner pour son propre compte l'attention du mécène ; ou, plus probablement, sont-ils des amis complices qui participent à un des nombreux rassemblements de λόγιοι Ἑρμῆς, dénomination que nos savants affectent pour désigner leur cercle d'amis et de collègues. Dans ce cas, ils n'ont pas besoin de communiquer par lettres, en laissant ainsi des traces visibles de leurs éventuels rapports. L'épistolographie est presque le seul moyen de reconstruire les réseaux d'intellectuels à cette époque.
À partir de la question de Lucien, les personnes savantes que nous venons de citer (à l'exception de Hyrtakenos qui ne participe pas à ce débat, au moins d'après ce que l'on peut conjecturer à partir de ses écrits parvenus jusqu'à nous) prennent la parole pour répondre, chacune à sa manière, à une question qui concerne principalement l'application de l'héritage littéraire ancien dans le processus éducatif contemporain dont ils sont les travailleurs dévoués et les représentants.


Le second savant est Michel Gabras, un secrétaire du Patriarcat, qui nous a laissé une riche correspondance couvrant la période allant de 1305 à 1341. Dans deux lettres adressées à Théodore Phialitès (PLP 29715), un autre savant et son ami/antagoniste, connu pour sa *métaphrasis* en langue soutenue de la *Dioptre* de Philippe le Solitaire, il s'occupe du sujet Lucien et de son usage scolaire et pédagogique. Selon la réponse de Gabras, Phialitès se déclare admirateur de Lucien et adepte de son usage dans les activités littéraires de l'école, alors que notre auteur réfute cette prétention. Dans la première lettre, il accuse Lucien d'athéisme et le couvre d'insultes dignes de celles employées par Aréthas dans ses commentaires au début du Xe siècle (Gabras, *Lettres*, ed. Fatouros, n° 162). Dans la deuxième lettre, cependant, il reconnaît l'utilité qu'on pourrait tirer « même de la bile », et constate que l'influence de Lucien a été bénéfique sur le style, au moins, de son correspondant (*Ibid.*, n° 163). Dans ces lettres, Gabras affiche à haute voix son intégrité morale : pour lui, le plus important est de préserver la piété envers Dieu au lieu de cultiver ses propres capacités rhétoriques à l'aide des auteurs classiques immoraux. De telles déclarations de principe n'obscurcissent cependant pas le fait qu'il a souvent recours à Lucien pour émailler ses lettres des délices de l'atticisme. Philès et Gabras partagent la même vision envers le texte de Lucien : une condamnation programmatique est accompagnée d'un usage discret de l'auteur ancien, dont l'impact se résume à son seul style.

Le dernier savant de ce cercle est Alexios Makrembolitès, un intellectuel beaucoup moins ambitieux que les autres, qui a procédé à l'interprétation allégorique de *Lucius ou l'âne*. L'approche de Makrembolitès constitue une évolution et en même temps une révolution par rapport à la perception de l'œuvre de Lucien. Tout en étant très négatif envers la personne du satiriste qu'il traite de « réel radoteur, tératologue et bavard », il dépasse cependant la fixation sur son style, les mérites et les démêrites de son usage et se tourne hardiment vers le contenu d'un de ses textes les plus scandaleux au niveau de la thématique. Il accepte d'abord la vérité que *Lucius* transmet et s'efforce d'interpréter le texte comme une allégorie chrétienne. Sa méthode et ses conclusions gêneraient probablement Jean Tzetzes, un des théoriciens du genre au XIIe siècle et sa manière organisée de procéder à l'allégorisation d'un mythe païen, mais réjouirait probablement Psellos qui considère l'allégorisation...
comme un terrain propice à l’auteur pour déployer toute sa virtuosité en faisant confluer « vérités » païennes et révélations chrétiennes. Makrembolitis cependant n’est pas un virtuose de l’écriture et son allégorie est très « scolaire » et conventionnelle. Sa nouveauté consiste et se résume à son audace dans l’interprétation d’un texte aux allures semi-pornographiques, insistant sur certains points de l’intrigue et en occultant d’autres afin de lui attribuer un sens chrétien. Makrembolitis rejette l’auteur, valorise le texte, mais aussi et surtout prône une méthode d’approche et d’analyse de la fiction philosophico-érотique. Approche étonnante, même si des démarches analogues sont signalées pour des romans sentimentaux de l’Antiquité tardive (interprétation allégorique du roman d’Héliodore). En un mot, il réhabilite un texte de fiction et lui cède une place dans son univers pédagogique. L’allégorisation devient ainsi la voie royale qui permet la réapparition de la fiction érotique à Byzance au début du XIVème siècle ; l’univers de Lucius, avec son extravagance et sa liberté sexuelle est plus proche de plusieurs romans paléologues tels que Callimaque et Chrysorrhoë que les romans comnènes. Ainsi Makrembolitis, l’humble savant qui vécut à Constantinople dans la première moitié du XIVème siècle, avec son allégorie maladroite de Lucius, offre un alibi et assure une quête littéraire beaucoup plus importante : celle qui conduit à la réhabilitation de tout récit fictionnel, potentiellement expliqué comme une allégorie chrétienne.

Dans un poème attribué à Georges Kerameus et contenu dans le manuscrit Parisinus gr. 2231, daté traditionnellement du XIIIème siècle, on a un autre effort d’allégorisation, cette fois d’un texte fictionnel traduit de l’arabe, Stephanités et Ichnilatités. Le manuscrit, qui est destiné à la lecture (écriture claire et facile à lire, pas d’abréviations, présentation très soignée du texte) et non pas au dépôt des textes à l’usage exclusif des seuls professionnels de l’écrit, comme nombre de manuscrits à Byzance, contient le Syntagma des aliments de Syméon Seth, une copie de Stephanités, attribué au même auteur, et certaines questions théologiques, morales et physiques de Michel Psellus. Le poème se trouve à la fin du texte de Stephanités et il semble être une sorte de dédicace à l’adresse d’un certain Andronic Paléologue, de la part du copiste ou de celui qui a présidé à la composition du volume et qui est Georges Kerameus. Ici, Stephanités est interprété comme une allégorie sociale, les animaux indiquant les qualités et les défauts humains et transmettant des leçons morales aux lecteurs et aux auditeurs du texte et prioritairement à Andronic. Le poème, qui utilise l’allégorie comme prétexte pour faire l’éloge du destinataire du livre, se conclut par une dédicace très éloquente à l’adresse du riche mécène : « Ayant le présent livre, ô glorieux Paléologue,/ branche brillante et très illustre du grandissime et puissant despote,/ ô Andronic, toi le meilleur, une plante de grâces,/ sois sage, enorgueillis-toi de la décence,/ et fais tout ce qui est profitable,/ afin de te présenter comme un serviteur très efficace des grands empereurs dans toute affaire/ et apparaître digne d’admiration en toute cause/ pour tes parents proches ;/ pour nous, tes coupables et misérables serviteurs, sois une grande consolation et joie » (ed. Haskins, p. 177, v. 24-36).

La plupart des savants modernes datent le poème du XIIème siècle et identifient Andronic à un homonyme, cité par Nicétas Choniatès (Historia, ed. Van Dieten, p. 318) comme stratège dans une bataille contre les Normands en 1185. Le même Andronic pourrait être aussi le destinataire d’une lettre de Michel Glykas. L’auteur du poème a été aussi identifié comme étant Philagathus Cerameus, un auteur prolifique de la Sicile normande.

Or, tous ces renseignements sont aléatoires. Rien n’est exclu, et une autre identification est même très probable. D’abord, le nom Cerameus n’est pas le seul privilège de Philagathus et celui-ci porte aussi les noms de Théophane ou de Philippe et jamais celui de Georges. D’autres personnes,
en revanche, portent ce nom durant les dernières années du XIIIᵉ et la première moitié du XIVᵉ siècle (le PLP en recense une vingtaine mais aucune ne porte le nom de Georges). De l’autre côté, le manuscrit est daté du XIIIᵉ siècle en raison de l’impression donnée par son écriture et pas en raison d’un autre critère plus décisif (une date, un nom de copiste bien localisé et contextualisé). Il pourrait être le produit des dernières décennies du XIIIᵉ aussi bien que des premières du XIVᵉ siècle. Si en cela, on imagine que le poème est contemporain de la copie du texte et non pas de beaucoup antérieur, il serait plus plausible de voir derrière la personne d’Andronic Paléologue, auquel est destiné le livre, le cousin d’Andronic II et l’auteur présumé du roman érotique Callimaque et Chrysorrhoé, Andronic Paléologue Branas Doukas Angelos (PLP 21439).

Si notre reconstitution est exacte, nous sommes devant une figure-clé non seulement de la réapparition du roman érotique, mais aussi de la popularisation et de la diffusion des textes qui inspirent à cette même époque la création de satires ayant des animaux comme protagonistes, à l’instar de Stéphanités.

Stéphanités, Lucius et leurs lectures allégoriques résument et exemplifient l’un des choix de la fiction à Byzance, telle qu’elle sera pratiquée au XIVᵉ siècle, les autres étant les traductions et les adaptations du roman occidental, ainsi que les récits biographiques épico-romanesques.

La littérature du XIVᵉ siècle a rejeté les leçons classicisantes du roman comnène et a cantonné à la deuxième place les satires lucianesques du XIIᵉ siècle, moroses par leur contenu et pédantes par leur forme, pour se ressourcer dans une littérature beaucoup moins rhétorique, beaucoup plus directe et plus diversifiée au niveau du contenu, mais aussi plus conventionnelle : les histoires érotiques lues comme une métaphore des angoisses métaphysiques et la morale des animaux qui soulignent l’injustice sociale définissent le goût littéraire d’une nouvelle société, celle qui doit gérer la restauration moribonde de l’État byzantin.

Pour clore cet itinéraire qui a commencé comme une tentative de localisation d’un cercle de lucianistes autour de Théodore Patrikiotès, et qui a évolué vers la mise en relief d’une tendance littéraire qui concerne la renaisANCE de la fiction pendant la première moitié du XIVᵉ siècle, avec comme point de référence Andronic Paléologue, il nous manque une pièce, un trait qui unirait, même potentiellement, les deux « cercles ». Ce rôle est échu à Manuel Philès, qui tente lui aussi sa chance dans l’allégorisation. Son choix ne se porte plus sur un texte de l’Antiquité tardive, ni sur un conte moral qui transmet la sagesse éternelle de l’Orient, mais sur la fiction d’Andronic Paléologue, Callimaque et Chrysorrhoé. Ici l’allégorisation, comme dans le cas du poème qui accompagne la copie de Stephanités, n’est qu’une occasion pour louer l’auteur.

Les « cercles », pour indépendants qu’ils soient, voire complètement virtuels, convergent vers une théorie et une pratique nouvelles du produit littéraire dans un siècle d’angoisse où l’on cherche dans la fiction les réponses à des questions qui tourmentent mais que l’on n’ose pas toujours clairement formuler.
Horizons of Clerical Authors and Their Audiences: Towards a Sociology of the Miracle Story Collection

A key principle of Hans Robert Jauss’ reception theory is that literature has a social root and function. As he himself formulates it, “literary forms and genres are […] primarily social phenomena, which means that they depend on functions of the lived world” (Jauss [1972] 1982: 100). Thus, a new literary genre emerges when there are new social situations, needs and aesthetics, and it is cultivated as long as these are present. More specifically, Jauss locates literature’s sociological dimension in the reader whose experience “enters into the horizon of expectations of his lived praxis, performs his understanding of the world, and thereby also has an effect on his social behaviour” (Jauss [1970] 1982: 39).

By concentrating on the reader, Jauss forgets the author and her/his own role in literary sociology. When s/he produces a work, an author of a particular society, who is a reader too, is also driven by her/his horizons and aspirations that are equally determined by the existing social and cultural milieu. Having mentioned that, I do not mean to criticize Jauss for having neglected the author who was proclaimed “dead” some years earlier by his contemporary Roland Barthes (“La mort de l’auteur”, 1967). After all, Jauss is interested in one aspect of literary sociology, namely literature’s reception and not its production.

The present paper—which will provide a short introduction to the sociology of a Byzantine genre, the Miracle Story Collection, by briefly examining the social context of its appearance and production and some aspects of its function and reception—nevertheless cannot ignore the male author’s horizons. As it will be shown, the Miracle Story Collection comes into being, develops and is fashioned according to the interrelationships and interconnected expectations of its practitioners and their audiences. The ensuing discussion will therefore focus on certain facets of the social dimension of the triangle Author-Genre-Audience in an attempt to address the following questions: What kind of phenomenon is the Miracle Story Collection? What are its social origins? What is the social status of its authors? How are Miracle Story Collections shaped through the hagiographers’ own socio-religious purposes and their awareness of the audience and its needs?

In Jauss’ words, the Miracle Story Collection, like most of the medieval genres he examines, is “originally tied to cultic, religious, and social functions” (Jauss 1982: 103). Its emergence is inextricably related to at least four important Byzantine socio-religious realities: pilgrimage, cultic activities, doctrinal conflicts, and regionalism. Byzantine pilgrims to important healing shrines—such as those of Saints Thekla in Seleukia, Kyros & John in Menouthis, Kosmas & Damian in Kosmidion, Demetrios in Thessaloniki, and Eugenios in Trebizond—circulate stories about miraculous cures and events which are at some point committed to writing in the form of collections, enhancing faith, regional identity and the shrine’s reputation attracting more pilgrims (Constantinou 2016 and forthcoming). In addition, these collections participate in cultic competition and become
useful tools for the establishment of “true” doctrine that is questioned by contemporary and rather influential religious circles (see, for example, the Miracle Story Collections of Saints Thekla and Skyros & John [Davis 2001; Montserrat 2005]).

It is thus no wonder that the large majority of Byzantine Miracle Story Collections are written by high ecclesiastical authorities that are attached to a certain miraculous shrine and are well versed in church politics and “orthodox” doctrines. Furthermore, the fact that these texts, which refer to wondrous events taking place at a famous shrine, are authored by clerics shows a serious attempt by the official Church to regulate the veneration of popular saints.

In general, our clerical hagiographers are not just related to a certain shrine, but they are also representatives and protectors of larger Christian communities. Their significant socio-ecclesiastical status, which they repeatedly stress in their texts, allows them to acquire their audience's respect and trust. For authors of Miracle Story Collections especially, it is extremely important to gain control over audiences, since their stories are amazing and effectively difficult to believe. The hagiographers’ respected status thus plays a central role in their strategy for achieving credibility. The same purpose is also served by the authors’ preference for miracle stories whose sources and/or protagonists are also clerics who are considered pious and truthful men.

In fact, the distinguished authors of Miracle Story Collections use a number of methods in their attempt to reach and manipulate large audiences. For example, they construct a dialogue with their listeners or readers whom they repetitively address in a cajoling manner; they adopt a simple narrative style; they give explanations about things that a general audience might not be aware of; and they undertake the oral storyteller’s role through which they identify with actual pilgrims exchanging stories during pilgrimage. Of course, these audience-oriented techniques determine some of the Miracle Story Collection's genre-specific characteristics.

Since the strict word limit does not allow the discussion of all socio-religious factors that lead to the emergence of the examined genre, the abovementioned questions referring to the hagiographers’ communication and relationships with their audiences and how these establish the genre’s character will be addressed only in relation to the practice of pilgrimage, which is a wider social phenomenon. As such, pilgrimage has a higher contribution to the Byzantine Miracle Story Collection's popularity, on the one hand, and it determines the genre's production, on the other.

Concerning the composition of Miracle Story Collections, this is undertaken as long as healing shrines are active; as soon as they become inactive the genre in question declines. That is why the examined genre flourishes in the early Byzantine period when a number of healing shrines operate. It declines in the middle period once these shrines lose their power, while it is revived in the Palaiologan era when some Constantinopolitan shrines, such as those of the Source and Kosmidion monasteries, regain their miraculous powers.

Byzantine pilgrimage has various social meanings and is prompted by different needs and desires (Frankfurter 1998; Talbot 2002). In the corpus under investigation (about 17 texts of the 5th to the 14th c.), however, pilgrimage signifies predominantly a quest for satisfying sick people's social need for bodily health. Most Miracle Story Collections consist of healing miracles only, while in collections with more miracle categories, such as vengeance, war, and food miracles, the healing narratives as a rule outnumber the rest. Accordingly, it is healing pilgrimage that is considered here.
Healing pilgrimage is in fact particularly important for this paper’s purposes, as it is the principal locus where the hagiographer’s and his audience’s desires and status are aligned. Many of our authors have been beneficiaries of miraculous healings, which, as they emphatically state, give them a special grace to compose their works.

Ill hagiographers, like all sick pilgrims who are aware of former healing miracles, become members of a community of sufferers looking for a saintly cure. When this arrives the hagiographer and his fellow-pilgrims acquire a different and very special status: they are sacralized. Their new standing is established through the publicization of the miracles in which they are involved. Hence the healing narratives of the examined corpus close with the joyful protagonist who leaves the shrine with the intention of spreading the wondrous news of her/his miraculous cure. The cured pilgrim’s final move shows how her/his story travels from mouth to mouth to reach a potential hagiographer. As for the healed hagiographer, he advertises the miracles he himself receives, along with others, in a Miracle Story Collection where his personal experiences with the divine have a prominent place.

That the pilgrims’ communal activities of listening to and telling miracle stories play a decisive role in the composition of a Miracle Story Collection is very graphically illustrated in the third part of Saints Kosmas & Damian’s anonymous collection (Mir. 21-26; 6th c.). As the hagiographer reveals in the prologue, during Saturday all-night vigils at the Kosmidion shrine the freshly healed people recount their “pleasing” stories. When he himself as a sick pilgrim was awaiting the Saints’ visitation he used to listen to such stories which, having been prompted by a certain Florentios, he writes down as a thanksgiving for the acquisition of his own health. His text is also meant to contribute to the continuation of the miracle stories’ collective reading and listening. In the epilogue, the hagiographer promises to send Florentios any other miracle stories he might come across inviting him to read them to other people too.

The six miracle stories incorporated in the text addressed to Florentios are presented in a conversational manner thus reflecting their pilgrimage context. One cured man’s story provokes that of the next and each story responds thematically to the previous one. For example, the first storyteller used to suffer with his stomach and he was asked by the saints to avoid dried pulses. As soon as he finishes his story, a second storyteller responds saying how he was healed from a disease that was the effect of a bad diet. He goes on to add that one of the symptoms of his illness was the swelling of his testicles. Once the second man ends his account, a third one starts talking by mentioning his own terrifying genital infection, which the saints also cured. In this way, the one story follows the other revealing the collection’s organizing principle that is determined by the social milieu of pilgrimage.

These people’s connected stories show how their identities first as sufferers and then as miracle recipients are experienced and understood in relationship to each other. In addition, these narratives become the means through which the sick listeners come to terms with their own bad situation in the expectation of change. The Florentios text, which is given the form of a collective work that appears to have been co-authored by seven men, the hagiographer included, is a great example of how an author shapes his work according to his own, the protagonists’ and the audiences’ shared social experiences, expectations, and desires.

Having discussed how hagiographers identify with their fellow pilgrims—who are either protagonists of the collections’ narratives or actual audiences of the texts—it is about time to quickly consider how the healing narrative per se is constructed and what it accomplishes in relation to the
hagiographer’s horizons and those of his audience. The healing narrative in which the interrelations between hagiographer and audience are best exemplified is the autobiographical one: that is, the narrative whose protagonist is the hagiographer himself. A case in point is the last narrative from the Miracle Story Collection, consisting of seventy stories, of Saints Kyros & John that was written by Sophronios, patriarch of Jerusalem, in the seventh century.

Sophronios’ autobiographical narrative is the text’s longest, most detailed and most sophisticated story, mirroring the high social stature and erudite knowledge of its author and protagonist. Its detailed description of Sophronios’ illness and divine experiences, which are absent from the other stories of the collection, belong to the expected conventions of a personal narrative. Sophronios’ need for verisimilitude would not allow him to offer such details when recounting other people’s healing stories. Of course, the form and character of Sophronios’ story are also determined by the self-image the patriarch hopes to convey to his audience.

However, in spite of the personal character of this narrative, Sophronios manages to transform it from an individual to a collective instrument of “knowing as well as telling, for absorbing knowledge as well as expressing it” (Abbott 2002: 11). According to H. Porter Abbott, people use narrative as a means to reflect on and come to terms with their difficult problems. As a common human problem, illness is central in Sophronios’ story and collection, allowing him and his audience to understand their social reality first as sufferers and then as receivers of healing miracles and subsequent exemplars for other sufferers. The longer and the more detailed Sophronios’ story is, the more effectively it both responds to the author’s and audience’s expectations and serves their needs and purposes.

Sophronios’ autobiographical narrative is divided into four parts: prologue (§1-3), illness description and doctors’ involvement (§4-6), divine experiences and healing (§7-24) and epilogue (§25-27). In the prologue, Sophronios provides his own reading of a couple of Christ’s healing miracles and the beneficiaries’ behaviour through which he achieves a twofold purpose. First, he determines the reception of his own healing. Second, he establishes himself as part of a long tradition of miraculously cured men that goes back to the Bible. As he emphatically states, like these men, he is not going to leave the story of his own healing untold. Therefore, the inclusion of his personal story in the work should be seen as an expression of gratitude to the healing saints and as an offering to his audience.

In the narrative’s other parts, Sophronios writes in the third person distancing himself from the story and thus removing his account from the private sphere and providing it with the necessary objectivity. First, Sophronios gives a short biography of himself, which focuses on the eye disease he gets during his stay in Alexandria. Following the healing narrative’s conventions, he avoids mentioning any information that is irrelevant to his illness and subsequent healing. He says, for instance, that it is not necessary to include in his account the reason for his trip to Alexandria.

Then the patriarch describes his continuous and unbearable sufferings, which are aggravated by the doctors’ wrong diagnosis and treatments. With his descriptions, he tries to create and give meaning to his social reality as a sick man whose new identity changes his relationship with his body, the doctors and his environment. As a result of this situation, the normal course of his life is interrupted, causing him anxiety and confusion.

The miraculous healings of other sick people who have turned to Saints Kosmas and Damian prompt Sophronios to undertake a pilgrimage to the Saints’ shrine. In so doing he puts an end to his
social isolation and his dependence on incompetent doctors. His divine experiences in the shrine occupy the largest part of the narrative. The Saints visit the patriarch in five consecutive dreams and even though it takes him some time to achieve a complete cure, his contact with the divine and fellow-sufferers through the dreams offers him the ethical and emotional support he needs to cope with his sufferings. His new approach to pain, with its regenerating effects, invites his audience to adapt spirituality as a solution to similar anxieties.

In the epilogue, Sophronios repeats that he has composed the collection as a thanksgiving to the healing saints. His last words, however, reveal another reason for which he writes this work. As a counter-gift, he asks the saints to become his perpetual protectors: to save him from life's sufferings and temptations and to include him in God's kingdom after death. Sophronios' final sentences do not only concern his personal aspirations for health and salvation, but they also coincide with the audience's desire to listen to or read the texts of saintly people for spiritual benefit.

Inspired by the social dimension of Jauss' reception theory, I have attempted to offer a sociological reading of the Byzantine Miracle Story Collection that concerns both its production and reception. As I have hopefully shown, the genre in question mainly originates from the official Church's wish to control the social practice of healing pilgrimage. The continuous co-existence of the clerical hagiographers' horizons and those of their audiences determine the genre's character and development throughout time. In their attempt to achieve their own religious, political and personal purposes, on the one hand, and to satisfy the audiences' needs, on the other, our hagiographers produce literary texts with socially informed characteristics, such the illness thematic and the oral storytelling style.
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Insider, Outsider, or Both? 
Manuel Philes and Relational Self-Fashioning in Late Byzantium

Recent studies on the social position of Byzantine authors have helped us to gain a much more complex picture of the production and reception of Byzantine literature than twenty years ago. Status seems to be understood mainly as a state, which the literati could change in time by advancing their career and standing with the help of their rhetorical skills. Yet, apart from developing over time, status should be seen as a relational category, solely produced in relationships and practically non-existent when a person is studied in isolation. In this way, it is fluid and instable and one person can have different statuses simultaneously in different relationships. Manuel Philes’ oeuvre – the subject of my doctoral thesis at Vienna University – offers rich evidence for how social relations were shaped through literature and can serve as an excellent example for the complexity of the social position of an author. Although next to nothing is known about his life, his c. 30,000 verses, which have come down to us in more than 150 manuscripts, provide evidence for his intimate acquaintance with the upper class. In spite of this, he and his work are usually seen as isolated phenomena. On the one hand, Philes’ status is generally considered to be lower than that of his addressees, thus suggesting that his relationship to others was asymmetrical. On the other hand, if he is compared to other Byzantine authors in literary terms, he is usually compared to Theodoros Prodromos and other much earlier poets. Scholars have not yet reflected upon his position among contemporary literati. In the following, I shall study Philes’ social position from the external perspective, meaning how he is described in other sources, and the internal perspective, namely his poems. I suggest that the theoretical framework of relational sociology offers a rich set of analytical tools, helping to understand literarily constructed social status as a fluctuating phenomenon. The staging of the authorial self and the addressed other can be seen as both a relative and a relational entity dependent on the author, the addressee and the occasion of writing.

As a theoretical framework, relational sociology offers promising concepts. Instead of focussing on the individual as an autonomous actor, the theory sees relationships as the driving forces of society. Furthermore, relational sociology takes the stories behind social ties into account, meaning the character of a relationship as it is established in the interactions. What makes the theory so attractive for the study of Philes is that almost all we know about him derives from his own poems addressed to others. Hence, he creates the picture of himself in relation to another person and thus literarily forms a relational identity. What is more, relational sociology is essentially process-orientated. Every new act of communication between two individuals changes their relationship and thus changes the expectations both of them have. However, a relationship does not show a linear development, but can shift back and forth between different poles.

Philes’ social network is mainly known from his oeuvre, where one can identify c. 150 different historical figures who were in contact with him as friends, donors, patrons and clients (often taking different roles in different contexts). In his epigrammatic work these persons occur as praying
donors of works of art, as deceased laudandi or laudandae in epitaphs or as skilful authors in book epigrams. However, in these cases we do not learn much more about Philes’ relationship with his clients than that his poems were, in all likelihood, commissioned. Yet there are about 320 poems which can be classified as epistolary poems on the basis of formal and functional characteristics as well as from hints in the texts about their extra-literary context. A large part of these has so far been subsumed under the category of ‘begging poetry’, often treated as a distinct genre – a notion that I find highly problematic. These poems bear witness to the fact that, in addition to being a ‘literary artisan’, Philes used his skills to establish and stay in contact with other literati and members of the upper class. As in prose letters, the relationship between the sender and the addressee plays an essential role. If status is a relational category, one will have to study this corpus in order to understand Philes’ social position and literary self-fashioning.

Before analysing the latter, one should focus on three letters addressed to Philes, one by Planudes (ed. Leone ep. 84) and two by Michael Gabras (ed. Fatouros ep. 233 and 415). Due to the lack of concrete historical or biographical information they have largely been ignored by modern scholarship. Yet, they bear rare witness to an external perspective on Philes, whereas his own poems only offer information about his fictionalised ‘I’ as part of his self-fashioning strategies. Planudes sent his letter in about 1295 as an answer to a (verse?) letter by Philes. He praises him for some compositions, which he claims to know, bewails the fact that he has not yet met him in person and expresses his wishes for a future meeting. The letter shows that even while still a young man Philes was considered a literatus, whose writing was worthy of a response from a well-known scholar. This confirms Philes’ own statements, in which he claims to be in correspondence with his high-standing addressees over a longer time period. Thus, Philes’ attempts to get in contact with members of the upper class was by no means a one-sided effort, but led to reciprocal relationships. The two letters by Gabras support this picture. What is more, in them we find Philes himself as a benefactor. In ep. 233 Gabras thanks Philes for his attempts to help him, even though he failed as a result of the malevolence of other people. The letter confirms what we find in Philes’ poems, as in some texts he asks his addressee to help a friend of his and to judge him justly, thus acting as an advocate (ed. Miller F 140, F 143). The poet had influence on his addressees and actively pursued his aims. Philes’ network is thus not only characterised by bottom-up-relationships, in which he is someone’s protégé, but he, too, consciously acts as a patron. Finally, together with ep. 415 Gabras sent Philes a prayer as a proof of his literary skills, hoping that he would enjoy it. In some verse letters Philes contacts his correspondents because he sends or receives a book, mainly scientific works (cf. F 109, F 240, P 107, ed. Martini 38, 70). This friendly exchange of books and literary works suggests that he took part in the literary and scholarly discourse of his time and thus belonged to the intellectual elite.

Unfortunately, these letters are all we have on Philes from an external perspective. There is much richer material allowing us to understand his self-fashioning tactics. In this context, a comparison of poetic corpora directed to different addressees is most helpful. The poems addressed to the emperor on the one hand and to Theodoros Patrikiotes on the other seem to be a convenient choice. Theodoros and the emperor are the most frequent addressees of Philes. Apart from that, the big difference in status between them illustrates different strategies of self-fashioning.

Theodoros Patrikiotes was a tax official in Thrace, as such part of the Byzantine civil service and hence part of a functional elite. He was also a correspondent of Michael Gabras and Theodoros Hyrtakenos. Within Philes’ oeuvre there are about 60 poems which we can identify with certainty
as addressed to him, most of which can be classified as verse letters. He must have possessed considerable wealth. Although not part of the highest aristocratic circles, he was in a powerful situation. One might thus expect that Philes, who is well known for his repeated requests for material support, would position himself far below his addressee in order to gain profit. Yet, Philes’ poems draw a much more complex picture. At first sight, the expressions Philes uses to describe his correspondent are mainly conventional and can be found in most of his epistolary poems. They are frequently connected to the virtue of generosity, thus highlighting the nature of Philes’ interest in Patrikiotes, namely pleading with him to receive various goods. Additionally, Philes frequently refers to the discourse of friendship employed in epistolography. This form of staged equality in a friendship relationship is further strengthened when the poet calls his correspondent ὁμόψυχον φῶς (F 141.10), thus referring to the topos of one soul in two bodies, well known in epistolography. Another poem opens with the verse πρὸς τὸν μεγαλόψυχον ὁ σμικρόψυχος (F 135.1), accentuating a difference in the status of Philes and that of Patrikiotes. These three composites of ψυχή mark very different ways of representing the authorial self and the other, yet they occur in the same context, namely the context of requests. They are adapted to the literary character of the poems. Whereas F 135 uses an antithetical setting, contrasting the wealth of Patrikiotes with the need of Philes, F 141 focusses on Patrikiotes’ praise, and the request for help is only expressed briefly. Status, as expressed in literary terms, connected to the same addressee in a similar context, is thus variable and not a static entity. Nevertheless, in the passages cited the power relations are clear: whether Philes positions himself on the same level as Patrikiotes or below him, it is the poet who requests something from the tax official, whose influence is built on his fiscal authority and material wealth. In this way, their relationship is asymmetrical, with Philes on the lower level. Yet, this asymmetry can be reversed when Philes emphasizes his power – namely his literary production and its social impact. Some of the verse letters read like a demand note. In these, Philes highlights the value of the poems he wrote for Patrikiotes, urgently prompts him to pay and threatens not to write verses anymore, if he does not get his remuneration. What is more, the poet not only threatens to withhold his service, but also announces that he would actively make use of his power over Patrikiotes. The frequent use of the term κρότοι (applause or more general praise) in connection with his own works shows that Philes is aware of the impact of his poems on Patrikiotes’ reputation, which can be elevated by literary praise. Without using the actual term, Philes threatens to write psogoi about his correspondent if he does not show himself to be worthy of praise. Although there are no actual psogoi in Philes’ letters to him, the poet uses irony and sarcasm in several poems in order to undermine the hyperbolic praise established in other texts. In one poem Philes praises him for the fine dishes that he sent in order to refine the poet’s kitchen. He then comments on a specific gift: Ἰξὺς δ’ ὁ τυκτός ὡς ὀπισθόπλος φύσει | βρωθεὶς ἐξερασμός καὶ παλιμβόλους δρόμους (F 165.7–9; “The dressed fish, swimming back as is his nature, having been eaten, scrambled up in the manner of a crab to be vomited up and go back the way he came.”). The fish he received was of such an exquisite quality that it scrambled up from the poet’s stomach and reversed its course. The whole poem is written in an encomiastic mode. It is only in the second to last verse with the word ἐξερασμός, that this tone changes and the actual aim of the poem becomes clear, namely to rebuke Patrikiotes for his nasty gift. In this way, the address as χρυσοῦς φίλος (v. 1), which is usually found in the context of the praise of somebody’s generosity, is subverted and the enkomion turned into a psogos. None of the poems blames Patrikiotes as a person, but several of them abuse the gifts he sent (another motif well known from epistolography).
Furthermore, the manuscript transmission of these poems suggests a chronological reading. If this is correct, encomiastic poems are mixed with others including elements of psogos. Hence, there is no clear line of development of the relationship between Philes and Patrikiotes over time, but one can find completely different ways of shaping it in poems directly following each other. The verse letters prove that status and power are highly fluid and can be rapidly created and reversed.

Philes addressed even more and much longer poems to the emperor. Due to the highest social status of the emperor, the forms of address are quite different from those Philes uses to describe Patrikiotes. The emperor's official titles dominate, while the epithet κράτιστε underlines his power. The reference to virtues such as pity (συμπάθεια) and the emperor's mimesis of Christ, as well as the reference to the emperor as sun or light, are part of the well-known imperial ideals. In general, the epithets used seem to be more conventional with regard to the Kaiserideologie and to a lesser extent relatively connected to an occasion or the aim of a poem. One also finds accumulations of encomiastic epithets, which can take up as many as 20 lines. Hyperbolic elements thus gain an importance that by far exceeds the one in the poems to Patrikiotes. The frequent use of the topos of inexpressibility and the topos of surpassing further underline this hyperbolic setting. Antithetic figures, too, are used in a much more exaggerated way, mainly due to the contrasting description of the poetic 'I' and the emperor. Philes calls himself a servant and slave of the emperor (δοῦλος, οἰκέτης etc.). Furthermore, he stresses his deplorable position as an outsider (ξένος), who finds little acceptance in Constantinople and who is more dead than alive. Unsurprisingly, this self-description is found when Philes asks for help and thus accentuates his neediness. The distribution of power seems to be clear and underlined by the rhetorical figures of hyperbola and antithesis: The 'I' is far below the emperor and even to address him is daring boldness (τόλμη). If the emperor helps, he does so out of mercy but without any obligation. Yet, Philes also expresses thoughts similar to those in the Patrikiotes poems. He accentuates the value of a poet who sings like the birds or a cicada in the service of his master. He also mentions how much he has done for the emperor in the past, and asks for recompense. When he calls himself ἐγκωμιαστής (P 55), he also refers to his service: the praise of the emperor. Despite the frequent use of the humility topos, here and there one can find a self-confident 'I', for example when he tells the emperor that on Earth, where the mouth of the angels is not available, he would take up their job and sing for and about him (F 112). What is more, there are poems which have a subversive character, subtly questioning the perfection of the emperor. One verse letter (P 200) praises God as the βασιλεὺς of the world for providing it with a warm coat. Following this, he asks how it is right that the emperor, as the βασιλεὺς and as a mimeta Christi, does not help Philes with a coat. Although not openly criticising the emperor, the 'I' questions the emperor's performance of one of the imperial core virtues, the imitation of Christ. Compared to his dealings with Patrikiotes, the intensity with which social status is questioned is much weaker, yet the reader of his poems finds Philes in different social roles, which are based on the changing nature of his staged relationship with the emperor.

The analysis of the letters addressed to Philes and his verse letters support an alternative picture of the poet from the one prevailing in former scholarly discourse. Since there is no other author in the early Palaiologan period whose oeuvre resembles Philes' in size and poetic ductus, he has been studied as a rather isolated person. Yet Philes was not only an 'artisan' selling his poems and a person of low status who was 'begging' for support, but he was also an appreciated literatus, whose works were read by other intellectuals, who could act as an advocate for friends (and friends of friends).
and who was in contact with intellectuals and scholars. He was thus an insider of the literary elite of his time. As most of the evidence for his relationships with others comes from the poems that can be classified as verse letters, I suggest that, in order to understand his social position, one should study Philes in the context of epistolography, where social relations and network building have been as much a topic of the recent scholarly debate as the situational positioning of the author. On the other hand, the picture of Philes as the outsider of society begging slavishly to gain profit from the upper class is one that he himself draws as part of his conscious self-fashioning. It occurs especially in the context of requests and can thus be seen as a deliberately used literary device to pursue his aims, namely to gain social recognition and material payment for his poems. Self-fashioning does not mean shaping a consistent picture of the poet’s self, but rather a flexible process changing from occasion to occasion, dependent on the addressee and characterised by the simultaneity of different social roles between the low-standing and the self-aware poet. Thus, Philes can neither be classified as an insider nor as an outsider. He is both. The case of Manuel Philes is an excellent example of how social status can be understood as a complex entity. The status of the authorial self and the other should be seen as relational insofar as status does not exist and cannot be understood without the understanding of the relationship between (at least) two individuals. On the other hand, it is relative insofar as it can be adapted to author, addressee and occasion, while different roles can be assumed at the same time.
Early Byzantine Literary Production, the Rise of Christianity and the Decline of the Polis: Changing Contexts, Changing Audiences, Changing Texts?

The study of Byzantine hagiography has over the last century or so developed to reach a certain degree of maturity. The first step was to make these texts accessible. The Bollandists and others laid the groundwork through editions of the original Greek texts and great efforts were made—thanks, among many others, to André-Jean Festugière, Alice-Mary Talbot and Paul Halsall—to make them available to a broader public in translation. Beginning with the rising interest in the social history of the lower strata of society since the mid-20th century, hagiographical texts were mined for information about the everyday life of women, men and children and the realia that surrounded them. This trajectory is true for the entire Byzantine period.

When the chronological focus falls onto the early centuries until ca. 700, as is the case here, more specific issues emerge. An enduring question is the continuity with the religion and culture of the Greco-Roman period that precedes it. Are the saints pagan deities in Christian garb? Are sacred locations and cultic practices continued, transformed or disrupted? These questions were raised in the 1920s by Hermann Usener, Lucius Anrich and others of the ‘religionsgeschichtliche Schule,’ and they continue to occupy scholarship in the digital age, for example with the Oxford project ‘The Cult of Saints.’

While social historians, historians of mentalité and historians of religion have found hagiography a rich treasure trove of material, historians of literature have treated it with a certain unease. Here, too, the issue of continuities comes into play. The basic matrix for all studies of Byzantine literature has been the presence of different levels of style, or linguistic ‘registers,’ combined with a driving interest in the survival and reception of the great works of ancient Greece. Elite authors and their erudite works in Atticizing language, full of allusions to classical texts, were privileged by scholars eager to trace the ‘mimesis’ of the ancient literary heritage in the Byzantine middle ages. That this hardly does justice to the full range of Christian culture, including written culture, of medieval Byzantium has been noted with characteristic poignancy by Cyril Mango when he described Byzantine literature of the high register as a ‘distorting mirror.’ He was not the first to do so. Already Karl Krumbacher was aware of this when he set out to write his foundational Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur (1897). As Panagiotis Agapitos has recently observed, Krumbacher’s scholarly interest did not stop at literary elite products. An excellent linguist of the Greek language up to the modern period, Krumbacher’s curiosity about all levels of literary expression led him, over the course of his work, to abandon the slightly derogatory term vulgärgriechisch (‘vulgar Greek’) in favor of the more neutral volkssprachlich (‘popular language’) — a designation that found its way into the title of Hans-Georg Beck, Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur (1971). The fault line between the linguistic registers, it was long believed, follows the dividing line between paganism and Christianity. Recent scholarship, however, has demonstrated that this division was not a permanent chasm of the nature of a Saint Andreas fault, but a narrow and unstable line that each intellectual
and each author drew and re-drew in the sand, as the situation required. In this scholarly landscape of overly stark contrasts, hagiography was relegated to the side of Christianity and deemed to be deficient literary quality.

In the last decades of the past century, the linguistic turn has led to a re-evaluation of hagiographical writing, not least influenced by Averil Cameron’s argument of Christian rhetoric in late antiquity as a ‘totalizing discourse.’ Early Greek hagiography is no longer treated with the patronizing eye of the 19th century anthropologist in search of unspoilt natives, as a charming, but somewhat inferior creation of writers who failed to master the higher art of rhetoric and classical learning. After all, comparisons with later centuries have shown that highly skilled authors varied their literary style in accordance with their genre of writing. The same author could write erudite show-pieces of glittering rhetoric, sprinkled with classical allusions, and tell the story of the Life of a saint in a biographical narrative.

For most of the Byzantine period, hagiography was enjoyed as much for its content as for literary aesthetic pleasure. This tendency can be observed in nuce in the 7th century, but comes to full fruition in the stylistic cosmetic surgery applied by Symeon Metaphrastes who operated within the context of the great encyclopedic reform of literature and learning associated with the reign of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos. His collection of 117 saints’ lives became canonical for the subsequent Byzantine centuries, even though some earlier versions managed to survive that allow, by way of comparison, a full appreciation of Symeon’s work of ‘metaphrasis’, transposition into a different stylistic register.

The question whether hagiography constitutes a novel ‘genre’ has long occupied historians of literature. Interestingly, this is a concern that spreads across the spectrum, from histories of Greek literature that aim to trace trajectories that extend from the classical past into the middle ages to histories of Christian literature that seek the roots of the middle ages in the classical past. In recent decades, this debate has partially dissolved itself in a greater awareness of the intertwining of Classical and Christian culture in the formative period of early Byzantium. By the same token, the terms of inquiry have shifted from genre to purpose, and from entire texts to their narrative elements. Foregrounding the edifying purpose has resulted in blurring of the boundaries of the hagiographical ‘genre’ and the establishment of a continuum of edifying literature that extends from sayings to anecdotes to pious travelogues to full-length biographical accounts (the conventional definition of ‘hagiography’). Recent analysis of narrative elements in seventh-century texts has shown the considerable and deliberate craft of hagiographical authors of our period.

My aim in the following is to ask questions of continuities between early Byzantine hagiography and other kinds of literary production within the context of the fourth to the seventh centuries, and to do so from the point of view of the audience.

How can we inscribe authors and audience of hagiographical texts onto the general map of literary activity at the time? What was the market share of hagiography compared to other kinds of writing?

Who were the people for whom the authors wrote? In what performative context did they come across these texts, private or public, through listening or reading?

These questions are particularly poignant in the early Byzantine centuries, a period that was marked by significant shifts in social structure and urban environment. The fourth to the seventh centuries are traditionally associated with the decline of the middle class of the curiales and the
decline of the *polis*—the consumers and the context for much of what we now consider as 'literature'. Recent re-assessments, especially through the corrective lens of archaeology, have called the master narrative of overall decline into question, drawing attention to great regional diversity and areas of remarkable upswing in prosperity, especially in northern Syria.

Still, the question remains: Were the consumers of hagiographical texts the same people who would have been exposed to the traditional forms of literature that we commonly associate with Greco-Roman ‘high’ culture, the performance of panegyrical speeches in the market place and the presence of Homer and Isocrates in the schoolbooks? Or does the contextualized study of hagiographical consumption lead to the conclusion that this is not just a new (or at least newly prominent) form of written expression, but that it also addresses a new social stratum? An economist would phrase the question thus: how does a changing consumer base drive changes in the demand for certain products?

- Market share of Christian texts compared to pagan writing
- Contexts of hagiographical delivery (all texts relating to a cult): church, cult site, home; oral performance vs reading, text as relic signaling the presence of the saint
- List of of hagiographical texts: time and place of composition (Vitae only)
- Locations of hagiographical production
- Locations of the protagonist saints
- Historical background to those locations
towns vs cities?
centers of learning (Athens, Antioch, Alexandria, Berytus, Constantinople) represented or not?
great regional spread (why?), Constantinople not predominant
- Is it possible to see the history of social and urban restructuring in the distribution of hagiographical production?
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Introduction

Most of the modern analyses of Greek scientific texts have concentrated on the textual transmission. Research has mostly focused on Byzantine manuscripts of famous scientific texts and on translations into other ancient languages (Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Hebrew, Armenian, and Slavic). This has been essential for the production of modern critical editions, as well as for the development of our knowledge on Greek science. However, the very important aspect of the visual transmission of scientific knowledge through images or drawings accompanying the texts has been neglected.

This round table aims to give an account of the role and function of Byzantine illustration in the acquisition and transmission of scientific knowledge, by considering scientific illustration not merely as an accompanying image but also as “visual thinking”, an approach that has not been considered thus far.

The visual transmission of scientific knowledge is a complex process and this round table will provide an opportunity for discussing this matter, both by itself and in conjunction with textual and oral transmission. The scientific community is conscious of the need for thoroughly exploring the relationship between texts and their illustrations. This is especially important when examining illustrated scientific texts. Our objective is to reflect on the theories underlying these relationships, in order to define clearly the functions of Byzantine miniatures in the field of the illumination of scientific texts.

Participants will also be asked to consider the following questions (the list is indicative and by no means exhaustive at this stage): Do some texts defy illustration? How can an experiment be illustrated? What did the reader of a scientific text expect from the illustrations? Can the illustration be more informative than the text next to it? Participants will also attempt to elucidate how the illustration translates into knowledge.

A further important goal in this round table will be the choice of a common methodological approach in the different examples that will be discussed. From Nikodim Kodakov to Kurt Weitzmann, and through most of their disciples, the study of Byzantine miniatures was influenced on one hand by the method of “pictorial criticism” and on the other by iconographic and stylistic studies. Would it be possible to establish another approach for the study of the scientific illustration as a visual transmitter of knowledge? And, if so, on what kind of method should it be based? Participants are invited to explore the possibility of applying other kinds of methods, such as the anthropology of images (cf. H. Belting, Bild-Anthropologie, Munich, 2001), the iconology (cf. A. Warburg, Gesammelte Schriften, Leipzig, 1932; E. H. Gombrich, Aby Warburg, an Intellectual Biography, London, 1970; E. Panofsky, Studies on Iconology, New York 1939) and the cognitive and visual studies (cf. W.J.T. Mitchell, Iconology; Text, Image, Ideology, Chicago, 1986; R. L. Solso, Cognition and the Visual Arts, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1994).
Η σημασία τών γεωμετρικών σχημάτων στήν κατανόηση τού μαθηματικού περιεχομένου τού Βιενναίου Έλληνικον κόδικα 65 τῆς Εθνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τῆς Αὐστρίας τού 15ου αἰ., καί τού κόδικα 72 τῆς Ἰστορικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τῆς Δημητσάνας τού 18ου αἰ.

Εἰσαγωγὴ

Ὁ κόδικας 65 τοῦ 15ου αἰ. εἶναι ἕνα βυζαντινὸ μαθηματικὸ χειρόγραφο μὲ ὅλη ποὺ προοριζόταν γιὰ διδασκαλία σὲ ἀκροτατὶρ διαφόρον ἥλικιαν καὶ ἰδιοτήτων. Αὕτω ἐξελεγεῖται διότι στὶς σχολικὲς τάξεις ἐκείνης τῆς ἐποχῆς ἦταν δυνατὸν νὰ συνυπάρχουν μαθητὲς τῆς σημερινῆς πρωτοβάθμιας καὶ δευτεροβάθμιας ἐκπαίδευσης, μὲ ὁικοδόμους, δημοσίους ὑπαλλήλους, ἐμπόρους, ἀργυροχρυσοχόους, κ.λ.π. Τὸ μεγαλύτερο μέρος τοῦ κόδικα ἀφορᾶ σὲ κεφάλαια Ἀριθμητικῆς, Ἀλγεβρᾶς καὶ Γεωμετρίας διδασκόμενα σὲ μαθητές τοῦ σημερινοῦ Δημοτικοῦ, Γυμνασίου καὶ Λυκείου. Ὁ Ἀνώνυμος συγγραφέας μᾶς ἐκπλήσσει συχνὰ, μὲ τὶς πρωτότυπες μεθόδους ἐπίλυσης ἑπιλογῆς προβλημάτων, καὶ δείχνει ὅτι εἶναι ἐνημερωμένους σχετικὰ μὲ τὴν ἐξέλιξη ποὺ παρουσιάζει ἡ Μαθηματικὴ Ἐπιστήμη κατὰ τὴν ἐποχὴ τοῦ. Δέχεται ἐπιρροές ἀπὸ

- Τὰ Μετρικὰ τοῦ Ἡρώνα τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρα
- Τὰ Ἐπιπεδομετρικὰ τοῦ Διοφάντου
- Τῇ Σύνοψει περὶ μετρήσεως καὶ μερισμοῦ τῆς γῆς (γεωδαισία) τοῦ Ἡσάυνη Πεδιάσιμου
- Τὸν Ἀλ Χουαρίζμι, ὁ ὁποίος συνεθεὶς ἔργο ὅπου περιέχονταν προβλήματα μέτρησης ἐκτάσεων καὶ γενικῶν γεωμετρικῶν υπολογισμῶν
- Τὸν Φιμπονάτι, ὁ ὁποίος ἔγραψε σχετικὰ μὲ τὰ ἐμβαδά.

Ἡ διδακτέα ὠλὴ συμπληρώνεται μὲ κεφάλαια ποὺ ἀφοροῦν στήν ἀργυροχρυσοχοία, τὸ ἐμπόριο, τὶς ὁικοδομικὲς ἐργασίες, τὶς μετατροπὲς νομισμάτων, τὸ ἐμπόριο τῆς μετάξης, καὶ ἄλλα ἰτήματα ποὺ σχετίζονταν μὲ τὴν καθημερινὴ ἐποχὴ τῶν Βυζαντινῶν τοῦ 15ου αἰ.

Ἡ σπουδαιότητα τοῦ κόδικα 72 τῆς Δημητσάνας, τοῦ Θεοτόκη, ποὺ ἀργότερα ἐκδόθηκε ὡς Στοιχεῖα Μαθηματικῶν, ἔγειρε στὸ ὅτι εἶναι ἕνα ἀπὸ τὰ πρώτα κείμενα μὲ μὴ στοιχειώδη Μαθηματικὰ τῆς ἐποχῆς τῆς Τουρκοκρατίας. Προγενέστερο τοῦ ὑπήρξε μόνον ἡ Ὁδὸς Μαθηματικῆς τοῦ Ανθρακίτη τὸ ὅποιο ὅμως περιείχε ἀποκλειστικὰ κλασικὰ Μαθηματικὰ ἐνώ στερεῖται παντελῶς τῶν σύχρονων. Ἐπίσης ἀποδεικνύεται ἀπὸ τὴν ἄλληλογραφία μεταξὺ τῶν Διδασκάλων τὸν Γένος ὅτι τὰ Στοιχεῖα Μαθηματικῶν διαγράφθηκαν σὲ διάφορα σχολεῖα τῆς ἐποχῆς καὶ ἔχαραν εὐρείας ἐκτίμησης.

Ὁ κόδικας 72 περιέχει ὅλη Ἡὕκλειδειάς Γεωμετρικὰς σύμφωνα μὲ τὰ βιβλία ὅπως αὕτα παρουσιάζονται στὰ Στοιχεῖα τοῦ Ἡὕκλειδῆς. Σημειώνεται ὅτι ο Νικηφόρος Θεοτόκης ἀναλύει μὲ περισσότερες λεπτομέρειες σε σχέση μὲ τὸν Ἡὐκλείδη τὶς ἔκφωνήσεις τῶν προτάσεων καὶ τῶν θεώρημάτων, γεγονός ποὺ δείχνει ὅτι ὁ στόχος τοῦ ἦταν ἡ πλήρης κατανόηση τῶν συλλογισμῶν ἀπὸ τὰς μαθητές.
Ἡ διδακτέα ζήλη στὸν κώδικα 72 συμπληρώνεται μὲ προβλήματα ποὺ ἀφοροῦν σὲ ζητήματα τῆς καθημερινῆς ζωῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων κατὰ τὰ τελευταῖα χρόνια τῆς Τουρκοκρατίας.

Ὁ Νικηφόρος Θεοτόκης κατὰ κύριο λόγο χρησιμοποιοῦσε τὰ εργα:

Tacquet, Elementa Euclidea Geometriae planae, ac solidae; et selecta ex Archimede Theoremata: ejusd. trigonometria plana, Plurimis Corollariis, Notis, ac Schematibus quadraginta illustrata a Guilielmo Whiston, Quibus nunc primum accedunt Trigonometria Sphaerica Rogerii Josephi Boscovich & Sections Conicae Guidonis Grandi Annotationibus, ed. tertia Veneta ad Romanam diligenter exacta, atque a mendis summo studio expurgata, Bassani 1781.

Ozaman, Les elements d’ Euclide demontrés d’une manière nouvelle et facile, par M. Audriene, Paris 1746, καὶ


Στὴν παρουσίαση αὐτὴ ἑξετάζουμε τὴ σημασία τῶν γεωμετρικῶν σχημάτων -ὅπως αὐτὰ παρουσιάζονται στὰ δύο χειρόγραφα- στὴν κατανόηση τῶν ἀντίστοιχων γεωμετρικῶν ἐννοιῶν.

Σχετικά μὲ τὶς βασικὲς γεωμετρικὲς ἐννοιες σημειώνεται ὅτι ὡς γεωμετρικὸ σημεῖο Α ὀρίζεται ὁ τόπος ποὺ εὑρίσκεται τὸ Α, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἵδιο τὸ σημεῖο Α δὲν ἔχει διαστάσεις. Τὸ ἵδιο συμβαίνει καὶ μὲ τὴν ἐννοια τῆς εὐθείας. Ὡς ἐκ τούτου τὰ γεωμετρικὰ σχῆμα τὸ παρουσιαστῶν στὴ συνέχεια προέρχονται ἀπὸ ἀναπαραστάσεις ἰδεατῶν ἐννοιῶν.

Στὴ διδασκαλία τῆς Γεωμετρίας τοῦτο ἀποκτά ἱδιαίτερη σημασία, ἀν ἀναλογισθοῦμε ὅτι χωρὶς αὐτὴν τὴν ἔστω καὶ ὑποτυπώδη ἀναπαράσταση θὰ ἦταν ἀνέφικτη ἡ κατανόηση ἀκόμα καὶ τῶν ἀπλούστερων γεωμετρικῶν συλλογισμῶν.

Στὸν κώδικα 65 τοῦ 15ου αἰ.

- Σὰν πρῶτο παράδειγμα στὸν κώδικα 65 τοῦ 15ου αἰ. ἀναφέρω τὸ πρόβλημα στὸ ὅποιο ἦταν ἐφεξῆ ὁ ὅγκος τοῦ δοχείου ποὺ φαίνεται στὴν εἰκόνα ποὺ ἀκολουθεῖ.
Πρέπει να τονιστεί ότι στο χειρόγραφο αυτό οι πράξεις περιγράφονται με λόγια και δεν χρησιμοποιούνται τύποι για τούς μαθηματικούς ύπολογισμούς. Σήμερα δε, για τον ύπολογισμό του συγκεκριμένου έγκυκλου χρησιμοποιούμε τη θεωρία του Ολοκληρωτικού Λογισμού, ή όποια δεν ήταν γνωστή τόν 15ον αι. Η προσέγγιση του άγνωστου συγγραφέα είναι πρακτικής φύσεως, και αποτελεί μία αξίολογη πρώιμη απόψεωρα επίλυσης προβλημάτων αυτού του σημαντικότατου κεφαλαίου της Μαθηματικής Ανάλυσης.

Ο συγγραφέας στό 235ο κεφάλαιο του κώδικα 65 γράφει συγκεκριμένα:

Περί τού πώς ἐστί εἰδέναι οἰνοδόχον ἄγγος τὸ κοινῶς βουτζίον καλούμενο τῷ ὄντι σανίδων λ, δεχόμενον δὲ καὶ μέτρα λ, γενόμενον δὲ, σανίδων κ, πόσα μέτρα ἐλαττώ τῶν λ δέξεται.

Ἔστω οἰνοδόχον ἄγγον τὸ κοινῶς βουτζίον καλούμενον ὅπερ ἔχει σανίδας λ, δέχεταί δὲ καὶ μέτρα λ. Ἀφαιρεθέντω σανίδων ι καὶ γενόμενον σανίδων κ, ζητεῖς εἰδέναι πόσα μέτρα ἐλαττώ τῶν λ δέξεται.

Εἶναι προφανὲς ότι χωρίς τὴν ὑπάρξη τοῦ πιστεύουμε να έτυχε να αντιληφθεί κανείς ἀπὸ τὴν περιγραφή μόνο τοῦ συγγραφέα περί τίνος πρόκειται.

• Ένδιαφέρον επίσης εἶναι τὸ σχῆμα ποὺ χρησιμοποιεῖται ἀπὸ τὸν συγγραφέα γιὰ τὸ κανονικὸ (οἱ πλευρὲς εἶναι μεταξὺ τοὺς ἑς 40-γωνο, προκειμένου να ύπολογίσει τὸ ἐμβαδόν του μὲ μία πρωτότυπη καὶ ἄγνωστη στοὺς σύγχρονους μαθηματικοὺς μέθοδο.

Παρατηροῦμε ὅτι ο συγγραφέας χωρίζει τὴν περιφέρεια τοῦ κύκλου μὲ ἰκανοποιητικὴ ἀκρίβεια σε 40 ἰσα τμῆμα, ἐνώ δὲν εἶναι εξακάθαρο αὐτὸ ἐξετάζει ἀπὸ τα σημεία του μὲ εὐθύγραμμα τμῆμα, ἀπὸ τὸν πρότυπος του κανονικοῦ 40-γωνο.

Παρατηροῦμε ἐπίσης ότι εἶναι καλὸς γνώσις τῆς κατασκευῆς ἐνὸς πληρώνον μὲ μεγάλο πλῆθος πλευρῶν, ἀφοῦ γίνεται τὸ κατασκευάζουσα σήμερα, θὰ έπρεπε νὰ ξεκινήσουμε ἀπὸ τὴν κατασκευὴ τοῦ κανονικοῦ πενταγώνου, καὶ στὴ συνέχεια νὰ χωρίσουμε τὸ κάθε ἕνα ἀπὸ τὰ 5 τόξα σὲ δύο ἰσα τμῆμα, ὅπως ἐνώνοντας τὰ 10 σημεία του μὲ να προκύψουν νὰ ἔχουμε ἕνα κανονικὸ 10-γωνο. Ὁμοίως μὲ τὴν ἰδια διαδικασία ἀπὸ τὸ 10-γωνο κατασκευάζουμε τὸ 20-γωνο, καὶ ἀπὸ τὸ 20-γωνο τὸ 40-γωνο.
• Άκρως ἀπαραίτητη εἶναι ἡ ὑπαρξή τοῦ σχήματος γιὰ τὸ πρόβλημα τοῦ 220οῦ κεφαλαίου,
στὸ ὁποῖο ζητεῖται ὁ υπολογισμὸς τοῦ ἐμβαδοῦ ἕνος ἰσόπλευρου τριγώνου «ἔλλιπος».

Ὅπως ἔχουμε διαπιστώσει καὶ ἄλλες φορές, παρατηροῦμε πῶς σὲ αὐτὸ τὸ σημεῖο τοῦ
χειρογράφου, ὁ συγγραφέας χρησιμοποιεῖ ὀρολογία ἢ ὅποια ὅροι δὲν συνηθίζεται σήμερα,
καὶ ἀπλοτέρων δυσκολείει σημαντικά τὴν ἔρευνα τὸ γεγονός ὅτι χρειάζεται χρόνος μέχρι νὰ
κατανοῆσαι κανεῖς ἀπὸ τὴν μακροσκελέστατη περιγραφή τί ἐννοεῖ ὅταν ἀναφέρεται στὸν ὅρο „
ἔλλιπές ἰσόπλευρο τρίγωνο”.

Προκύπτει λοιπόν, πῶς ἐννοεῖ τὸ μὴ κυρτό τετράπλευρο τὸ ὁποίο προκύπτει, ἀν ἀπὸ ἕνα
ἰσόπλευρο τρίγωνο ἀφαιρέσουμε τὸ ὅποιο ἐμβαδὸν που περιέχεται στὸ ἰσόπλευρο ὅπως
φαίνεται στὸ σχῆμα.

Τὸ θέμα αὐτὸ εἶναι μία καλὴ ἀσκήση γιὰ νὰ κατανοῆσουν οἱ μαθητές του τὴν ἐφαρμογὴ τοῦ
Πυθαγορείου Θεωρήματος, ἀλλὰ φαίνεται νὰ ἐπιθυμεῖ νὰ τοὺς δυσκολέση περισσότερο εἰσάγοντας
ὅτι η μεγαλύτερη περίμετρο ἐμβαδόν

• Οἱ μαθηματικοὶ τῆς σύγχρονης ἐποχῆς ἀντιμετωπίζουν δυσκολία στὸ νὰ ἐπιτύχουν νὰ
κατανοῆσουν οἱ μαθητές τους ὅτι ἡ μεγαλύτερη περίμετρο ἐμβαδόν.

Τὸ σχῆμα αὐτὸ ἀντιμετωπίζει αὐτὴν τὴν δυσκολία στηρίζομενος στὸν υπολογισμό του, ἀλλὰ κυρίως
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αὐτὸ ποῦ ἔχει τὸ μικρότερο ἐμβαδὸν εἶναι τὸ τετράγωνο. Βέβαια ἔχει ἑξεκινῆσει αὐτὴν τὴν διαδικασία ὑπολογίζοντας τὸ ἐμβαδὸν κύκλου μὲ πρίμετρο 20 σπιθαμές, τὸ ὅποιο εἶναι τὸ μεγαλύτερο ὅλον τῶν ὑπολοίπων σχημάτων. Στὴ συνέχεια, μετὰ ἀπὸ τὸν κύκλο καὶ τὰ κανονικὰ πολύγωνα, σχεδιάζοντας ὀρθογώνια παραλληλόγραμμα καὶ ἕνα ἱσόπλευρο τρίγωνο, ὅλα μὲ περίμετρο ἵση πρὸς 20 σπιθαμές, δείχνει πῶς τὸ μικρότερο ἐμβαδὸν τῶν πιὸ πάνω σχημάτων τὸ ἔχει τὸ ὀρθογώνιο μὲ μήκος 9 καὶ πλάτος 1 σπιθαμή.

Στὴν πρώτη εἰκόνα παρατηροῦμε ὅτι ὅσο ἔλαττώνεται τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πλευρῶν τῶν κανονικῶν πολυγώνων μὲ σταθερὴ περίμετρο, τόσο ἔλαττώνεται καὶ τὸ ἐμβαδὸν, τὸ ὅποιο στὸ πρώτο πολύγωνο (40-γωνο) εἶναι 31 9/11, καὶ στὸ τελευταῖο (12-γωνο) 30 1/13.

Στὸ δεύτερο σχῆμα βλέπουμε πῶς τελικὰ τὸ τετράγωνο μὲ περίμετρο 20 ἔχει τὸ μικρότερο ἐμβαδὸν ὅλων τῶν κανονικῶν πολυγώνων μὲ τὴν ἰδιαί περίμετρο, τὸ ὅποιο ἱσοῦται μὲ 25.

Στὴ συνέχεια φαίνεται στὸ σχῆμα, ὅτι τὴ τελικὰ τὴ μικρότερη ἐκτάσει ὅλων τῶν προαναφερθέντων σχημάτων καταλαμβάνει τὸ ὀρθογώνιο παραλληλόγραμμο μὲ πλευρές 9 καὶ 1 καὶ ἐμβαδὸν 9.
Στό 230ό κεφάλαιο διαβάζουμε: «Περὶ τοῦ πῶς ἐστὶ εἰδέναι πόσων σπιθαμῶν πανίν, ἔσται σοι χρεία πρὸς τὸ ποιῆσαι σκηνὴν ὅσου ἀν μεγέθους βούλῃ».

Εἶναι προφανὲς ὅτι ἡ ἀσάφεια τῆς ἐκφώνησης δὲν προσφέρει περιθώρια γιὰ τὴν ἐξέυρεση λύσης. Ὡστόσο μετὰ ἀπὸ προσεκτικὴ μελέτη τῆς μακροσκελέστατης περιγραφῆς που ἀκολουθεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς κατανόησης τοῦ σχήματος, χωρὶς τὸ ὅποιο θὰ εἶχαμε μεγάλη δυσκολία, τὸ πρόβλημα διατυπώνεται ἀπὸ ἐμᾶς ως ἔξοδος: «Ζητεῖται ὁ ὑπολογισμὸς τοῦ ἐμβαδοῦ τῆς παράπλευρης ἐπιφάνειας μίας κωνικῆς σκηνῆς ύψους 40 σπιθαμῶν καὶ παράπλευρης ἀκμῆς 50 σπιθαμῶν».

Ὡστόσο μετὰ ἀπὸ προσεκτικὴ μελέτη τῆς μακροσκελέστατης περιγραφῆς ἀκολουθεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς κατανόησης τοῦ σχήματος, χωρὶς τὸ ὅποιο θὰ ἔχαμε μεγάλη δυσκολία, τὸ πρόβλημα διατυπώνεται ἀπὸ ἐμᾶς ως ἔξοδος: «Ζητεῖται ὁ ὑπολογισμὸς τοῦ ἐμβαδοῦ τῆς παράπλευρης ἐπιφάνειας μίας κωνικῆς σκηνῆς ύψους 40 σπιθαμῶν καὶ παράπλευρης ἀκμῆς 50 σπιθαμῶν».

Η συγγραφέας χρησιμοποιώντας τὸ Πυθαγόρειο θεώρημα καὶ ἀκολουθώντας δική του πρωτότυπη μέθοδο ὑρίσκει τὸ ζητούμενο ἐμβάδον.

Διαπιστώνουμε ὅτι ἔχει χρησιμοποιηθεῖ τὸν γνωστὸν σὲ ἐμῶν υπολογισμὸ τὸν ὃς ἐφαρμόζουμε σήμερα κατὰ τὴν ἐπίλυση συναφῶν ζητημάτων, δηλαδὴ υπολογίζει τελικὰ τὸ γινόμενο τῆς ἡμιπεριμέτρου τῆς κυκλικῆς βάσης ἐπὶ τὸ ύψος.

Στὸν κώδικα 72 τοῦ 18ου αἰ.

Σὲ αὐτὸ τὸ χειρόγραφο τοῦ ὁποίου τὸ περιεχόμενο διδασκόταν στὴν Ἑλλάδα λίγες μόνο δεκαετίες πρὶν τὴν ἐπανάσταση τοῦ 1821 ἰδιαίτερο ἐνδιαφέρον παρουσιάζουν τὰ σχήματα που ἀφοροῦν στὸ 3ό Βιβλίο καὶ συγκεκριμένα στὸ κεφάλαιο τῶν Ἐμβαδῶν. Τοῦτο διότι ἡ διατύπωση καὶ γενικώτερα ἡ συλλογιστικὴ τοῦ Θεοτόκη κατὰ τὴν παρουσίαση καὶ ἀνάπτυξιν τῶν Ὁρισμῶν, τῶν Προτάσεων, τῶν Θεωρημάτων κ.λπ. εἶναι ἰδιάξουσα καὶ δυσκολονόητη, καθὼς ἐντοπίζονται ἐντυπωσιακὲς διαφορὲς σὲ σχέση μὲ τὴ σύγχρονη πρακτικὴ καὶ μεθοδολογία.

Σὰν πρῶτο παράδειγμα ἀναφέρω τὸν ὁρισμὸ τοῦ ὅρθωγωνον παραλληλογράμμου, ὁ ὄποιος σήμερα διατυπώνεται ως ἐξής: «Ὅρθωγόνιον παραλληλόγραμμο εἶναι τὸ τετράπλευρο που ἔχει τὶς ἀπέναντι πλευρὲς παράλληλες καὶ τὶς γωνίας ὀρθές». Ὡς ἐμβαδὸν δὲ αὐτοῦ, ὁρίζεται τὸ γινόμενο τῆς βάσης ἐπὶ τὸ ύψος αὐτοῦ, ὅπου σὰν βάση θεωροῦμε τὴν μεγαλύτερη συνήθως πλευρὰ καὶ σὰν ύψος τῇ μικρότερῃ.
Θα διακινδύνευα τὴν ἀποψη, ὅτι καὶ χωρὶς σχήμα δύναται νὰ ἀντιληφθεῖ κανεὶς περὶ τίνος πρόκειται. Στὴν περίπτωση ὅμως τοῦ Θεοτόκη, ὁ ὁποίος ὁρίζει τὸ ὀρθογώνιο παραλληλόγραμμο, ὡς «αὐτὸ ποὺ περιέχεται μεταξὺ δύο εὐθυγράμμων τμημάτων καθέτων μεταξύ τους», μόνο βλέποντας τὸ σχῆμα κατανοοῦμε ὅτι ὁ Θεοτόκης ὁρίζει εξ ἀρχῆς τὸ ἐμβαδόν τοῦ ὀρθογωνίου παραλληλογράμμου καὶ ὅχι τὸ ὀρθογώνιο παραλληλόγραμμο ὡς γεωμετρικὸ σχήμα.

• Ἐπιπλέον, καθὼς στὸν κώδικα 72 δὲν ἀναφέρεται ἡ λέξη «Ἐμβαδόν», εἶναι χρησιμότατο καὶ ἀπαραίτητο ἕνα ἀκόμα σχήμα, ὅτε νὰ γίνει κατανοητό, ὅτι ὅταν π.χ. ὁ Θεοτόκης γράφει ἄ2 ἡ ἄβ2 ἐννοεῖ τὸ ἐμβαδόν τοῦ τετραγώνου μὲ κορυφὴ τὸ σημείο α, ἢ μὲ πλευρά τὸ εὐθύγραμμο τμῆμα αβ ἀντίστοιχα.
Καὶ στὶς δύο αὐτὲς περιπτώσεις πρόκειται γιὰ τὸ ἐμβαδὸν τετραγώνου μὲ κορυφὴ τὸ α καὶ πλευρὰ ἵση πρὸς 4, ὅποτε ἡ κορυφὴ β τὴν ὑποίαν ἀναφέρει ὁ Θεοτόκης θὰ ἔπρεπε νὰ εἶναι ἀκριβῶς στὸ σημεῖο που ἔχει γραφεῖ ὁ ἀριθμὸς 8.

Σημειώνω, πῶς δὲν εἶναι δυνατὸν νὰ καταλογίσουμε προχειρότητα στὴ γραφὴ τοῦ Θεοτόκη, ὅταν γνωρίζουμε τὸν ἀγώνα που ἔκανε γιὰ νὰ στέλνῃ ἀπὸ τὸ Ῥώσικα καὶ τὴ Ρωσία ὅπου εὐρύσκετο ἐπὶ σειρά ἐτῶν ὑλικὸ τέτοιο ὡστε τὰ ἐλληνόπουλα νὰ θωρακιστοῦν μὲ σύγχρονες γιὰ τὴν ἐποχὴ γνώσεις. Μάλιστα πολλὰ ἀπὸ τὰ ἔργα του, ὅπως συμβαίνει καὶ μὲ τὸν κώδικα 72 τὰ ἔστελνε ἀνυπόγραφα, δείχνονται ὅτι τὸ τελευταῖο πράγμα που τὸν ἀπασχόλησε ἦταν ἡ προβολή τοῦ ἱδίου. Συμπληρώνω αὐτὴν τῇ μικρῇ ἐκτάσει ἀναφορὰ στὸ ἔργο του λέγοντας ὁ Θεοτόκης ὑπῆρξε ὁ πρῶτος ἐπιστήμων, ὁ ὁποῖος ἀνέγραψε στὰ Ἐκπαιδευτικὰ Προγράμματα τῆς τουρκοκρατούμενης Ἑλλάδας, ὡς πρωτεύοντα μαθήματα τὰ Μαθηματικὰ καὶ τὴ Φυσική.

Στὴ συνέχεια παρουσιάζω μία πρόταση τοῦ κώδικα 72 ὅπως καταγράφεται στὸ χειρόγραφο:

Μέχρις ἐδώ, καὶ χωρὶς νὰ ἔχουμε μπροστά μας τὸ ἀντίστοιχο σχῆμα εἶναι φανερὸ πῶς δὲν κατανοοῦμε περὶ τίνος πρόκειται.

Ἀπὸ τὴ μεταγραφή προκύπτει τὸ ἔξης:

«Πρότασις 1»

Ἔστωσαν δύο εὐθείας αἱ αβ, βγ, καὶ τετμήσθω δίχα ἡ βγ ὡς ἐτυχε κατὰ τὰ δ, ε σημεῖα. Λέγω ὅτι τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν αβ, βγ περιεχόμενον ὀρθογώνιον ἴσον ἐστὶ τῷ ὑπὸ τὸ ἀτμήτου, καὶ ἐκάστου τῶν τμημάτων περιεχομένων ὀρθογώνιοις.

Ἀλλὰ καὶ μὲ αὐτὸ τὸ βήμα δὲν εἶναι σαφὲς τὸ Ἴητοῦμενον.

Ἄν ὁμως παραθέσουμε τὸ σχῆμα:
Τότε διαβάζοντας προσεκτικά την πρόταση διαπιστώνουμε πώς ζητείται να δειχθεί ότι το έμβαδο του παραλληλογράμμου με κορυφές η, θ, γ, β είναι ίσο με το άθροισμα των έμβαδων των 3 πετείχων σε αυτό παραλληλογράμμων. Δηλαδή ένα σχήμα στην ουδέτερα μας «λούνε τα χέρια» ώστε να ξεκινήσουμε την αποδεικτική διαδικασία της πρότασης. Βέβαια πρέπει να είμαστε ιδιαίτερα προσεκτοί με κάποιες λεπτομέρειες, όπως π.χ. το ότι αντί για την «κορυφή η» ο Θεοτόκης γράφει «κορυφή α» έννοώντας ότι το τμήμα αβ δεν δημιουργηθεί στο τμήμα ηβ.

- Όσο τελευταίο παράδειγμα έπελεξα μία πρόταση του κώδικα 72 συνυφασμένη με την έννοια του «Γνώμονα». Υπενθυμίζω ότι ο άρθος «Γνώμων» είχε χρησιμοποιηθεί από πολλούς επιστήμονες κατά την αρχαιότητα ώστε εξής:

**Ο Οινοπόθης το Χίος** όνομάζει την χάραξη καθέτου από σημείου προς ευθεία «κατά Γνώμονα». Αργότερα ως Γνώμων ορίζεται και το διγλάνο σχεδιασμός όρθων γωνιών.

Κατά τόν Αριστοτέλη είναι το σχήμα που ήταν προστεθεί σε ένα τετράγωνο διατηρεί το σχήμα του τετράγωνου.

Στόν Εὐκλείδη ορίζεται ως το σχήμα που ήταν προστεθεί σε παραλληλόγραμμο αυτό (το παραλληλόγραμμο) παραμένει το ίδιο.

**Ο Ήρων ο Αλεξανδρεύς** ορίζει τόν Γνώμων ως το σχήμα το όποίο ήταν προστεθεί σε διαφορετικό άλλο σχήμα διατηρείται η ομοιότητα του δευτέρου σχήματος.

Στόν κώδικα 72 ο Θεοτόκης όπως είναι αναμενόμενο χρησιμοποιεί τον Ευκλείδειαν όρισμό, εννοώντας ώστε ή έκφραση «παραμένει το ίδιο» σημαίνει ότι το σχήμα που προκύπτει αν σε ένα παραλληλόγραμμο προστεθεί ο γνώμων, είναι και αυτό παραλληλόγραμμο και μάλιστα ομοιο προς το άρχικο.

Το σχήμα που άκολουθησε μας επιτρέπει να κατανοήσουμε τι άκριβώς είναι αυτό που προστίθεται σε ένα παραλληλόγραμμο ώστε να δημιουργηθεί ένα σχήμα ομοιο προς το άρχικο.
Ὑποθέτουμε ότι το άρχικο παραλληλόγραμμο είναι αυτό πού έχει διαγώνιο την δβ. Σε αυτό προστέθησαν 3 παραλληλόγραμμα, δηλαδή το δζ (έννοει αυτό με διαγώνιο δζ άκριβώς κάτω από το άρχικό), ένα δεύτερο το γε (άριστερα από το δζ), και ένα τελευταίο το θδ (πάνω από το γε).

Σημειώνω, πως ο Θεοτόκης έχει παραλείψει να θέσει το γράμμα θ στην πάνω αριστερή κορυφή του τελικού παραλληλογράμμου.

Έτσι κατανοούμε ότι ο «Γνώμων» δεν είναι τίποτα άλλο παρά ένα σχήμα πού αποτελείται από 3 παραλληλόγραμμα, το οποίο προστίθηκε στο άρχικο παραλληλόγραμμο δημιουργεί με αυτό ένα μεγαλύτερο και ίματσιο προς το άρχικο παραλληλόγραμμο, το αβ. Η ομοιότητα δε τών δύο παραλληλογράμμων φαίνεται από την ισχύουσα λόγω των ιμαιών τριγώνων αναλογία δγ/αζ=βγ/βζ.

Οι δύο χρονικοί περιόδοι, τόσο αυτή του 15ου αι. στο Βυζάντιο, όσο και ή του 18ου αι. στην τουρκοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα επελέγησαν ώστε, ως ελάχιστη προσφορά απορρέουσα από την έρευνά μου, να δοθεί ένα δείγμα από την τότε δραστηριότητα των Ελλήνων στην Επιστήμη των Μαθηματικών. Πρόκειται να έναν μεγαλύτερο και ιματσιότερο περίοδος προσφέρει ο σκοταδισμός και η πλήρης άποψις εκπαιδευτικών πρακτικών συνυφασμένων με την τότε ανάπτυξη των άλλων εθνών στον επιστημονικό τομέα.

Πηγές
L’illustration comme preuve scientifique:  
le *De communione physica* de Théodore II Lascaris  

Le *De communione physica* de Théodore II Lascaris est accompagnée dans les manuscrits d’une illustration constituée exclusivement de figures géométriques. Comme le confirme l’analyse du contenu de l’oeuvre et l’examen de sa tradition ancienne, ces schémas ne constituent en rien un élément adventice par rapport au texte, mais forment bel et bien la pièce maîtresse de la démonstration scientifique.
The Poet-Alchemists and Their Relations to Stephanos of Alexandria

Stephanos of Alexandria (late 6th-early 7th cen.) is a Byzantine scholar known as a commentator of Plato and Aristotle; astronomical, astrological, alchemical and medical works are also attributed to him.

According to tradition he was a well-known and eminent scholar in Alexandria, even before being invited by the emperor Heraclius (610–641) to Constantinople, in order to teach the quadrivium. He is the author of the work On the Great and Sacred Art of Making Gold, which is a commentary on selected passages of earlier alchemical texts. The manuscript tradition of the work indicates that it was greatly appreciated: it survives in 53 mss (47 in Greek, 2 in Greek with Latin translation, and 4 in Latin; 6 mss date in the 11th to the 15th centuries, the rest date in the 16th to 19th centuries). His work greatly influenced the poet-alchemists as is evident from several passages in their texts. A close study of their works reveals not only their dependence on Stephanos’ work, but also the different subjects they were interested in.

Theophrastos praises the astrological predictions based on astronomical observations, especially those predictions related to iatromathematica (medical astrology); moreover he refers to astrological properties of plants, animals, metals and stones. He repeats Stephanos’ view that the seven colours of the “stone” are accomplished by their corresponding seven planets moving through the twelve towers (signs) of the four conversions (solstices and equinoxes) of the zodiac. Moreover, he describes the related chemical operations for the making of the “stone” as passions of the ouroboros dragon, reminding Stephanos’ Letter to Theodoros. His poem ends with a prayer to God’s Logos.

Hierotheos, following Stephanos, refers to the enigmatic teachings of the ancient wise men; their secrets can be disclosed to piously living men through the grace of Christ God. Hierotheos is the only one who refers extensively to the same astronomical phenomenon observed and recorded allegorically in one of Stephanos’ lectures. According to my study, this phenomenon has been observed at Constantinople in the year 617, in the interval between May 26 and June 3; this is the date of Stephanos’ work. His poem ends with a prayer to Christ Lord.

Archelaos, influenced by Stephanos refers also to the knowledge bestowed by God’s grace to pious men who retire and live in purity, fasting and praying. He focuses in the famous alchemical principle: “The nature rejoices in the nature and the nature masters the nature and the nature conquers the nature.” It should be noted that some of his verses refer clearly to the “Epitafios threnos,” the famous orthodox hymn of Good Friday. His final verses are inspired by Stephanos who advises his audience to choose their optional death by mortification of their senses and the flowing of many tears, if one wishes to be illuminated by God.

In Heliodoros’ poem addressed to the great king Theodosios, the “red galactite stone” narrates how it has been conceived as a baby in his mother womb and the various phases of its treatment until its final transformation. The poem ends with a prayer to Christ.

A detailed study of these poems would possibly elucidate the question of their date as well as the relation of their authors to Stephanos of Alexandria.
Representations of the Oikoumene in Strabo’s Manuscripts

When we think of illuminated geographical manuscripts, some luxury codices (Vat. gr. 699 of Kosmas Indikopleustes or Vat. Urb. gr. 82 of Ptolemy) come to mind; but the average geographical manuscript has no images at all, or just a few modest figures. Apart from Ptolemy’s well-known manuscripts with maps that have attracted much attention, the earth projections and regional maps of the oikoumene illustrating geographical and non-geographical texts (such as Aristotle, Nikephoros Blemmydes, or Oppian) have aroused interest only in recent years. But our purpose here is to explore the modest figures found in some manuscripts of Strabo’s Geography that have not been yet studied or discussed, although they were mentioned by Aubrey Diller (“The Scholia on Strabo”, Traditio, 10, 1954, 29-50) in his list of Strabo’s scholia.

Strabo has the peculiarity of being the most frequently epitomized ancient Greek author, to the extent that we preserve almost as many epitomes of the Geography as Byzantine copies of the whole work. I would recall here that Strabo’s Geography is organized into 17 books, each one corresponding to a different region of the oikoumene except books 1-2, with an introduction to the subject. We have no preserved copies of single books, but collections of sentences, excerpts and particularly restatements and abridged texts.

The most ancient manuscript of Strabo preserves a Chrestomathy within a miscellany of geographical texts, Palat. Heidelberg. gr. 398 (ff. 60-156), belonging to the Philosophical collection, a library of philosophical books from the third quarter of the ninth century. The work is known as Chrestomathia A of Strabo, and it has proved difficult to date: traditionally its authorship is attributed to Photius, but some scholars would date it back to Late Antiquity: D. Marcotte, “Le corpus géographique de Heidelberg (Palat. Heidelb. gr. 398) et les origines de la Collection philosophique”, in C. D’Ancona (éd.), The Libraries of the Neoplatonists, Leiden-Boston, 2007, 167-175; D. Marcotte, “Priscien de Lydie, la géographie et les origines néoplatoniciennes de la Collection philosophique”, Journal des Savants, Juillet-Décembre 2014, 165-203.

The five figures of Heidelberg. gr. 398 are a case in point for our purpose, and we shall focus on them. They were included in the margins of the text by the same hand, which means that they were in the model. Since the figures are superfluous and trivial, they may be a selection from a more bulky figural corpus, and they do not seem to reflect a conscious effort to help the reader or to complete the text. This is proved by another, later copy of the Chrestomathy, known as Chrestomathy E, a selection of 198 excerpts (all of them from books VII and XI-XV) preserved in Par. gr. 571, ff. 418v-430, copied in a mimetic handwriting from the thirteenth century. From its two figures, the one in f. 418v (the limits of Syria represented as a rectangle) is absent from Chrestomathy A. A third testimony is a copy of the Heidelberg MS made at the end of the thirteenth century, Vatopedi 655, ff. 55-69.
Figures complementing Strabo's explanations or descriptions were not necessary to a proper understanding of the text, but rather arise from the specific indications given by Strabo. Their inclusion on the margins was therefore intended to emphasize or illustrate rather than to facilitate their comprehension. They may be figural or geometrical representations, as well as sketches of some regions or diagrams of the distances between points of the same meridian or parallel.
Plants, Medicine, People: Rethinking Botanical Illustration

Whereas numerous Greek manuscripts contain plant representations, most of them have been overshadowed by the sole Vindobonensis medicus graecus 1 well known thanks to its large polychrome illustrations covering almost the full pages of the codex. The naturalism of many such representations has generated an interpretative discourse articulated which has been widely accepted and is characterized by two major ideas: botanical illustrations originally expressed a direct visual perception of the natural world, and these illustrations became increasingly non-natural with the passing of time.

The presentation will be based on a decade-long research on the topic, which proceeded in three major successive phases: the search for all the Greek manuscripts with botanical illustrations; what has been rightly called a “philology of illustrations”; and the interpretation of resulting data. Focusing on the interpretation, the paper will summarize the results of the research, which led in a radically different direction than previous analyses. In so doing, it will lay down the basis for a renewed approach to ancient scientific illustration. In substance such interpretation will merge–and go beyond–major past and current interpretative methods (e.g. iconology, anthropology, visual studies, and cognitive analysis), and will propose a synthetic approach focusing on the function of visual representations analyzed as knowledge vectors which translated analytical data (sometimes also expressed in the form of texts) rendered in visual forms not always corresponding to nature or sometimes not even perceptible in nature, but nevertheless unambiguous because they used (or referred to), and possibly assembled several sets of codes known to–and decipherable by–users, possibly in a changing form through time and space.
Pour une approche méthodologique renouvelée
de l’analyse de l’illustration toxicologique byzantine

Distinct de l’écrit tant par sa forme que par les informations qu’elle contient, c’est pourtant à travers des approches issues des études textuelles que l’imagerie médicale byzantine est le plus souvent abordée. Elle se voit ainsi entraînée dans une quête d’un hypothétique original perdu, comme d’aucun essaie de reconstituer une version primitive d’une œuvre, ou sondée à partir d’un vocabulaire dédié à l’écrit, en vue de percer les mystères de son langage.

Si l’analyse des miniatures médiévales occidentales a, ces dernières années, fait l’objet de questionnements méthodologiques renouvelés, un travail de fond reste à mener en ce qui concerne l’illustration des manuscrits médicaux byzantins.

Partant de quelques exemples tirés de codex illustrés de toxicologie, cette communication est ainsi l’occasion de proposer une méthode inédite. L’image, objet à partir duquel toute la réflexion débute et sur lequel toute l’attention se focalise, est ainsi scrutée dans ses moindres détails avant d’être mise en relief. L’objectif est alors d’en appréhender les moindres fléchissements, afin d’en extraire toutes les informations qu’elle peut nous transmettre et que nous sommes, dans la mesure du possible, à même de comprendre. Tous ces éléments sont alors autant d’informations sur le rôle et les fonctions de ces miniatures dans la transmission et l’acquisition du savoir scientifique.
Investigating the Sources of Late-Byzantine Zoological Illustration

Looking at zoological representations in the art of the Latin and Palaeologan periods, we face with an irruption of novel images of animals hitherto unknown in the documents we have. A significant case is the so-called extended cycle of illuminations for the Book of Job; the original, so-called short cycle, we know in early- and middle-Byzantine manuscripts, was transformed into a more extended cycle, which has gained numerous illustrations for the animals God describes between the marvels of creation in the final chapters of the book. A second case is the illustrations of the creation of animals, fish and birds and the episode of man giving name to the animals at Genesis 1-2, in the illuminated Octateuchs, in particular in the 14th-century manuscript in the Biblioteca Laurenziana in Florence. Here, we see very accurate images of terrestrial creatures and flying birds, but curiously the images of fish are very poor thing. Where the Byzantines found the models for such novel zoological images that are absent in scientific illustration of the earlier period? Did they look at Western models (bestiaries, hunting treatises)? Did any ichthyological catalogue exist in late Byzantium? A symptomatic case of deficiency in zoological models is found in the Physiologus manuscript once in Izmir: the pictures were painted or over-painted in the fourteenth century, but for a number of exotic animals the illuminator was forced to rely on contemporary Islamic illustrations.
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Introduction

Cette table ronde a pour objectif de pallier une lacune : la quasi absence, jusqu'à une date récente, d'études appréhendant dans son ensemble le sanctoral figuré dans les églises byzantines. Or, plus que toute autre partie du décor, les représentations hagiographiques constituent souvent une source précieuse sur la fonction et le fonctionnement de l'édifice, sur les commanditaires et sur le contexte de création de l'église, entre tradition constantinopolitaine et revendication locale. Le choix des saints, leur place dans l'espace ecclésial, leur visibilité, les marques éventuelles de la dévotion dont les images étaient l'objet, leurs regroupements et leurs interférences avec le reste du décor peuvent être riches d'enseignement. Expression de la dévotion portée à tel ou tel saint, qui peut être ou non en lien avec le calendrier liturgique ou avec la présence de reliques, les effigies hagiographiques apportent des données sur le culte des saints, qui sont rarement prises en compte par les spécialistes des textes. Elles peuvent être aussi au service d'une idéologie, traduisant des orientations religieuses, voire des revendications politiques.

L'étude de la Chapelle Palatine de Palerme (Sulamith Brodbeck) ouvrira cette table ronde, car elle permet de mettre en évidence la pluralité des éclairages que peut apporter un programme hagiographique à la connaissance d'un monument. Trois décors majeurs seront ensuite revisités : Hosios Loukas (Nano Chatzidakis), Saint-Georges de Kurbinovo (Sashka Bogevska) et Saint-Marc de Venise (Élodie Guilhem). La relation entre la sélection et l'emplacement des saints d'une part et les pratiques et rites d'autre part sera considérée dans un espace particulier, le narthex, à travers deux exemples : Xanthos en Lycie (Catherine Jolivet-Lévy) et Kučevište en Macédoine (Smiljka Gabelić). Nancy Ševčenko abordera le thème sous un autre angle, en analysant le rôle des images de saints dans des églises de Kastoria, dans la diachronie du XIIe au XIVe siècle. Enfin, Dubravka Preradović montrera, à propos des martyrs de Sirmium, Singidunum et Ulpiana, la difficulté à mettre en relation les dossiers hagiographiques, les reliques et l'iconographie.
L'apport de l'étude des programmes hagiographiques
L'exemple de la Chapelle Palatine de Palerme

La Chapelle Palatine de Palerme, consacrée en 1140 sous le règne de Roger II, frappe par la beauté de son décor en mosaïque, joyau de l’art siculo-normand. Son architecture se présente comme la fusion de deux corps : le sanctuaire ou presbyterium (nous n’entrons pas ici dans les problèmes terminologiques liés à cet espace) surmonté d’une coupole, qui reprend le modèle grec de la Martorana, et les nefs qui suivent le développement des églises latines. Si les cycles de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament ont été largement étudiés et interprétés, le programme hagiographique n’a jamais été analysé à sa juste valeur, alors qu’il dévoile des informations essentielles à la meilleure compréhension de l’édifice et de son contexte de création.

Cette communication s’intéressera aux principaux éclairages que peut apporter l’étude d’un programme hagiographique. Dans un premier temps nous verrons comment les images de saints définissent des espaces, leur fonction et leur destination. L’usage du lieu répond à des motivations liturgiques mais aussi politico-religieuses que la place des saints, les échos et les correspondances entre les images permettent d’appréhender. Dans cette perspective, les figures de saints doivent être considérées dans leur lien étroit à l’architecture et au mobilier liturgique et cérémoniel. Ensuite, les effigies hagiographiques sont souvent un révélateur précieux des orientations et de l’identité du ou des commanditaires du décor. Enfin, les étapes chronologiques de la réalisation des mosaïques peuvent être précisées à travers la cohérence du programme ou au contraire les ruptures ou nouvelles orientations dans le choix des saints et leur emplacement.


Usage des images de saints comme délimitation des espaces et de leur fonction

Ces dernières sont séparées du presbyterium par un degré d’emmarchement et des arcs dans lesquels prennent place les saints médecins et anargyres Côme, Damien, Panteleimon, Hermolaos, Jean et Cyr. Situés à un emplacement privilégié, ils reprennent ici la tradition byzantine de les situer souvent aux abords de l’abside, matérialisant ainsi l’entrée dans l’espace le plus sacré. La partie orientale de la Chapelle Palatine est composée de plusieurs espaces qui chacun répond à une fonction particulière que les saints mettent en valeur. Ainsi, Pères de l’Église et évêques, répartis en pied dans l’abside et sur les murs latéraux entourent le chœur liturgique, tandis que martyrs byzantins des premiers temps se déploient en médaillons dans les intrados des arcs de la coupole, reprenant le modèle de Sainte-Marie de l’Amiral qui lui-même s’inscrit dans les traditions des églises grecques du XIe siècle, comme l’a démontré Kitzinger dans sa monographie sur la Martorana.

La chapelle nord est, quant à elle, délimitée par une série de saints en pied : des militaires au sud – Théodore Tiron, Démétrius, Nestor, Mercure – auxquels vient s’ajouter saint Nicolas, puis sur le mur ouest les saintes femmes Agathe, Catherine et Paraskévi (dont l’identité n’est pas certaine). Ces saints, situés à une certaine hauteur, ont longtemps été mis en relation avec la tribune de Roger II sur le mur nord, jusqu’à l’étude récente de Beat Brenk qui remet en question l’emplacement de celle-ci. Que cette tribune ait existé ou non, les effigies hagiographiques sont de toute évidence liées à la personne du souverain – qui entrait par cette chapelle nord – et soulignent la destination royale de cet espace à travers la dimension politique des saints soldats, protecteurs privilégiés du roi dans ses conquêtes territoriales, ou encore la présence de saint Nicolas, considéré comme le saint patron de la dynastie des Hauteville. On peut ajouter à cette lecture la présence des saintes femmes qui vient renforcer la fonction royale du lieu et oscille entre ancrage dans la tradition byzantine et réappropriation locale. Sainte Agathe rappelle la translation des reliques de la sainte de Constantinople à Catane, sous les Normands, en 1126 ; sainte Catherine de sang royal est, selon l’usage, représentée en impératrice byzantine ; sainte Paraskévi, outre sa dimension liturgique reconnue, illustre l’appropriation d’un culte en contexte normand : introduite dans la liturgie italo-grecque, elle devient, après la conquête normande, une ancienne martyre locale.

Les saints de la chapelle sud sont plus rarement pris en considération. Très récemment Slobodan Ćurčić a analysé, sous un nouvel angle, la présence du Pantocrator et le choix des scènes christologiques, agencées autour du thème prédominant de la lumière et liées à la porte latérale sud, au-dessus de laquelle prend place l’Entrée du Christ à Jérusalem, à la dimension royale et symbolique tout à fait éloquente. L’auteur aboutit à la conclusion que cet espace aurait été dévolu au couronnement du roi. Les effigies hagiographiques viendraient ici corroborer une telle hypothèse. Les médaillons dans les intrados de l’arc sud ne présentent aucune symétrie avec leur pendant côté nord, ils donnent à voir au contraire une variété de saints, aux statuts différents : martyrs, diacres, soldats et prêtres. Cette diversité est comme une version condensée et abrégée, dans un espace précis et délimité, d’un programme hagiographique plus vaste, comme un microcosme au service du souverain lui assurant reconnaissance et protection. En outre, de part et d’autre de l’Entrée triomphale du Christ se tiennent les saints Martin et Denis, deux saints patrons de la monarchie française dont se revendique Roger II, comme le soulignait déjà Eve Borsook. On peut ajouter que la fonction cérémonielle de cet espace trouve un écho dans l’Ekphrasis de Philagatos de Cerami, intellectuel et moine de langue grecque actif à la cour de Roger II, qui fait l’éloge du souverain, le comparant au soleil dont la splendeur domine tout, image reprise dans une homélie du même auteur prononcée pour la fête du Dimanche des Rameaux en présence du roi Roger II. Le souverain faisant son entrée est qualifié de radieux et la célébration est considérée comme une fête aussi bien divine que royale, illuminée de deux splendeurs.
Sur les piliers de la nef, prennent place des évêques sur les faces internes et des saintes femmes sur les faces externes. Les saints évêques présentent ici un sens de lecture d’ouest en est qui semble être tout à fait signifiant pour la compréhension de la fonction de cet espace. Les autres décors siculonormands développent généralement une hiérarchie des saints d’est en ouest et non le contraire. Or, à la Chapelle Palatine, les premiers piliers côté occidental sont occupés par deux grands saints de l’Église d’Orient, Blaise et le patriarche Athanase, puis l’Église latine est représentée par le pape Léon face à saint Ambroise, suivis de saint Augustin et saint Catalde. Et enfin, les deux derniers piliers, côté oriental, sont dotés des images de saint Sabin et saint Julien. Dans cette perspective, la présence d’un trône royal sur le mur occidental de la nef donne au programme tout son sens : les effigies hagiographiques ont été pensées dans un axe ouest-est, en fonction de l’emplacement de ce mobilier cérémoniel. Cette organisation fait écho à l’usage initial de salle de trône du corps occidental de la Chapelle sur lequel nous reviendrons. Les médaillons des arcs vont dans le sens d’une telle lecture : seuls certains saints sont visibles depuis le trône et dévoilent une clef d’interprétation intéressante. Une des observations depuis l’ouest met par exemple en valeur la place de Léonard et Rémi qui, si l’on observe le plan au sol, sont représentés dans deux arcades différentes, à un emplacement distinct que rien ne semble lier. Or, vus depuis le trône à l’ouest, ils apparaissent l’un derrière l’autre et cette disposition pourrait rappeler que Léonard a été converti par Rémi, évêque de Reims.

Les saintes femmes représentées dans les nefs latérales sont au nombre de seize et se répartissent en pied et en médaillon. On retrouve une même concentration d’effigies féminines dans la cathédrale de Monreale, mais aussi dans certaines églises grecques d’Italie méridionale, comme à Saint-Adrien à San Demetrio Corone en Calabre. La présence de ce groupe dans les nefs latérales pose la question de la place des femmes pendant les cérémonies royales et liturgiques. À Byzance, dans les églises métropolitaines, les femmes forment une part importante de l’assemblée. Selon Taft, elles assistent à l’office liturgique depuis les galeries, certainement avec leurs enfants, garçons ou filles. Cependant, elles peuvent aussi se tenir dans le bas-côté nord de la nef. Il n’en demeure pas moins qu’aucun document d’époque ne situe les femmes dans la nef centrale ou les en exclut. Toutefois, si elles occupent les galeries et les bas-côtés, il est fort probable que l’espace central demeure réservé uniquement aux hommes. Il est difficile de savoir si les nefs latérales de la Chapelle Palatine et de certaines autres églises du Mezzogiorno répondaient à cette fonction, mais la question mérite d’être posée surtout quand les effigies de saintes femmes sont situées à une hauteur qui favorise une dévotion personnelle.

**Le choix des saints et les orientations du commanditaire**

La partie orientale de la Chapelle Palatine est l’œuvre de Roger II (1130-1154). Le lien intrinsèque entre l’architecture, le mobilier liturgique et cérémoniel, le choix des saints et la place des images dans l’espace illustrent les orientations du souverain commanditaire qui revendique son attachement à la tradition grecque. Il se place sous la protection de saints militaires, il invoque saint Nicolas comme saint patron – symbole de réappropriation d’un culte oriental en milieu latin –, il est entouré de saintes femmes comptées au nombre des anargyres et reconnues pour leur rôle d’intercesseurs privilégiés. Cet espace de la Chapelle Palatine développe une relation étroite entre choix des saints, fonction et destination des images, une relation très sophistiquée qui témoigne d’un programme hautement réfléchi. Les effigies hagiographiques font écho au cérémoniel que ce dernier soit d’ordre privé ou public, comme l’était par exemple la fête triomphale du dimanche des Rameaux pendant laquelle le souverain entrait en grande pompe dans la ville de Palerme puis dans sa propre chapelle.
La partie occidentale de la Chapelle a été généralement considérée comme plus tardive, le décor ayant été orchestré sous Guillaume Iᵉʳ (1154-1166). Comme l'affirme Demus, les saints de la nef sont, quant à eux, le reflet de l'époque de Guillaume Iᵉʳ : Anastasie est la sainte patronne d'un important monastère grec à Mistretta ; Catalde est particulièrement vénéré à Palerme : une église lui est dédiée sous l'autorité de l'emir Maion de Bari, grand chancelier du roi ; la translation des reliques de sainte Christine à Palerme a lieu sous le règne de Guillaume Iᵉʳ ; sainte Marguerite est la sainte patronne de la reine Marguerite de Navarre et enfin des églises dans le royaume de Sicile étaient consacrées aux saints Julien, Léonard ou Léon pape. Cependant, nous pouvons aller plus loin dans ces considérations et déceler, à travers le choix des saints, un personnage influent dans la conception du programme hagiographique. Plus que Guillaume Iᵉʳ, nous nous demandons dans quelle mesure Maion de Bari n'a pas eu un rôle important dans le choix des saints de cette partie du décor. Émir des émirs, il est considéré comme l'homme le plus doué du gouvernement et devient vite indispensable aux affaires du royaume. Il était déjà à la tête de la chancellerie sous Roger II et devient le bras droit de Guillaume Iᵉʳ, orientant les affaires intérieures et gérant les relations internationales. La représentation de saint Catalde dans la nef centrale est particulièrement intéressante, car il est le seul saint doté de la mitre de l'évêque, détail iconographique latin par excellence. Cette mise en exergue du saint renvoie à la conservation d’une de ses reliques, mais peut tout aussi bien être interprétée comme le choix personnel de Maion de Bari, le commanditaire direct de l'église Saint-Catalde à Palerme qui lui sert de chapelle privée. La présence d’un autre saint illustre la probable intervention de l'emir, il s'agit de saint Sabin de Canosa. Celui-ci n'est honoré dans aucun des calendriers liturgiques de Sicile, une unique mention en marge dans le martyrologe de Palerme témoigne d’un ajout plus tardif, qui date peut-être du règne de Guillaume Iᵉʳ. Saint Sabin de Canosa est un des saints les plus vénérés de Pouille et une partie de ses reliques a été transférée au XIᵉ siècle dans la crypte de la cathédrale de Bari, ville dont il devient le saint patron aux côtés de saint Nicolas. Pourquoi ce saint tiendrait-il une place aussi importante sur un des piliers de la nef centrale, si ce n'est par une volonté personnelle du commanditaire d'honorer un saint local, en l'occurrence le saint de la ville et de la région dont est originaire Maion ? Ce dernier est réputé pour sa connaissance aiguë des affaires internationales et les saints de la nef semblent refléter l'actualité politique de cette période, à travers la mention des villes du Mans (saint Julien), de Poitiers (sainte Radegonde) et de Limoges (saint Léonard) qui peut être interprétée comme un écho à la nouvelle situation politique en France, bouleversée par la séparation de Louis VII et d'Aliénor d'Aquitaine et par le mariage de cette dernière avec le comte d'Anjou Henri II Plantagenêt en 1152, qui deviendra roi d'Angleterre en 1154.

Le chantier du décor en mosaïque : des saints comme indices chronologiques

Depuis les études de Demus et de Kitzinger, l'architecture de la Chapelle Palatine est présentée comme la fusion de deux corps qui répondraient à deux fonctions principales sous le règne de Roger II : chapelle privée du roi ornée de mosaïques byzantines à l'est et salle d'audience publique dans le vaisseau occidental, surmonté du plafond à muqarnas de tradition islamique. Aujourd'hui, on cherche moins à isoler les éléments de telle ou telle tradition et on tend à considérer l'édifice dans son ensemble comme un unicum, tant d'un point de vue artistique que fonctionnel. Le décor en mosaïque est généralement considéré comme une œuvre réalisée en deux phases chronologiques distinctes : la partie orientale sous Roger II et la partie occidentale sous Guillaume Iᵉʳ. Toutefois, à la suite de la récente campagne de restauration des mosaïques, finalisée en 2008, Beat Brenk tend à réduire cet écart chronologique et émet l'hypothèse que seules deux ou trois années séparent la réalisation des
mosaïques du presbyterium et celle des nefs. Cette hypothèse va dans le sens des études actuelles sur la Chapelle et peut trouver une confirmation dans la comparaison du traitement de certains détails des panneaux vétéro et néo-testamentaires. En revanche, le programme hagiographique des deux parties de l'édifice va à l'encontre de cette hypothèse et atteste plutôt un écart chronologique beaucoup plus important. Le choix des saints reflète en effet deux conceptions politico-religieuses différentes qui correspondent à deux règnes successifs : celui de Roger II marqué par une culture grecque dominante, visible dans les orientations liturgiques et cérémonielles de sa chapelle, et celui de Guillaume Ier qui s'occidentalise considérablement, reflet des nouvelles perspectives de la cour normande tournée vers Rome d'une part et vers le Nord d'autre part, et plus précisément vers les Plantagenêt. Si la salle du trône et d'audience publique qui occupait le vaisseau occidental est une initiative de Roger II, le programme hagiographique de cette partie de l'édifice est de toute évidence orchestré sous le règne de son fils et pensé en fonction de la place du roi depuis le trône occidental. Ainsi, si le laps de temps peut être raccourci entre le chantier des mosaïques de la partie orientale et celui du cycle de l'Ancien Testament sur les murs de la nef centrale, il faut de toute évidence compter au moins une décennie avant la réalisation des saints de la nef, échos du règne de Guillaume Ier qui prend le pouvoir à la mort de son père en 1154.

L'analyse de ces différents aspects du programme hagiographique de la Chapelle Palatine apporte de nouveaux éclairages sur la fondation et son contexte de création. Elle démontre également la subtilité du langage monumental des saints et la sophistication des stratégies de mise en espace, de fonction et d'usage des images.
Hosios Loukas. Le choix et la disposition des saints dans le sanctuaire et dans la nef centrale du naos

Le catholicon de Hosios Loukas, fondation monastique unique non seulement par la grandeur et la modernité de ses formes d'architecture, mais également par la splendeur de sa décoration en marbes et en mosaïques (Bouras 2015), a été construit dans une région éloignée de la capitale du thème de l’Hellade, Thèbes, et désertée après les invasions barbares des IXᵉ-Xᵉ siècles, pour vénérer les reliques miraculeuses d’un saint local, hosios Loukas (896-953) qui malgré les vicissitudes, avaient survécu dans ces lieux, choisis pour construire sa demeure monastique. Les conditions historiques et la date de la construction du catholicon en 1011 ou en 1022 par les soins de l’higoumène Philothéos, chargé de la translation des reliques du saint dans la nouvelle église, précisées par les publications pertinentes de M. Chatzidakis, N. Oikonomides et N. Sofianos, nous ont permis de mieux saisir les circonstances qui ont régi un système unique de planification pour l’agencement du programme iconographique et en particulier pour le choix et la disposition des saints dans le catholicon. En effet, ce programme suit délibérément un système déjà établi au IXᵉ siècle à Constantinople, selon le témoignage de l’homélie de Léon VI pour l’inauguration de l’église de son gendre Stylianos Zaouzès (890–896), qui comprend un nombre réduit de scènes alors que les saints isolés prédominent dans la décoration. Or, à Hosios Loukas, il n’y a que neuf scènes christologiques et deux de l’Ancien Testament (dans le diaconicon), auxquelles il faut ajouter quatre scènes dans les chapelles latérales et six dans la crypte, alors que plus de 250 figures isolées habitent les surfaces susceptibles d’accueillir une décoration : on peut dénombrer en effet plus de 170 figures en mosaïque, auxquelles il faut ajouter 80 figures en fresque dans les chapelles latérales et dans la crypte.

Apparemment, un esprit ingénieux, de haute culture théologique, a su manier la disposition de ce nombre impressionnant de saints par des agencements délicats, pleins de sens apparents ou dissimulés. En même temps cette même pensée, subtile et cohérente, a su gérer l’ensemble du programme iconographique de ce monument extraordinaire. Dans une vue d’ensemble, nous allons essayer d’éclairer la destination liturgique de cette planification et de décrypter le sens de la présence des saints, investie parfois de multiples couches de significations superposées.

En outre, les portraits des nouveaux saints locaux du IXᵉ siècle, tels que Nicon le Metanoeite et Luc le Gournikotes, font écho aux activités de ces moines dans la région, qui ont été depuis longtemps notées et commentées (N. Oikonomides, 2004, N. Patterson-Ševčenko, 2004).

Parallèlement à ces personnages, des saints évêques, répartis à des emplacements privilégiés du sanctuaire (y compris le diaconicon et la prothésis) et du naos, sont en majorité, formant un groupe de plus de trente personnages, dont l'emplacement suit une hiérarchie dogmatique apparente, qui présente pourtant des déviations éloquentes, liées au besoin d'honorer le culte du saint local, hosios Loukas et l'higoumène du monastère, Philotheos, fondateur du catholicon et responsable de la translation de ses reliques. Des critères analogues ont prévalu pour le choix de certains saints, répartis dans d'autres endroits du naos, comme les moines défenseurs de l'orthodoxie parmi les autres moines du désert dans les compartiments ouest du naos. Les guérisons miraculeuses de hosios Loukas rapportées dans sa *Vita*, ainsi que celles attribuées à ses reliques, ont conduit au choix et à l'emplacement du saint médecin-guérisseur Pantéléimon à une place équivalente à celle du portrait principal de hosios Loukas dans le naos. Enfin, les saints Théodores, qui figurent parmi les saints militaires ornant les arcs soutenant la grande coupole, ont été mis en valeur sur l'arc oriental, devant le sanctuaire, afin d'honorer la mémoire des membres homonymes de la puissante famille de Thèbes, celle des Léobachos ; la présence répétée de ces saints, en mosaïque dans le diaconicon et en fresque dans la chapelle nord-ouest du catholicon, confirme cette intention.

Dans cette fondation monastique unique, le choix et l'emplacement des saints dans le catholicon trahissent une profonde culture théologique d'origine constantinopolitaine, qui a su adapter les principes de la hiérarchie dogmatique aux besoins du culte local par un système décoratif soigneusement élaboré *ad hoc.*
Le programme hagiographique de Saint-Georges de Kurbinovo revisitée

La petite église dédiée à Saint-Georges du village Kurbinovo (Macédoine) a attiré l'attention des chercheurs dès 1940. En 1975, dans une monographie consacrée à ce monument, Lydie Hadermann-Misguich a étudié très méticuleusement son décor exceptionnel aussi bien par ses traits stylistiques que par quelques nouveautés iconographiques (l'Amnos dans l'abside, les eaux vives dans l'Ascension, les gloires lumineuses du Christ, etc.)

Une inscription, retrouvée au cours des travaux de restauration derrière l'autel, indique la date du 25 avril 1191 pour le début de la décoration de l'église. Les travaux ont donc commencé deux jours après la fête de saint Georges à qui l'église est dédiée. Nous n'avons pas, en revanche, de témoignages épigraphiques mentionnant la date de la construction de l'édifice ou les noms des fondateurs. L'architecture de l'église est modeste : une seule nef probablement charpentée se terminant à l'est par une abside, flanquée de deux niches. Malgré la sobriété de l'architecture, l'intérieur de l'église et les façades occidentale et méridionale ont reçu un décor de très haute qualité.

Le programme iconographique de l'intérieur de l'église comporte un cycle christologique faisant le tour de la nef (deuxième registre), une image théophanique sur le mur occidental et des sujets eucharistiques qui ornent l'espace du sanctuaire. Les parties hautes, sous le toit, ont été décorées d'images de prophètes qui ont subi de nombreux dommages, tandis que le premier registre présente un programme hagiographique soigneusement choisi. Hormis les peintures de l'intérieur de l'église, quelques compositions lacunaires et une Désis avec le saint patron de l'église ornent la façade méridionale. Une image dédicatoire composée de figures impériales et de saints guerriers à cheval, sur la façade occidentale, complète le tout.

Dans cette contribution nous souhaitons donner un nouvel éclairage sur le programme hagiographique de Saint-Georges de Kurbinovo, faire quelques remarques sur le choix des saints représentés, leur emplacement dans l'église, leurs relations avec les scènes christologiques et leurs associations avec d'autres saints. Parmi les quelques cinquante portraits de saints peints, plusieurs présentent des difficultés d'identification. Nous nous attarderons plus particulièrement sur les murs méridional et septentrional du sanctuaire où certains auteurs ont proposé d'identifier des saints locaux. Il est nécessaire de revenir sur le culte des saints Clément, Cyrille, Méthode et Érasme dans la région, afin d'affirmer ou non leur présence dans le programme hagiographique de Kurbinovo.

Sur la façade occidentale se trouve une composition dédicatoire en présence d'un couple impérial. En 1191, c'est l'empereur Isaac II Ange (1185-95) qui occupe le trône de Constantinople ; il est arrivé au pouvoir pendant l'invasion des Normands dans les Balkans et plus précisément au moment de la prise de Thessalonique en 1185. Selon certains chercheurs, le commanditaire du décor de Kurbinovo serait l'archevêque d'Ohrid, éventuellement identifiable au personnage fragmentaire vêtu de blanc à droite des empereurs. En nous fondant sur l'analyse des choix hagiographiques et
de quelques éléments iconographiques du programme peint, nous souhaitons émettre une autre hypothèse concernant le commanditaire des peintures de Kurbinovo et proposer de l'identifier à une femme : le décor de Saint-Georges octroie, en effet, une place particulière aux enfants, à la maternité et à la santé de la famille, qui sont des préoccupations surtout féminines.

Tout d'abord, sur le mur méridional de la nef sont peints saints Joachim et Anne Galaktotrophousa en pied. L'iconographie est insolite pour les programmes hagiographiques byzantins, dans lesquels les parents de Marie figurent souvent dans des médaillons et en buste. Certains auteurs pensent que c'est la simplicité de l'architecture de Kurbinovo qui a poussé les peintres à introduire les figures de Joachim et Anne dans la frise des saints en pied, l'église ne possédant pas de registre avec des figures en buste ; mais la place des parents de la Vierge dans la suite des saints est, à notre avis, due aux exigences du ktitor. Anne allaitante endosse ici le rôle de sainte protectrice des mères et de leurs enfants. Hormis la sainte famille (Anne, Joachim et Marie), le peintre a placé, dans la continuité du mur méridional vers l'est, les saints Constantin et Hélène qui représentent eux aussi un couple de mère et fils. Suivent ensuite trois saints anargyres très fréquemment représentés dans les programmes hagiographiques (Cosme, Damien et Pantéleimon), puis deux saints non identifiés, car détruits. Nous pensons qu'il pourrait s'agir d'autres saints médecins, possiblement Julitte et Kirykos (un autre couple de mère / fils), présents dans le programme hagiographique des Saints-Anargyres de Kastoria, de peu antérieur à l'œuvre de Kurbinovo. Ces deux églises possèdent des similitudes iconographiques et hagiographiques, qui nous aideront dans l'interprétation du programme de Kurbinovo, d'autant plus qu'une partie du décor des Saints-Anargyres a sans doute été commanditée par une femme - Anne Radènè.

Ainsi, dans le premier registre du mur méridional de Kurbinovo, le peintre a représenté, outre la Déisis placée immédiatement à côté de l'iconostase, un grand nombre d'anargyres, et probablement trois couples mère / enfant. Enfin, sainte Marina, peinte sur le piédroit de la porte méridionale, est aussi rangée parmi les saints guérisseurs. Il s'agit de la sainte martyre d'Antioche, qui intègre fréquemment les programmes hagiographiques byzantins. Elle est souvent figurée près des portes et des passages en endossant une fonction apotropaïque. C'est également le cas à Kurbinovo, d'autant plus qu'elle y assure un démon avec un maillet en cuivre. Cet épisode est tiré de sa Vie, et sa représentation n'apparaît en Orient qu'à partir du siècle dans l'église des Saints-Anargyres de Kastoria. L'iconographie est en revanche bien connue en Occident depuis le Xe siècle, et au XIIe, la légende de sainte Marina (Marguerite) s'enrichit d'un autre épisode. Dans son cachot, Marina est tentée non seulement par un démon qu'elle frappe avec un maillet, mais aussi par un dragon. Avalée par le monstre, la sainte sort indemne de son ventre après avoir fait le signe de la croix. C'est à l'analogie entre l'accouchement et la sortie du ventre du dragon que Marina doit ses vertus obstétricales dès le XIIe siècle en Occident. À Kurbinovo, par l'emplacement de son image et son iconographie, elle revêt son rôle habituel de protectrice des entrées. Toutefois, la popularité grandissante de la sainte en Occident, surtout après le transfert de ses reliques en 1145 à la cathédrale de Montefiascone, et l'apparition d'un nouveau type iconographique de sainte Marina en Macédoine, région située sur la route empruntée par les Normands peu avant la prise de Thessalonique, nous autorisent à envisager peut-être des vertus thérapeutiques maïeutiques attachées à sa personne.

Sur le mur occidental de l'église de Kurbinovo sont peintes six saintes femmes et parmi elles sainte Théodora, probablement d'Alexandrie. Excepté ses images fréquentes dans les manuscrits surtout du XIe siècle, ses effigies sont rares dans l'art monumental. Deux portraits de la sainte

Comme l’a déjà remarqué Lydie Hadermann-Misguich, les enfants dans l’église de Kurbinovo sont traités avec un soin particulier, notamment dans l’image des Rameaux. Si leur place dans les Rameaux est habituelle, la présence d’Abel dans l’Anastasis auprès de ses parents Adam et Ève l’est moins. Les enfants de l’image des Rameaux et Abel dans l’Anastasis portent une boucle d’oreille. Marqués de ce signe distinctif, ils trouveront assurément le salut car leurs âmes sont innocentes. Le spinario présent dans l’Entrée à Jérusalem est aussi un sujet rare. Les auteurs qui ont étudié ce motif pensent que l’enfant qui arrache l’épine de son pied, enlève le mal, le péché, les passions de son âme et se purifie. La multiplication des scènes ayant comme protagonistes des enfants, y compris le Christ Amnos aux bouclettes blondes, révèle encore une fois les préoccupations maternelles de la donatrice de Kurbinovo.

Le programme hagiographique de Kurbinovo est très riche et la polysémie des images qui entourent les saints représentés permet des lectures multiples. Ainsi, la présence de saint Euphrosynos sur le mur septentrional, des saints militaires à cheval sur la façade occidentale ou de la Déisis avec le saint patron au-dessus de l’entrée méridionale, mérite une attention particulière et offre d’autres pistes de recherche.
Le programme hagiographique de la basilique Saint-Marc, miroir de Venise

La basilique Saint-Marc n'est pas le plus ancien édifice cultuel de la Sérénissime ; le premier cœur religieux de la ville de Venise se situe à Rialto. Saint-Marc n'est pas non plus la cathédrale de Venise ; celle-ci a été édifiée à l'extrémité ouest de la ville dans le secteur de Castello, presque aux limites de la ville. Dans ce contexte, pourquoi et comment la basilique Saint-Marc est-elle devenue le symbole même de la ville de Venise ?

La basilique a été bâtie sur l'église primitive consacrée de Saint-Théodore, située sur les terres du monastère de San Zaccharia, couvent impérial qui aurait été érigé sous l'impulsion de l'empereur Léon V l'Arménien en 827. Saint Théodore, le premier patron de la ville, a été détrôné par saint Marc après le vol des reliques de l'évangéliste à Alexandrie par les deux pécheurs Rustique et Tribun en 826. L'église actuelle est celle qui a été reconstruite au XIe siècle à l'initiative du doge Domenico Cantarini (1043-1070), achevée et consacrée en 1094 au temps du doge Vitale Falier (1084-1096). Avec Vitale Falier, Saint-Marc conserve sa fonction et son statut de chapelle palatine, mais doit aussi remplir la fonction d'apostoleion, de reliquaire, de trésor et de chapelle ducale. À partir du doge Dandolo (1192-1205), le statut de la basilique change encore. Elle n'est plus la chapelle privée du doge — cette fonction est assurée désormais par la chapelle Saint-Nicolas située dans le palais — elle devient la chapelle d'État de la ville, ce qui se voit clairement à travers le programme en mosaique, et plus particulièrement dans le choix des effigies hagiographiques.


À partir du XIIIe siècle, on constate deux phénomènes : d’une part, la politique d’acquisition de reliques, consécutive à 1204, se traduit par le développement de nouveaux cultes qui se reflètent dans le programme hagiographique. Ainsi, avec l’arrivée massive des reliques de la Passion, sainte Hélène, la mère de Constantin, remplace la sainte homonyme d’Auxerre. Apparaissent aussi les saints patrons de territoires tombés sous la domination vénitienne, comme saint Isidore de Chios, patron de l’île égéenne, pour le corps duquel une chapelle est même construite. D’autre part, on observe une occidentalisation progressive du programme hagiographique, avec l’apparition de saints comme Sigismond et Léonard, et la présence des fondateurs des ordres monastiques François et Dominique. Les saints auxiliaires, appelés aussi les saints de secours, comme sainte Barbe et saint Christophe – saints dont l’intercession est jugée particulièrement efficace dans les situations d’urgence – se substituent aux saints médecins.

Le programme de Saint-Marc ne met pas seulement en scène le rayonnement de la République hors des frontières de la ville, il permet aussi d’affirmer le pouvoir ducal en son sein même. Les figures hagiographiques de Saint-Marc reflètent à partir du XIIIe siècle la géographie ecclésiastique de la ville en réunissant les saints des grandes paroisses, des Scuole, des fraternités et d’autres institutions dévotionnelles. Les paroisses et les Scuole sont le cœur de la cité lagunaire ; elles en sont l’élément constitutif. En effet, la vie privée et la vie publique des Vénitiens s’organisent autour
d'elles par le biais de leur dévotion et les fêtes de leur saint patron. Il est donc intéressant de noter que les figures de saints isolés dans le décor de Saint-Marc sont les saints les plus populaires, ceux des petites paroisses et des corporations d'artisans. Cinquante-deux saints présents dans la basilique Saint-Marc sont titulaires d'une paroisse dans la ville de Venise, soit environ un tiers du programme d'ensemble. Ce sanctoral reflète les orientations politiques et religieuses de la cité, son attachement à la tradition orientale, ses liens à Rome et son hégémonie commerciale ; ainsi, pour ne mentionner que quelques exemples, sont titulaires d'une paroisse le saint militaire oriental Georges et la sainte martyre romaine Agnès. La présence de saint Fantin illustre, quant à elle, les échanges commerciaux entretenus par la République avec le Sud de l'Italie. Son culte aurait été introduit par les marchands de sel calabrais vivant à Venise.

Les liens entre le décor de Saint-Marc et les paroisses vénitiennes sont de plusieurs ordres : une proximité de dates dans l'apparition de la paroisse et de la mosaïque, ou une concomitance dans la restauration des deux, ou un changement de dédicace pour les deux, ou encore une popularité simultanée. Il semble donc exister une corrélation évidente entre la figuration d'un saint en mosaïque et l'existence d'une église. Parfois, c'est la construction ou la transformation d'une église qui conduit à placer le saint dans le panthéon marcien. C'est ainsi le cas de sainte Lucie, qui apparaît deux fois dans la basilique. Depuis 1169, une petite église lui est dédiée dans la ville et à la fin du XIIe siècle, son culte prend de l'ampleur, car on attribue à son intercession la victoire sur Frédéric Barberousse en 1176. Cet événement a sans doute poussé en 1204 les Vénitiens à s'émanciper de ses reliques conservées au monastère Saint-Georges de Constantinople. La petite chapelle vénitienne est alors élevée au rang d'église paroissiale. Lors de la réalisation du programme en mosaïque du XIIIe siècle, il apparaît normal de représenter la sainte deux fois, en signe de son importance nouvelle dans le sanctoral vénitien. Les deux mosaïques de la sainte ont été modifiées à l'époque moderne en même temps que la transformation de son église.

Nous avons également constaté que la présence d'une paroisse à Venise peut entraîner un changement d'identité à la basilique Saint-Marc et inversement. Les Vénitiens jouent sur l'homonymie des saints entre Orient, Occident et tradition locale ; c'est le cas de sainte Justine. Sainte Justine de Padoue possède l'une des plus anciennes églises à Venise, construite, d'après la légende, à la demande du premier évêque de la ville comme symbole anti-lombard. Une sainte de Saint-Marc porte également le nom de Justine, mais il s'agit probablement de la sainte orientale, car sainte Marine de Bithynie, une autre vierge martyre orientale lui fait face et que les saints sont sou-vent regroupés par aire géographique. Progressivement, cependant, un glissement s'opère dans le calendrier liturgique : la sainte est désormais fêtée le 7 octobre, jour de la fête de sainte Justine de Padoue. Ce changement peut s'expliquer par plusieurs raisons : tout d'abord par la piété populaire, la sainte étant la patronne des marchands de laine, une des compagnies importantes de Venise. Justine devient aussi une des saintes d'État après la conquête de la ville de Padoue ; elle a donc désormais toute sa légitimité à Saint-Marc. En 1571, les Vénitiens se placent sous sa protection lors de la bataille de Lépante, preuve de la dévotion croissante dont elle est l'objet. L'exemple de sainte Justine illustre donc bien la désaffection progressive des Vénitiens envers les saints orientaux.

L'existence d'une paroisse à Venise peut également expliquer la présence de certains saints peu fêtés, comme saint Ubald de Gubbio. Le culte de ce saint devient plus fervent à Venise au début du XIIIe siècle, comme en atteste le changement de dédicace de l'église de Santa Agata. Elle est construite dans le sestiere de San Polo à la fin du XIe siècle, l'église prend le vocable de saint « Boldo » (saint Ubald) vers 1203. La mosaïque marcienne date, elle, du deuxième quart du XIIIe siècle.
On remarque aussi quelques divergences entre les paroisses de la ville et les saints représentés dans la basilique. Ainsi certains, très populaires à Venise, sont totalement absents du décor de Saint-Marc ou sous-représentés, comme les saintes femmes, par exemple. Ce dernier phénomène s’explique sans doute par la fonction étatique de la basilique, dédiée au pouvoir civil, militaire et religieux, détenu par les hommes, comme le protocole d’accès à l’église tend à le mettre en évidence : en dehors de la Dogessa — la femme du doge — et des épouses de hauts fonctionnaires, les femmes ne pouvaient accéder à la basilique.

Pour conclure, le programme hagiographique de Saint-Marc, qui s’étend sur une fourchette chronologique assez large, reflète les ambitions politico-religieuses de la Sérénissime, regardant dans un premier temps vers l’Orient, puis se tournant après la quatrième croisade vers l’Occident. L’église des doges est un véritable monument pour la Cité. Les effigies hagiographiques semblent incarner deux orientations précises qui reflètent la volonté identitaire de Venise : le passé mythique de la ville et la mise en valeur des paroisses et Scuole vénitiennes. La basilique Saint-Marc semble apparaître comme une Venise miniature, car toutes les principales paroisses de la ville sont représentées par leurs saints patrons. Culte populaire et culte d’État se rejoignent à Saint-Marc, véritable miroir de l’âme vénitienne.
Quelques remarques sur un décor de narthex à Xanthos (XIᵉ siècle)


Lors de leur découverte, les peintures avaient subi d’importants dégâts dus à la destruction des voûtes par un incendie, à l’action des intempéries et au développement de lichens. Vingt-cinq personnages, sur les trente-sept environ que pouvaient accueillir les parties basses du narthex, étaient cependant encore partiellement conservés, alignés, de face, au-dessus d’une zone de faux marbres polychromes. La destruction des têtes et de presque toutes les inscriptions nominatives rend dans la plupart des cas impossible ou hasardeuse leur identification et, partant, toute interprétation poussée du programme iconographique ; on ne peut savoir par exemple si le choix et la place des figures avaient été déterminés par le calendrier liturgique et les saints groupés en fonction de la date de leur fête. Nous manquons aussi les peintures des parties hautes du narthex, ainsi que la totalité du décor du naos, à l’exception de la Deisis du templon. En revanche, les catégories auxquelles appartaient les saints représentés peuvent se déduire du costume et, le cas échéant, de la présence d’attributs, avec une marge d’erreur non négligeable due à la médiocre conservation des peintures.

Je voudrais néanmoins essayer de montrer, à partir de cet exemple, la relation entre le choix et l’emplacement des effigies hagiographiques et les pratiques et rites se déroulant dans le lieu décoré. Les sources textuelles, archéologiques et iconographiques révèlent la très grande diversité des usages du narthex et de son décor : aucune règle stricte ne dicte la décoration de cet espace plurifonctionnel et on ne cherchera évidemment pas à établir une coïncidence entre les images et le fonctionnement du lieu.

Une assemblée assez éclectique de saints – évêques, diacres, prêtre, martyrs, moines (?) et militaires, saintes femmes et peut-être anargyres – entourait la Mère de Dieu entre les archanges, regroupés près de la porte orientale, ouvrant dans le naos. Bien que la destruction de la partie supérieure de la figure peinte à gauche du passage n’autorise aucune identification certaine, son emplacement, la couleur de ses vêtements (robe bleue et manteau rouge) et la présence des deux archanges de part et d’autre suggèrent en effet de reconnaître la Théotokos, représentée au même emplacement par exemple à Saint-Nicolas Kasnitzi, à Kastoria. Conçue comme une image dévotionnelle, cette icône de la Mère de Dieu occupait un emplacement bien en vue à l’est, près de l’entrée dans le naos, usage qui sera surtout attesté à l’époque paléologue. Deux archanges, probablement Michel et Gabriel, en costume impérial (lôros) se font face sur les murs nord et sud de la travée centrale du narthex, vers l’est ; encadrant le passage, ils montent la garde de part et d’autre de l’entrée dans le naos et de l’image de la Mère de Dieu.
À l’ouest, en revanche, près de l’entrée du narthex, semblent avoir été réunies quelques saintes femmes, catégorie hagiographique souvent reléguée dans la partie occidentale des églises : deux, dont l’une en costume royal, flanquaient probablement l’entrée et d’autres se trouvaient à proximité dans les travées nord et sud.

Dans la niche nord-ouest, un saint identifiable à un prêtre en raison de son costume, qui comporte, sous le manteau, l’épitrachélion. Représenté à l’écart des évêques et diacres que nous verrons plus loin regroupés dans la travée sud, il avait certainement un rôle différent. La présence d’Abibos en face, dans la niche sud-ouest du narthex, pourrait être un argument en faveur de l’identification de l’un des deux prêtres, Gourias ou Samonas, martyrisés avec lui à Édesse, à moins que ceux-ci n’aient été figurés dans la travée sud, à proximité immédiate d’Abibos. Mais il pouvait s’agir aussi d’un saint médecin, Hermolaos, le maître dePantéléimon, qui était prêtre à Nicomédie, voire même peut-être, étant donné la place d’honneur qui lui est conférée, dans une niche, de saint Pantéléimon lui-même, vêtu en prêtre, avec l’épitrachélion, à Sainte-Barbe de Soğanlı, en Cappadoce, dans un décor daté de 1006 ou 1021. La médiocre conservation des figures voisines ne permet pas toutefois de confirmer ces propositions et d’autres prétendants peuvent entrer en ligne de compte.

L’identification de la figure peinte dans la niche nord-est reste également sujette à caution ; elle porte un manteau rouge, qui lui couvrait la tête, une robe ou tunique bleue, bordée dans le bas d’un large galon ocre. On peut hésiter entre l’identification d’un moine, la tête couverte du koukoullion, ou d’une sainte femme en maphorion qui, compte de tenu de sa mise en valeur dans une niche et de la couleur rouge de son maphorion, pouvait être sainte Anne, la mère de la Vierge, ou sainte Marina. Les couleurs vives du vêtement et de l’emplacement de la figure au nord du narthex plaident, nous semble-t-il, en faveur de l’identification d’une femme ; les saintes sont en effet souvent regroupées dans cette zone, en accord avec la tradition ancienne attribuant aux femmes la nef nord de l’église, pratique qui se maintient à l’époque médiévale et se reflète dans le décor des églises cathédrales. Toutefois, l’hypothèse d’un moine aristocratique, comme saint Théodore Stoudite, souvent richement vêtu, ne peut être totalement écartée.


Mais la catégorie la plus intéressante est celle, dans la travée sud, des figures « liturgiques » (évêques et diacres) ; la présence dans le narthex de cette catégorie de saints n’est pas exceptionnelle – elle est attestée à partir du XIe siècle, par exemple aux Saints-Anargyres de Kastoria – mais ils occupent ici une place importante eu égard aux dimensions modestes de l’espace. On compte quatre ou cinq prélats dans la partie orientale ; une inscription fragmentaire permet de reconnaître à droite, près de la niche, saint Jean Chrysostome ; à côté se tenait peut-être saint Basile de Césarée, près duquel on peut restituer, à titre d’hypothèse, Grégoire de Nazianze et Nicolas. Les saints diacres Étienne et Abibos occupent respectivement les niches sud-est et sud-ouest.

Toutes ces images de saints, sans pouvoir être rattachées à des pratiques ou rituels précis, sont liées aux fonctions du narthex et, d’une certaine manière, participent de celles-ci. Dans cet espace se déroulent dans les monastères plusieurs offices des Heures et c’est aussi là que commence, dans le rite cathédral, l’office de l’oracle (ou matines) ; les prières presbytérales pour les vivants et les morts, qui font appel à l’intercession de tous les saints, pouvaient leur être adressées par l’intermédiaire des images peintes sur les murs. Si le narthex des églises byzantines accueille fréquemment des inhumations, ce n’était pas le cas à Xanthos, ce qui n’interdit pas d’y restituer des
rituels commémoratifs et funéraires ; Sharon Gerstel a proposé d'expliquer ainsi la présence des figures de saintes femmes, investies d'un rôle d'intercesseurs pour les défunts, rôle qui peut être attribué à d'autres catégories de saints. Le lavement des pieds le Jeudi saint, le baptême et la petite bénédiction des eaux (μικρὸς ἁγιασμός), célébrée non seulement le 6 janvier mais d'autres jours de l'année, le dimanche et les jours de fête, ont souvent lieu dans le narthex. Aucune cuve n'a été retrouvée à Xanthos, mais rares sont les églises médiobyzantines à avoir conservé les aménagements liturgiques liés à cette fonction. Enfin, les évêques et les diacres, présents à travers leurs images dans le narthex de Xanthos, pourraient être aussi l'indice de rituels liés plus précisément à l'eucharistie. À l'époque médiobyzantine, le transfert des dons depuis le skevophylakion situé à l'extérieur de l'église est tombé en désuétude et toute l'action liturgique se déroule à l'intérieur, l'évêque attendant la Petite Entrée assis sur un trône, situé d'abord dans le narthex, plus tard dans la nef. En l'absence de prothèse flanquant l'abside de l'église médiévale de Xanthos, on peut se demander si les offrandes apportées par les fidèles pour la célébration de l'eucharistie ne pouvaient être reçues et préparées par les diacres dans le narthex. La présence dans ce dernier de quatre niches offre un argument en faveur de cette hypothèse : dans celles de la travée sud, où sont concentrées les effigies d'évêques et de diacres, la partie inférieure forme table. Le lien possible entre le décor du narthex et la célébration eucharistique est conforté par un passage du canoniste Théodore Balsamon (XIIe siècle). Discutant la place assignée aux femmes dans l'église, il indique que, lors de la Grande Entrée, le clergé traverse le pronaos, les prêtres portant les saintes offrandes et encensant au passage les tombes et les images. Le nombre des évêques et diacres figurés à Xanthos, inhabituel compte tenu des dimensions du narthex, a pu être favorisé de surcroît par le fait qu'il s'agissait d'une église cathédrale.

Le narthex est donc un espace liturgique et les images contribuent à son fonctionnement rituel, mais il est aussi, en dehors même du temps bref des célébrations, le lieu d'accueil des fidèles et un passage obligé pour accéder au naos. Ses peintures aux couleurs chatoyantes, rendant perceptible la sacralité du lieu, transportaient déjà les fidèles hors du monde de l'expérience commune, les préparant à pénétrer dans le naos. Les saints en pied, vus de face, situés dans la zone inférieure des murs du narthex, à hauteur du regard, étaient les premières images à être l'objet de l'attention des fidèles pénétrant dans l'église. Comme aujourd'hui sans doute, ceux-ci en faisaient le tour et s'arrêtaient plus particulièrement sur certaines d'entre elles pour leur rendre hommage et les vénérer afin d'entrer dans la communion des saints représentés et d'avoir part à leur pouvoir et à leur sainteté. L'absence de noir de fumée et de suie sur les fresques indique toutefois que l'église n'a pas été en fonction très longtemps après l'exécution de son décor peint, dans la première moitié du XIe siècle : elle a dû être abandonnée pendant la période de chaos qui suivit le désastre de Mantzikert (1071).
Figures of Saints in the Narthex of Kučevište

The church of the Presentation of the Virgin (presently of the Holy Saviour) in the village of Kučevište near Skopje with wall paintings dated to about 1330–1337 is the family foundation of the local lord and subsequent župan Radoslav, a subject of the Serbian kings Stefan Uroš III of Dečani and Stefan Uroš IV Dušan. Despite a few published works, including a monograph on its fourteenth-century wall painting and a study on the historical portraits of the king and the ktetors, some aspects of its iconographic programme of this church have not been elucidated.

The naos of the domed church on a cross-in-square plan shows a quite usual programme in the first register, similar to other fourteenth-century churches. The exception in terms of place and (gigantic) size is the fresco of the archangel Michael on the north wall. Also observable is the absence of female saints, who are depicted in the naos in a vast majority of other fourteenth-century aristocratic foundations. The narthex with a chapel on the upper floor has a tripartite plan, with the barrel-vaulted central bay and two narrower bays at its sides opening onto it and having small niches on their east ends. In the programme of the narthex, female saints account for one-third of the figures depicted in the lower register.

In the east niche of the north bay of the narthex is St Paraskeve (26 July) in a dark-coloured maphorion, holding a cross in one hand. Paraskeve lived in Rome in the second century, at first in a Christian community which she left to begin her itinerant ministry, and was martyred by the sword for her unflinching faith. She was venerated as a healer and protectress against everyday ills. Based on the theologically established link between her name and the day of Christ’s death, Paraskeve, a symbol of Christ’s sacrifice, was also considered the protectress of the dead. On the south wall of the north bay is St Marina of Antioch (17 July), daughter of an imperial governor who renounced lay life early on and was martyred under Diocletian. Clad in a tunic and red maphorion, she is pointing with her left hand to the southeast, where there are the figures of two female saints who are frequently depicted together, St Anastasia the Pharmakolytria (22 December), in common clothes but set apart by a white veil on her head (she renounced her noble status and gave away her inheritance) and, on the west wall, St Kyriake (7 July) in the clothes of a noblewoman. The figure of St Anastasia is partly damaged but she obviously wore a maphorion and held a cross in the right hand, while reaching the left towards the adjacent figure of St Kyriake (discernible is only a part of the wide sleeve of her half-raised arm). The gestures establish a conceptual link between the two saints and show that their figures were conceived as an iconographic whole. Anastasia the Pharmakolytria, a very popular saint, was martyred in Sirmium in the late third or early fourth century and her cult began to radiate from the Byzantine capital as early as the fifth century. Famed for her healing powers, she was believed to protect against poison, charms and enslavement. Her cult was associated with the Resurrection and Sunday. St Kyriake, who also lived in the reign of Diocletian, was raised in a wealthy home and in the Christian faith. She refused to renounce her
faith and was martyred in Nicomedia. Her image symbolises the day of the Resurrection of Christ. She is shown in ornate clothes (a gown and a cape sewn with decorative bands and round appliqués on the shoulders) and with a wreath resembling a hoop crown on her veiled head.

The entire north wall is occupied by the donor portrait which shows the Virgin with the Christ child and three standing figures. According to one interpretation, in front of the patroness saint of the church are Marea, the voivodes Vladislava (the two presumably holding the model of the church together) and Radoslav. According to others, these may be Marea, Radoslav and Jovan (the alleged son of Vladislava and Dejan) or the (unnamed) children of Vladislava and Dejan. The question of the identity of the persons who had the church built and decorated with frescoes remains open. It does not seem logical, for example, that the model of the church would have been presented by the (adult) children whose parents are also depicted, and it seems hardly possible that Vladislava could have been shown twice on two opposite walls of the narthex, once as a wife and a second time as one of the ktetors; if the model of the church indeed was presented by the two women, it would be an absolute iconographic exception both on local and on broader Byzantine level.

The royal (royal-donor) portrait on the south wall of the narthex depicts the holders of sovereign and local power: king Dušan and queen Helen and, west of the royal couple, the voivode Dejan and voivodess Vladislava. Dejan has been identified either as the subsequent sebastokrator and despot Dejan, founder of the Dragaš family whose marriage to Vladislava would have been his first marriage (he later married Dušan’s sister Theodora), or as the voivode Dejan Manjek/Manijak, a distinguished liegeman of Dušan’s mentioned in a document of 1333. What is reliable in any case is that the person was the local lord of the Kučešte area directly superior to Radoslav, future župan and possibly husband of his sister Vladislava.

Next to Dušan is St Cyril of Gortyna (9 July), a 3rd-century Cretan bishop who is shown blessing and holding a gospel book. Opposite him is St Ioannikios the Great (4 November), a former soldier of the eighth century who withdrew to Mt Olympus in Asia Minor to live an eremitic life, and in the niche on the east side is St Peter of Bithynia (13 September), a venerable hermit of the late eighth or early ninth century, known for his ascetic practices such as mortifying the body, constant fasting and wearing iron chains. Both are depicted as elderly monks holding (damaged) crosses, Peter also with a folded scroll. These three lesser-known and more rarely portrayed saints (only the cult of St Ioannikios was more prominent) are depicted in the immediate vicinity of the royal-donor portrait but detached from it.

On the west wall of the south bay is St Thekla (24 September) of Iconium in Asia Minor in a monastic habit, with the outward-facing palm of the left hand and the damaged right one. Her vita links her with the apostle Paul whose preaching inspired her conversion to Christianity. Having suffered terrible ordeals, she lived for a while in a mountain. Next to her is St Barbara (4 December) in royal attire, with a tall open bejewelled crown on her head. She probably holds a cross in the right hand, while the palm of the other turned to the front. According to her vita, she was of noble birth and did not take monastic vows. Like St Thekla, she ran away into the mountains, was thrown in prison and was martyred at the hands of her father.

The programme of the first register of the narthex also includes, in the central bay, two warrior saints on intradoses, St Niketas the Goth (15 September) (north arch, east side), a fourth-century great-martyr whose relics were believed to possess healing powers, and St Theodore Teron (or St Merkurios, 24 November) (south arch, east side), a soldier and early Christian great-martyr, the protective figures
of the apostles Peter and Paul (joint feast day 12 July) in front of the entrance to the naos, and, north of the entrance to the narthex, St Tryphon (1 February), martyred in Asia Minor in the third century, recognisable by his attribute, a lily in hand, a miracle worker and, above all, a heler.

The number of female saints in Kučevište is relatively large in proportion to the number of other individual figures of saints, including those in the naos, but Kučevište is not exceptional in that. Female saints were in fact rarely omitted from fresco programmes. Kučevište has the same number of female saints as Pološko (six – Thekla, Paraskve, Photina, Marina, Kyriake and Barbara), even though the latter is a smaller church. It has been observed that both churches were decorated with frescos under the patronage of women: Pološko by the despotess Maria, mother of the late Jovan Dragušin, and Kučevište presumably by Marena – if the name of the first patroness in the inscription in the naos has been read correctly – and Vladislava, both mentioned along with Radoslav in the inscription. The question is whether the observed role of women as those who commissioned fresco decoration in the two churches should be generalised and taken to have been widespread practice. Namely, there are different examples. The Virgin of Ljeviša in Prizren, the cathedral church of the Bishopric of Prizren decorated with frescoes under the patronage of king Milutin in 1309–13, has eight female saints in the naos, which is the largest surviving gallery of female saints in medieval Serbian wall painting (Theodosia, Catherine, Barbara, Irina, Kyriake, Paraskve, Thekla, Anastasia the Pharmakolytria and an unidentified one). It is also a fact that some katholikons have no female saints in their fresco programmes. In the case of aristocratic foundations such are, for example, the late-thirteenth-century Virgin Perivleptos in Ohrid and the mid-fourteenth-century Archangel Michael at Lesnovo or, among royal foundations, St Niketas from the first decade of the fourteenth century. But in the church of the Virgin at the Patriarchate of Peć from about 1335 there are in a window two standing figures of female saints, Paraskeve and Kyriake, the former in a monastic habit, the latter in imperial attire, although the ktetor was the archbishop Daniel II, a former Hilandar monk. Therefore, the examples bring into question the existence of a “rule” governing the inclusion or omission of female saints in fresco programmes.

There does not seem to be any relationship between the size of a church and the number of female saints. The extensive programme in the large katholikon of Dečani (mid-fourteenth century) includes only two female saints, St Photina and an unidentified one, possibly St Barbara. On the other hand, in the very small church of St Nicholas in Kalotina (1331–71, possibly 1331/2) there are four female saints on the west wall of the naos (Barbara, Marina, Paraskve and an unknown one) and as many as six or seven sainted nuns in the narthex, similarly to the quite reduced programme in the church in Rečani, where there are five. Besides, smaller churches from the mid-fourteenth century in the same area, such as Gornji Kozjak, Ljuboten or St John’s in Štip, each contain no more than two female saints.

It is also obvious that the “rule” of omitting female saints was not applied when they were depicted in the pair with the corresponding male saints (Mary of Egypt and Zosimas, Julitta and Quiricus, Constantine and Helena, Joachim and Anna), and also that, unlike the other “rules”, this one was consistently applied.

The female saints of Kučevište show a somewhat more modest variant of their usual iconography and, as it seems, lack individual attributes. Their clothes correspond to their respective social statuses as described in their hagiographies, but an emphasis laid on adornment in some cases was perhaps motivated by the intention of symbolically evoking the idea of female saints as inhabitants of the Heavenly Jerusalem and brides of Christ.
As far as the role and significance of the figures in the fresco programme in the narthex of Kučevište is concerned, it is difficult to pinpoint a single decisive motive. Apart from the medieval belief in the healing powers of female saints, their role as protectresses in the afterlife is particularly emphasised by the presence of Paraskeve, Kyriake and Anastasia the Pharmakolytria. This is also suggested by the surrounding paintings in the narthex (the cycle of the Last Psalms and the depictions of the cherubim and seraphim). That the female saints indicate the funerary purpose of the narthex is shown by analogous contemporary examples such as the programmes in Pološko, Rečani and Kalotina, or Ivanovo before them. It should also be borne in mind that they are painted in the vicinity of historical portraits, which suggests that their presence and place may be a sign of a particularly favourable inclination on the part of the female ktetors. This seems plausible but cannot be corroborated by written sources. Given that all female saints portrayed in Kučevište belong to the most distinguished Byzantine saints, the selection does not reveal any local peculiarity.

In regard to the principle that guided the shaping of the programme, it should be noted that the individual figures in the narthex of Kučevište do not follow the order of the calendar of the saints, but are grouped by the category of saints. The female saints indicate the sepulchral purpose of the narthex, testifying to the ktetors’ faith in the healing and protective powers of holy women, and possibly also allowing the assumption that the church formed part of a female monastery. What is hardest to explain is the presence of the portraits of monks (Peter of Bithynia and Ioannikios) in the narthex, and, in particular, of a bishop (Cyril of Gortyna). If we understand the monks as an extension of the group of monks depicted in the naos, which is their usual place, the portrait of a bishop is very rare outside the sanctuary, even on the walls of the naos (St Niketas), and it is quite an exception in the narthex. These saints are not from the ranks of the most highly venerated ones within their category, except St Ioannikos. He comes from the same region (Bithynia) as the Venerable Peter next to him, and they are also chronologically close to one another.

We are inclined to assume that the selection of saints shown in the lower register in Kučevište is partially the result of personal preferences of members of the ktetor family, and that, taken as whole, it mostly remains within the bounds of the iconographic programmes of the Palaiologan age.
Observations on Some Churches of Kastoria

My contribution to this roundtable is based upon the churches of Kastoria, in Northwestern Greece. These churches have been well studied in recent years, and more and more of their frescoes are being expertly cleaned and restored. What follows are merely observations from a recent trip, and contain nothing that is new, I am sure, to those many excellent scholars and conservators who have lived and worked in the city for so long.

Why Kastoria for this roundtable on the role of saints’ images in Byzantine church decoration? I chose the city because of its fabled number of churches located in close proximity one to the other and dating from most every period from the 10th to the 15th century and beyond. Kastoria offers the opportunity to study the monuments of a single town over time, and the consistency of their architecture gave me the chance to analyze their Middle and Late Byzantine fresco decoration somewhat more scientifically than if the programs of decoration were constantly occupying, and adapting to, different kinds of architectural spaces.

With of course one famous exception, that of the 10th-century Panagia Koubelidiki, the churches of Kastoria are not domed, and, again with exceptions, they are single-naved structures with timber roofs, devoid of aisles or other subsidiary spaces except for the occasional narthex. The particular plan of these churches distances their decoration from the hierarchical model so eloquently presented by Otto Demus in his *Byzantine Mosaic Decoration*; his study was based primarily on churches with domes or at least aisles, and did not encompass the simple rectangular interior spaces of churches such as those in Kastoria.

One general question then to be raised with this material is the extent to which the Demus model still holds when the architecture is so very different from that of the monuments on which his study was based. Does his hierarchy of images still prevail, if there is no dome, no centralized plan, no place up there for the all-seeing Pantokrator? Does the decoration of these churches attempt to accommodate what we might call the “imperial” model, the church as cosmos, or was a quite different model being developed for these far simpler architectural settings over the course of the 12th to the 14th centuries? And, since this roundtable is devoted to saints, how do the images of saints in particular fit in to all this?

I will have to ignore here the churches in Kastoria that were repainted or rebuilt over time, and concentrate on those that appear to have been frescoed at roughly the same time as the construction of the church itself. I will also ignore to some extent a discussion of the choices of saints, even if they are interesting for their local reference (for example, Saints Achilleios, Gregory Palamas, Nicholas *ho neos*), or for their mysterious identity (Elpidios) or curious iconography (for example, Ioulitta and her son Kerykos with Kerykos pointing to his own eyes or head). I will forego another potentially rich line of inquiry as well, namely how the decoration of later churches may have been responding to that of the early ones. My paper will be limited to a discussion of the role of the saints in general in the type of churches represented by the monuments of Kastoria.
I shall start with the richly frescoed church of Saint Nicholas tou Kasnitze, painted, it is thought, toward the end of the 12th century. It is a single-aisled church, with a narthex to the West, and a rounded apse to the East, but no other subsidiary spaces. There are entrances from the West, through the narthex, and through the North wall at its Western end. The roof is flat and timbered.

The walls of the naos are divided horizontally into three zones, albeit with some irregularities. In the lowest zone are full-length standing saints that include the Anargyroi or healing saints on the far West wall, warriors on the side walls, and ecclesiastics clustered at the East in the bema and apse. Two images painted on a very much larger scale than any of the others break up this horizontal sequence: the wall icon of Saint Nicholas at the East end of the South wall, and, in a comparable position on the East end of the North wall, the somewhat less emphasized figure of the seated Christ.

The second zone on the North and South walls is occupied by busts of martyrs, unframed and, though busts, painted to the same scale as the standing figures below. Prominent among these are the so-called Holy Five, who occupy the whole South wall down to the huge wall icon of Saint Nicholas to the East. In the bema, the martyrs of the second zone become the busts of bishops.

The third and uppermost Feast scene zone runs above the heads of all these figures, starting with the Annunciation at the apse and running along the South, West and North walls before returning to the West wall for the scene of the Koimesis of the Virgin. Because of the nature of the roof, both ends have pediments of similar shape, allowing here for the insertion of the Deesis at the East, and the Ascension at the West.

A quick review of what is missing here may be revealing. There being no dome, there is no bust of the Pantokrator, nor do we find the angels or prophets that usually accompany Him. In fact, the Old Testament is barely acknowledged, and even the Four Evangelists are absent. It is not that the expected themes of the central area in a domed church have been relegated to some new location: they have simply been omitted. Also missing are the monks: there is not a single male monastic figure to be found anywhere in this church: the monks who often occupy the West wall have been replaced here by six Anargyroi. There are no women saints here either, except in the narthex (where, however, there are plenty). There are no strictly liturgical compositions outside the apse. The principle of uninterrupted horizontal zones, encouraged by the architecture, allows for little digression.

As we have seen, the line of standing saints on the lower zone on the South wall, and the line of martyr busts on the zone above, both stop at the so-called wall icon of Saint Nicholas at the East end of the wall, right before the templon. Saint Nicholas, the patron saint of the church, is not only is way out of scale with the other figures, but also stands in a different physical space than they do: he occupies a niche that is quite deeply recessed into the South wall. Opposite him, on the North wall, is the figure of Christ seated under a painted trilobed arch. Unlike Nicholas, Christ is on the same plane as all the other figures. The figure of Christ is perhaps a kind of substitution for the missing Pantokrator, albeit far more approachable; at any rate, he foreshadows the Deesis composition that will regularly occupy this very position in churches of the 14th century. But it is Saint Nicholas who is given a setting that almost gives the viewer the impression that the saint is physically entering the church through a door in the wall. It is easy to see how this concept of the space-inhabiting patron saint could have led to its replacement by an actual three-dimensional carving such as the wooden Saint George in a comparable position at Omorphokklesia just outside Kastoria.
The warriors, by contrast, who turn very slightly to face each other two by two, reinforce the solid wall behind them. Their backs to the wall, arms at the ready, they form a powerful phalanx to prevent any potential enemy from the North or South from penetrating the side walls of the church. The healers on the West wall act in a similar fashion, united to keep disease at bay and outside the sacred space. Together, these saints form a powerful barrier, a wall of defense against the outside world. The walls of the narthex are almost entirely occupied by the figures of standing female saints, who themselves form a sort of outer shield around the room, presumably to protect the women whose space this was. In a domed church, the warriors and other saints are more isolated from each other, painted on separate piers or in vaults or under arches or on odd bits of wall, and lack this tight-knit defensive solidarity.

Let us return now to the naos, and to the second zone, the zone of the busts of martyrs. Though painted on the same scale as the standing figures below, they are entirely frontal and do not relate to each other in any visible way. Yet they too are bound together, if in a different fashion: the five busts on the South wall constitute a single set of martyrs, the so-called Holy Five, the Five Martyrs of Sebaste, who are celebrated together on the same day of the year, November 13. The North wall has comparable groups: the Holy Three, Gourias, Samonas and Abibos, celebrated together on November 15, and a pair, Phloros and Loros. While the saints below, the warriors and the Anargyroi, are grouped according to their profession, these saints are bound by their common story, by their fellowship in martyrdom, into a cohesive unit whose protective function is thereby made comparable to that of the line of warriors below.

If we jump now to the late 14th century, to a church of similar architecture but even smaller scale, such as Saint Athanasios tou Mouzaki or Saint George tou Bouou, we can see that these organizational principles have been further developed and refined. There are still tree zones of decoration, but they are now more strictly differentiated: there are fewer saints on the lower walls, and they are on a considerably larger scale with respect to the rest of the decoration. On the North and South walls, the saints are again pretty well limited to warriors, although Saint Nicholas is added sometimes, or the hermit Onouphrios if the church is the katholikon of a monastery. The importance of the Anargyroi is reduced: they no longer line the West wall but now join the middle zone where they appear only as busts in the company of the martyrs. The West wall contains the figures of Constantine and Helen flanking the cross, and of the archangel Michael, there to keep unbelievers or any other illegitimate intruders from entering the naos from the West. There are still no women here, except the occasional female martyr among the many busts, and, in a church that lacks a narthex or other space for women visitors, the figure of Barbara appears in the very Northwest corner of the church, presumably an indication of where the women would be standing.

The line of standing saints on the South wall ends once again with a large wall icon of the patron saint of the church: Athanasios in the church of Saint Athanasios tou Mouzaki of the early 1380s or George in the church of Saint George tou Bouou dated 1400. In the latter, the saint again occupies a three-dimensional space, a niche recessed into the wall. Facing the patron saint now is the Deesis: a large seated figure of Christ flanked by the Virgin and John the Baptist. The Virgin often holds her Paraklesis scroll, the one in which she appeals to Christ to have mercy on mankind. The patron saint depicted on the opposite wall of the church would seem to be part of this composition, with its overtones of the Last Judgment: he appears to participate in the appeal to
Christ from across the nave of the church. Behind John the Baptist, on the North wall of the bema, is a new composition, that of Peter of Alexandria's vision of Christ with the torn tunic, a reference to the proper celebration of the Eucharist and about the only composition with strictly liturgical reference in these churches outside the apse itself.

The martyrs on the second zone are no longer free-standing busts but now small-scale figures tightly enclosed in dozens of medallions; as they encircle the church, their content may change – in the bema area, martyrs are replaced by bishops - but the medallion form remains the same. Eventually all the medallions will be embedded in a uniform matrix of ornament, the frames even looped together.

Like the Holy Five at Saint Nicholas tou Kasnitze, the band contains coherent groups of associated martyrs, such as the Holy Three Gourias, Samonas and Abibos, or the five unpronounceable martyrs led by Akindynos, plus pairs such as Sergius and Bacchus, Ioulitta and her son Kerykos, etc. There seem to be no calendar implications or reason for the choice of these particular martyrs other than the fact that they coalesce into groups that are celebrated on the same day of the church year; their common story in each case serves to bind certain numbers of these medallions together, to form closely knit, cohesive sections within the long protective band that they establish around the walls of the church.

This kind of church decoration was of course not peculiar to Kastoria. But it does fit well with the character of the city, as analyzed so carefully by Evgenia Drakopoulou and others. A considerable distance even from Thessalonike, Kastoria was governed by a bewildering succession of rulers: Bulgarians, Byzantines, Normans, Serbs and Albanians all had their turn before the arrival of the Ottomans in the late 14th century. But none of these rulers ever put down very deep roots, with the possible exception of the pretender to the Serbian throne, Symeon Uroš, in the 1350s, and the Albanian Mouzaki family in the 1380s. The noble men and women of Kastoria seem to have managed quite well without a clear center of authority, without the presence in their midst of any kind of royal court that might conceivably have inspired a revival of the old centralized model of church decoration. Their churches were private affairs, closed in on themselves, distinguished with difficulty from private houses even today. The church interior was not seen primarily as a reflection of the cosmos, but simply as a place of safety and sanctuary where the liturgy could be performed. What counted was that the simple rectangular space was secure for worship, its doors guarded and its walls rendered impermeable by the saints that formed an inner line of defense; that there was a place for the patron saint to present the founder's case, and that of the faithful, to Christ, and a place for the liturgy to proceed without external threat. The program of decoration was reduced to the essentials both spatially and theologically, and excluded complex liturgical, monastic or even funerary themes. Simple as it was, though, the program was legible and coherent, and perhaps as well suited to its architectural setting and function as were the grand mosaic programs of the 11th century to theirs.
Les martyrs de Sirmium, Singidunum et Ulpiana dans l’hagiographie et l’iconographie byzantines et serbes

L’attention portée au choix et à l’emplacement des saints dans le décor des églises serbes s’observe dès l’église de la Vierge du monastère de Studenica. Les saints particulièrement vénérés, tels Étienne, protecteur de la dynastie, Nicolas, Jean-Baptiste, Sabas le Sanctifié, protecteur et modèle monastique de Sava Nemanjić, les saints militaires, notamment Georges et Démétrius, sont représentés au registre inférieur auprès de la figure du souverain ou du commanditaire, ou à proximité du sanctuaire. La présence de saints moines s’explique par des raisons historiques et religieuses : Barlaam et Joasaph à Studenica, Mileševa et Gračanica - saint Sava est, comme Joasaph, né prince et devenu moine - Boris et Gleb à Mileševa, rappel de l’amour fraternel liant les fils de Stephan le Premier Couronné, Radoslav et Vladislav, ou encore l’évêque Astius et le diacre Isaurus dans l’abside des Saint-Âpôtres de Peć.

Mais nous voudrions examiner de plus près aujourd’hui l’hagiographie et l'iconographie de saints moins connus : les saints martyrs de trois villes romaines, Sirmium (Šremska Mitrovica), Singidunum (Belgrade) et Ulpiana qui, durant le Moyen Âge, faisaient partie ou étaient très proches de l’État serbe. Il s’agit de l’évêque Irénée de Sirmium, des martyrs Hermyle et Stratonice de Singidunum et de Flore et Laure d’Ulpiana dont la présence dans les décors monumentaux est modeste malgré de nombreux récits hagiographiques et la vénération de leurs reliques à Constantinople. En raison du nombre limité des leurs représentations, ni l'iconographie de saint Irénée ni celle des saints Hermyle et Stratonice n’ont fait l’objet d’études particulières, ce qui explique pourquoi le martyre de saint Irénée dans le Ménologe illustré de Dečani n’avait pas été reconnu jusqu’à présent. Notre objectif est de reconstituer les routes de translations de leurs reliques, d’examiner leurs dossiers hagiographiques dans les traditions grecque et slave et leurs représentations dans l’art byzantin et serbe.

Avec les réformes administratives de Dioclétien, Sirmium devint le siège du gouverneur de la Pannonia Secunda. Vingt-deux martyrs de Sirmium sont connus par leur nom et plusieurs sont anonymes. Parmi eux se trouve un diacre du nom de Démétrios qui fut martyrisé à Sirmium trois jours après Irénée, comme en témoignent le martyrologe syriaque et l’héronymien. Seuls deux de ces martyrs sont fêtés par l’Église byzantine : le saint évêque Irénée et sainte Anastasie. Le dossier hagiographique ainsi que l'iconographie de sainte Anastasie ayant été amplement étudiés, nous n’examinerons que ce qui concerne saint Irénée.

Irénée, premier évêque de Sirmium historiquement attesté, a été victime de la persécution du gouverneur Probus en 304. Malgré les prières de sa famille, notamment de sa femme et de ses enfants, il refusa de sacrifier et fut condamné à la décapitation. Les restes de son corps furent jetés dans la Save et le cadavre de l’évêque martyr de Sirmium n’a été ni rejeté par le fleuve ni récupéré par la communauté chrétienne de Sirmium. Selon Hippolyte Delehaye, la passion de saint Irénée est issue des Actes du martyr et sa valeur historique est plus importante que celle des passions des autres saints de Pannonie. De nombreuses versions en latin (BHL 4466) - une quarantaine, dont...
la plus ancienne du VIIIe siècle - aussi bien qu'en grec (BHG 948-951) affirment que l'évêque de Sirmium était connu en Occident et en Orient au cours du Moyen Âge. La plus ancienne Vita du saint Irénée en slavon se trouve dans Codex Suprasliensis (Retkov sbornik), qui contient vingt-quatre vitae des saints du mois du mars, compilées à la fin du Xe ou au début du XIe siècle à Preslav. Dans le martyrologe syriaque et dans le martyrologe hiéromymien, la fête de saint Irénée est le 6 avril, comme dans la plupart des autres calendriers et martyrologes latins. La date du 25 ou 26 mars, qui apparaît également en tant que dies natalis de saint Irénée, est le résultat d’une confusion entre les ides et les calendes du calendrier romain (VIII id. apr). Dans la tradition byzantine et slave, le saint est également célébré le 23 août, le même jour que saint Irénée de Lyon.

Le développement du culte de saint Irénée à Sirmium et dans les environs n’est pas encore totalement éclairci. Une des six églises trouvées à Sirmium, celle qui est située dans la nécropole nord-est de la ville, du IVe siècle, a été consacrée au saint évêque Irénée, comme le confirme une inscription en latin. Un deuxième site mis en relation avec le culte du saint a été identifié dans le cimetière romain situé sur la rive gauche de la Save, où les fouilles archéologiques ont mis au jour les vestiges de trois églises médiévales (Xe-XVe), successivement construites au-dessus d’une structure paléochrétienne du milieu du IVe siècle. Bien que vraisemblable, l’identification du bâtiment paléochrétien avec le martyrium de saint Irénée reste du domaine de l’hypothèse.

Alors que, devant les invasions barbares, des reliques de saints des villes pannoniennes et dalmates furent enlevées et translatées, notamment à Rome (par exemple saint Quirin de Siscie, saints Domnio et Anastase de Salone, saint Maure de Parenzo, Quatre Saints Couronnés de Sirmium) ou à Constantinople (sainte Anastasie), on ne dispose d'aucune donnée concernant celles de saint Irénée. Théophylacte d’Ohrid (Historia martyrii xv martyrum), au XIe siècle, affirme que le lieu du culte de saint Irénée était très célèbre pour les miracles qui s’y produisaient, mais ce bref passage, qui raconte des événements relatifs au règne de Boris 1er de Bulgarie (852-889), ne confirme point la présence des reliques du saint à cet endroit.

Les représentations de saint Irénée sont très rares. En fait, on n’en connaît que deux, ou peut-être trois au total. Une miniature représentant le martyr se trouve dans ménologe impérial du musée historique d’État de Moscou (Syn. gr. 183), daté en 1034-1041. L’illustration pour le 26 mars, dies natalis de saint Irénée, suit littéralement le texte : un bourreau jette le corps décapité du saint dans la rivière où sa tête flotte déjà. Une représentation très similaire à celle de Moscou, non reconnue jusqu’à présent, se voit à Dečani (1345-1347). Là aussi la scène fait partie du ménologue, mais le martyr de saint Irénée illustre la date du 23 août. La confusion entre le saint évêque Irénée de Sirmium et le célèbre évêque homonyme de Lyon ne permet pas d’identifier avec certitude le saint représenté ([ΚΓ(argc)/ὁ ἁγιος] Ίρηναιος) dans le ménologue de Treskavac (1334-1343).

À la liste des martyrs de Sirmium, qui ont péri au début de la grande persécution, sur l’ordre de gouverneur Probus, s’ajoutent le prêtre Montan et sa femme Maxima, qui s’étaient enfuis de Singidunum (Belgrade), ville de la Mésie supérieure, vers la Pannonie. Ils ne sont célébrés ni par l’Église grecque ni par l’Église serbe. Si leurs noms manquent dans les anciens martyrologes, deux autres martyrs de Singidunum sont connus : le diacre Hermyle et son geôlier Stratonice. Leur dossier hagiographique, qui contient plusieurs récits en grec et en latin (BHG 774z, 774y-775b ; BHL 3858b), est de valeur historique douteuse. Une fois dénoncé comme chrétien, le diacre Hermyle refusa d’adorer les idoles et fut soumis aux tortures. Devant ces supplices, Stratonice, son geôlier,
fut gagné par la foi. Les deux martyrs, enveloppés ensemble dans un filet, ont été jetés au fond du Danube. Trois jours après, leurs corps ont été retrouvés sur le bord du fleuve et déposés par les fidèles dans un endroit situé à dix-huit stades de Singidunum. Selon leur passion, l'événement a eu lieu sous l'empereur Licinius, ce qui a incité Jacques Zeiller à situer leur martyre entre 308 et 311, alors que Métaphraste le place en 300. Les seules données historiques fiables sont les noms des martyrs et la localisation de leur sanctuaire aux environs de Singidunum, mais on ignore l'endroit exact de leur sépulture primitive.

À une date inconnue, leurs reliques ont été transférées à Constantinople. Autour de l'an 1200, Antoine de Novgorod a vu leurs chefs dans l'autel de Sainte-Sophie, où elles se trouvaient avec celles de saint Pantéléimon, du saint apôtre et évêque Codrat et du patriarche Germain. Le Typicon de la Grande Église confirme que les deux saints jouissent d'une certaine célébrité à Constantinople, où les synaxes des saints Hermyle et Stratonice étaient célébrées le 13 janvier, jour de leur fête principale, à l'oratoire de Saint-Michel-Archange τῆς Ὀξείας et le 1er juin en divers sanctuaires de la capitale.

François Halkin a montré que leur hagiographie grecque a été rédigée au VIe siècle ou même plus tôt (BHG 744z). Issu de cette Passion, un long panégyrique narratif (BHG 774y) est préservé uniquement dans un manuscrit du Xe siècle (Parisinus grec 1449) contenant le ménologe de la première moitié de janvier. En revanche, la version métaphrastique de leur Passion (BHG 745) se trouve dans plusieurs copies. Dès le XIIe siècle, les deux saints apparaissent dans la littérature hagiographique slave, dans l'Évangile du prince Mstislav de Novgorod (1103-1117) et dans le Ménée d'Ohrid.

La première représentation attestée des deux saints est d'origine constantinopolitaine. Elle se trouve dans le Ménologe de Basile II (Cod. Vat. gr. 1613, f. 314), où est représenté le supplice final de Hermyle et Stratonice. Cette représentation est copiée dans le ménologe impérial de Michel IV le Paphlagonien (1034-1041), aujourd'hui à Baltimore (Baltimoreiensis Walters Art Mus. 521, fol. 88r), qui contient une version abrégée de la Passion des deux martyrs (BHG 745b). Dans les autres ménologes illustrés des XIe ou XIIe siècles, les deux saints sont figurés en martyrs (Sinai, gr. 512, fol. 2v ; Vatican, gr. 1156, fol. 294v ; Marciana, gr. Z 585, fol. 54v), tandis que le Ménologe du despote Démétrios (1320-1344) reprend le modèle des manuscrits impériaux (Bodleian, MS Gr. th. f. 1, fol. 24v).

À la différence des martyrs susnommés qui ont subi le martyre lors des persécutions du début du IVᵉ siècle, Flore et Laure, frères jumeaux, chrétiens depuis l'âge plus tendre, ont péri sous l'empereur Hadrien. Selon leur Passion, c'est à Byzance que les deux frères sont devenus maçons. Une fois leurs maîtres, Proclus et Maximus, martyrisés, Flore et Laure ont quitté Byzance pour Ulpiana. Là, après avoir mis une croix sur un temple païen qu'ils avaient construit, ils furent condamnés et enterrés vivants dans un puits profond. L'indication de Byzance comme lieu où ils résidèrent ainsi que la tradition qui voulait que leurs reliques aient été transférées d’Ulpiana dans la nouvelle capitale par Constantin le Grand lui-même ont largement contribué à la dévotion particulière dont les deux saints ont joui à Constantinople. Le moment précis où leurs reliques furent translatées à Constantinople et l'endroit exact où elles furent déposées jusqu'à leur élévation ne sont pas connus. Ulpiana est l'une des villes illyriennes qui fut soumise aux assauts des Goths sous Théodoric, probablement en 473/474. Procope nous apprend que pendant le tremblement de terre de 518 les remparts ont été endommagés à tel point qu'il a été nécessaire de les abattre et que Justinien a reconstruit la ville la nommant Justiniana Secunda. Les fouilles archéologiques, qui ont récemment repris, apportent de nouvelles données pouvant être mises en relation avec le culte de Flore et Laure, notamment la découverte du baptistère et de la basilique.

On ne connaît pas de récits hagiographiques grecs concernant ces deux saints qui soient antérieurs au Xᵉ siècle (BHG 660-664m), ni de versions slaves avant le XIᵉ. Le plus ancien témoignage de la présence du culte des saints Flore et Laure dans la capitale de l'Empire date d'environ 900. Leur synaxe était célébrée le 18 août dans leur martyrium, près de Saint-Philippe, où avaient été déposées leurs reliques, comme le confirme Antoine de Novgorod. D'après le Synaxaire de Constantinople, la synaxe des deux saints était également célébrée dans le monastère du Pantocrator, parce que leurs reliques (τὰ ἅγια αὐτῶν λείψανα) y avaient été transférées, vraisemblablement sous le règne de Jean II Comnène (1118-1143). Il s'agit plutôt d'une partie de leurs reliques, probablement leurs chefs, qu’Étienne de Novgorod y vit vers le milieu du XIVᵉ siècle.

Du Xᵉ siècle date aussi la représentation en émaux ornant le pied d'un calice en sardonyx, aujourd'hui au trésor de la basilique de Saint-Marc à Venise ; une inscription mentionnant l'empereur Romanos permet de dater le calice du règne de Romanos 1er Lekapenos (920-944) ou de celui de Romanos II (959-963). Le culte des saints Flore et Laure était bien implanté à Constantinople, où la construction des églises où leurs reliques étaient déposées a été attribuée, selon des auteurs relativement tardifs, à Constantin. La présence de saints Flore et Laure sur le calice impérial, parmi d'autres saints particulièrement vénérés à Constantinople, témoigne de l’importance de leur culte dans la capitale, notamment dans le milieu impérial.

Dès le XIᵉ siècle, les deux saints d’Ulpiana font partie du chœur des martyrs représenté dans de nombreuses églises byzantines et, dans la plupart des cas, figurés en médaillons. À la différence de leurs images sur le calice de Venise, Flore et Laure sont figurés jeunes et imberbes, la croix du martyre à la main. En tant que jeunes martyrs, ils sont représentés dans les églises serbes dès le XIIIᵉ siècle. Leur place dans le programme décoratif n'est pas fixe : ils se situent dans le naos, dans la zone centrale ou occidentale, aussi bien que dans le narthex, de préférence dans les registres supérieurs des murs ou aux intrados des arcs et sont généralement représentés en buste ou en médaillons. À Žiča, ils se trouvent, en buste, au deuxième registre - l’un sur le pilastre sud-ouest au-dessus de saint Nicolas et l’autre sur le pilastre opposé, au-dessus de la figure du Jean Baptiste. À Mileševa (1220-1228), les médaillons des deux saints se font face au-dessus des arcs du transept, tandis qu’aux

***

En conclusion : établi dans sa ville natale dès l‘époque paléochrétienne, le culte de saint Irénée, après un hiatus de plusieurs siècles dû aux invasions barbares et à l‘installation des Slaves dans les Balkans, s‘est perpétué à Sirmium tout au long du Moyen Âge. Bien que son hagiographie ait été présente en grec comme en slave, son iconographie se limite à l‘image de son martyre à Dečani. La translation à Constantinople des reliques de Hermyle et Stratonice de Singidunum, et de celles de Flore et Laure d‘Ulpiana, probablement au Ve siècle, a contribué au développement de leur culte à Byzance et, par l‘intermédiaire de Byzance, en Serbie. L‘absence de reliques et de sanctuaires in situ a provoqué un oubli presque entier de leur mémoire, d‘où a résulté le changement d‘identité du diacre Hermyle. Flore et Laure ont joui d‘une vénération particulière dans le milieu impérial, alors qu‘en Serbie médiévale, la mémoire de ces martyrs locaux n‘était pas fortement présente. Bien que le territoire d‘Ulpiana ait fait partie de l‘état serbe et que les ruines de la ville aient été à proximité du siège épiscopal de Gračanica, il n‘existait ni églises ni chapelles qui leur soient consacrées.
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The Crime of High Treason in the Syntagma of Blastares

The discipline of high treason was included in the Hexabiblos of Konstantinos Armenopoulos and in Matthew Blastares’ Syntagma. Both compilations can be considered very relevant in Byzantine legal history, not only for their juridical contents, but also because of their diffusion and use in the Ottoman Empire, after the collapse of the Eastern Roman Empire. Furthermore the syntagma was translated and adopted in several countries of the Eastern Europe, such as Wallachia, Moldova, Russia, Bulgaria, and Georgia.

The 14th century was the last flourishing period in the Byzantine legal history and together with the Prochiron auctum (1300 ca.) the two compilations above mentioned, were the last important juridical texts. Both were redacted in the first part of the century. The paper is focused on the crime of high treason in the Syntagma of Blastares and on the reception of Greek-roman law discipline in Serbia.

The Σύνταγμα κατὰ στοιχεῖον of Matthew Blastares was a nomokanon alphabetically arranged, redacted like a juridical encyclopaedia in 1334-1335. The laws regulating a specific subject were included in a chapter (κεφάλαιον), which was introduced by a rubric. The rubrics of the Syntagma gave a systematic classification and definition for the juridical contents and were more practical for the consultation and understandable. Each chapters was composed of excerpts of canon law, followed by texts of civil law, thus kanones (canons) and nomoi (laws). The juridical work was composed of 303 chapters and in consequence of that, many juridical matters were disciplined.

The criminal matters were not grouped under the same title, as for instance in the 39th chapter of the Prochiron, Περὶ ποινῶν, but they followed the alphabetic order.

The texts about people who joined the enemy were grouped in the chapter Περὶ προδοτῶν (De proditoribus), composed of the texts of Proch. 39.1 / Eisag. 40.1, Proch. 39.3 / Eisag. 40.3, Proch 39.10 / Eisag. 40.12, and Proch. 39.17 / Eisag. 40.20.

1 The reception of the Syntagma among the Serbs, as well as among other populations in Eastern Europe between the 14th and 17th century has been the subject of a monograph published by Alexandrov. V. Alexandrov, The Syntagma of Matthew Blastares: the destiny of a Byzantine legal code among the Orthodox Slavs and Romanians, 14-17 centuries, Frankfurt am Main 2012.
6 Proch 39.1- Eisag. 40.1’’Ο ἐρεθίζων τοὺς πολεμίους ἢ παραδίδοντος πολεμίους ύπαρμαίους κεφαλικὰς κολάζεται”; Proch. 39.3 – Eisag. 40.3 : ”Τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ῥωμαίων πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους ἀποφεύγοντας ὡς πολεμίους ἔξεστιν ἀκινδύνως φονεύειν”; Proch 39.10- Eisag
Encouraging the enemy into bringing war against the Byzantine state and favouring the joining of the enemy, were punished with the death penalty. The killing of the soldiers who abandoned the imperial army was authorized and they could be killed without any juridical consequences ("ἀκινδύνως"). The ones who deserted and revealed military plans or information to the enemy were condemned to be hanged at stake or burned, as well as the death penalty was inflicted for the crime of giving instruction in the art of ship buildings.

Any conspiracy or attack to the person of the emperor was obviously repressed through the death penalty and, as in Roman law, the culprit was also subjected to accessory sanction of the confiscation of his goods ("δημεύεται").

Between the text of Proch. 39.1 / Eisag. 40.1 and Proch. 39.3 / Eisag. 40.3, Blastares included an excerpt which was not part of the Eisagoge, neither of the Prochiron, nor of the Basilika. This chapter approximated to the status of enemy, people helping latrones in pursuing their activities, providing a harsher penalty ("μᾶλλον κολάζονται") as a consequence of the fact that these activities were considered more dangerous ("χαλεπωτέρα") than an open conflict: the author referred to the contents of Peri prodotôn, which provided the honorum publication as accessory sanction:

Περὶ προδοτῶν: [...] Οἱ δὲ κατὰ χέρσυν ἢ θάλασσαν τοῖς λῃστεύουσι συλλῃτεύσαντες, τῶν φανερῶν πολεμίων μᾶλλον κολάζονται, δῶς καὶ τοῦ φανεροῦ πολέμου ή ἀφανῆς ἐπιβουλή χαλεπωτέρα καθέστηκε [...] 9.

Furthermore, sacrilege was equalised to the crime of lèse majesté in the chapter Περὶ ἱερῶν σκευῶν καὶ ἱεροσυλίας and, according to the chapter Ὄτι βασιλέα ὑβρίζειν οὐ δεῖ, laesa maiestas was repressed through the death penalty with the sword, as for the crime of conspiracy:

Ὅτι βασιλέα ὑβρίζειν οὐ δεῖ: [...] Οἱ καθοσίωσι πλημμελῶν, ἢτοι φατρίας κατὰ βασιλέως ξίφει τιμωρείσθω [...] 10.

People conspiring against the state were subjected to the lex maiestatis ("τῷ τῆς καθοσιώσεως ὑποκειται ἐγκλήματι"), like people furnishing help to the enemy with arms, troops, materials, money or in any other way, and people delivering some stronghold to the enemy:

Περὶ τῶν συνωμοσίας, ἢ φατρίας, ἢ στάσεις ποιοῦντων: [...] Ὁ συνωμοσίαν κατὰ τῆς πολιτείας παρασκεμάσα γενέσται [...] ἢ παρασκευάσας αὐτὸν βοηθήθηναι πλήθει [...] τῷ τῆς καθοσιώσεως ὑποκειται ἐγκλήματι [...].

The supreme penalty was massively imposed, in accordance with the tradition of Byzantine law. If in some cases Roman law provided the acqua et igni interdictio, Byzantine law was severer

7 In Byzantine law the term κεφαλικῶς indicated the supreme penalty and it could not be considered to be the loss of status, that is to say the capitis deminutio, provided in Roman law
8 Proch. 39.38-Eisag. 40.40: "Ὁ διδάσκων τοὺς βαρβάρους ναῦς κατασκευάζειν, κεφαλικῇ τιμωρίᾳ ὑποκειται".
9 On the proditio ad hostes see also: Ekl. 17.53: "Ὁ αὐτόμολοι ἤτοι εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους προστρέχοντες ἐξεῖ τιμωρεῖσθωσαν"; Proc. 39.19-Eisag. 40.22: "Ὅι πολέμοι καὶ οἱ πρὸς αὐτοὺς αὐτομολοῦντες ἐξεῖ τιμωρεῖσθωσαν".
10 On conspiration see also: “Ε. 17.3: Ὁ κατὰ βασιλέως φατριάζων ἢ βουλευόμενος ἢ συνωμοσίας κατ’ αὐτοῦ ἢ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν χριστιανῶν ποιῶν τὸν μὲν τοιούτον ἁμαθείως κατὰ τὴν ὀρθὰν ἑαυτοκτόνησιν καθὼς καὶ τὸν πολέμος κατέλησαν, ἀλλ’ ἵνα μὴ διεσώσωσαν τὸν πολέμος προστασίαν ἐξεῖ τιμωρεῖσθωσαν, ἢ τῆς βασιλείας ἑλάθησαν, δέον τὸν τοιούτον κατὰ τὸν τόπον ὑπὸ στερεάν παραφυλακὴν γίνεσθαι τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ τῷ βασιλείῳ ἀναφέρεσθαι καὶ καθὼς λοιπὸν αὐτὸς ἄνακριναι καὶ βουλεύεσθαι ποιεῖν".
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and there was no alternative to the supreme penalty. Criminal law was a distinguishing element of Byzantine law and the historiography has largely underlined its harshness, also because of the considerable presence of physical mutilations and punishments.\(^\text{11}\)

According to the byzantine tradition, the last book of the *Hexabiblos* of Konstantinos Armenopoulos contained penal law. The 8\(^{\text{th}}\) title of the 6\(^{\text{th}}\) book (Arm. 6.8.1-3,5-6) grouped these crimes under the rubric Περὶ αὐτομολῶν καὶ ἀνδραποδιστῶν, including the chapters extracted from Proch. 39.3,17,19,1,38,22, which were joined with an excerpt from the *Synopsis Basilicorum* 60.1.36. A text on the insult against the emperor and another one about the conspiracy against his person (extracted from Proch. 39.10), together with a chapter on exciting the sedition of soldiers (B. 57.1.9) were included in the 14\(^{\text{th}}\) title of the last book (Arm. 6.14.1-2, 6), Περὶ διαφορῶν ποινῶν.

Greek-roman law was received among the Slavs and the populations in the Eastern Europe. Immediately after the conversion to the Christianity (866) the Bulgarian prince Boris enacted the *Zakon sudnyj ljudem* (*The court law for the people*), which was based on the Isaurian Ekloge and in the following centuries Byzantine law was spread among all the new Christians. Also the Serbs received the Byzantine juridical texts. In 1219 Saint Sava redacted his *Nomokanon*, which included an integral translation of the *Prochiron* (§ 55). A Slav version of the *nomokanon* reached Russia as well Bulgaria, in the 13\(^{\text{th}}\) and 14\(^{\text{th}}\) century.

In Serbia this influence reached its apogee in the 14\(^{\text{th}}\) century. Serbian customary law was far different from Greek-roman law. The criminal system was based on the self-justice system, which started to be replaced with the pecuniary composition system after the foundation of the Nemanja monarchy (1217). The feud system was very dangerous for the public order and in consequence of that the compositions’ system was introduced. The adoption of Byzantine law was a further step, because the public repression and penalty system were introduced: new criminal matters were harshly repressed imposing physical punishments and mutilations, and the death penalty, which were unknown to the Serbian customary.

The Serbian king was crowned emperor and *autokrator* and in consequence of that, the discipline of high treason was actually needed in the new-born empire, which was based on the Byzantine political ideology. The Serbian *tsar* aspired to be the successor of the Byzantine *basileus* and decided to introduce a juridical system based on Greek-roman law in order to have a stronger legitimacy. Byzantine law was useful also for practical reasons, because the southern provinces of the empire were the former byzantine territories and the population had been using Byzantine law for many centuries.

The *Syntagma of Blastares* was integrally translated into Serbian language and in 1349 its abridged version was incorporated in the tripartite codification enacted by Stephan Dušan and became law in force in the Serbian-byzantine Empire, which had been founded three years before (1345-1346). Dušan’s legislation was composed of the *Abridged syntagma*, the code which holds the name of the Serbian emperor, and the so-called *Law of the emperor Justinian*, a short compilation – only 33 chapters – based on the *Nomos georgikos*, which regulated the agricultural relationships

---

between free peasants. The *Abridged syntagma* was the largest part of the imperial codification, and the two other parts were connected to it.\(^\text{12}\)

The *Syntagma* was translated and reduced, erasing the majority of canon law and preserving the *nomoi politikoi* (Царски закони), thus the secular laws about matrimonial law, criminal law and civil law in general. Only one third of the contents of the original version became part of the abridged one, because canon law was almost completely excluded. The crimes of treason, desertion, cooperation and sharing intelligence with the enemy - unknown to the Slav populations - were introduced in the Serbian juridical system and repressed according to Greek-roman law’s discipline.

The structure of the Byzantine state was transplanted, and the figure of the emperor was disciplined in the *Syntagma* at the chapter Β-5 *Περὶ βασιλέως* (О цар), according to the well-known texts of Eisagoge 3,1-11. The repression of the high treason was connected to the texts of B-5, which was included in the *Abridged syntagma*:

**Β-ε. Ο цари**

„Царъ весть закон нове представлетво, о животе благо въчелъ послушникомъ; ни же по пристрастю благотворе, ни же да взapoустрастът испоуче, ны противъ когохде добролдателъ обладающи, токоже ны въ подвигопослушникъ, почасти равно пода и не бысталъ благолданиа на вредъ друстымъ въкынимъ дароуе.

**Мысълъ весть царуо прѣбывающиа своихъ же и соштыхъ силь благотворъ хранене и оутврджене и погяхщихъ выдостоямъ присяляющъ бывшиите, и не ны въкынимъ прѣбывающъ и праведными цары и хироскиыми притежалие.**

**Концъ царуо весть благолданиа; тѣль же и благолдателъ благолдатъ се; и ныда отъ благолданиа изнеможетъ, мнить се погообьяша по древнихъ царскомъ начытане.**

**Нарочитъ въ православны и благочестиі ныхъ весть вѣсти царьъ, и въ рѣбени вожей прослюютъ.**\(^\text{13}, 14\)

The chapter *Ὅτι βασιλέα ὑβρίζειν οὐ δεῖ* was included in the chapter Αко цару не подобает досадити, while the chapter *Ο προδοτὰς* и *Περὶ τῶν συνωμόσιας* was composed of the dispositions of *Περὶ προδοτῶν* and *Περὶ τῶν συνωμοσίας*, ή φατρίας, ή στάσεις поиоийт̣ων̣:  

**Π κ.α. Ο предателъ и ненадринъ.**

„Пооштратѣнъ ратники на прѣдѣв ратниковъ православна главиа да томить се; а ныже ли по соцуоу ны по лоро йи госуоукиными госообяйше, иваныемъ ратникъ множае моучетъ се, елико и иваныемъ рати неиаваныемъ навѣтъ лютийнѣ вѣсть.

Иже отъ православныхъ къ ратникомъ отѣвращиа иако же и ратники лѣте вѣсть неазвѣдъ оживиать.


\(^{13}\) Matijev Vlastara Sintagmat, ed. S. Novaković, cit., pp. 127-128.

\(^{14}\) “*Rex est, legitima prefectura, omnium subditorum commune bonum; neque ex affectione benefaciens, nec ex odio puniens, sed ex acquo magistrium virtute, ut certaminis arbiter sua cuique praemia tribuens, nec nova beneficia in ali quorum damnum confren*. Scopus regis propositus est, vires quas habet clementia tueri et conservare, perditias indefessa cura reparare, eaque quas non habet prudentia justisque victorius expeditionibus quaderaere. Finis regis proponitur, omnibus beneficiare, quare et benefactoris nomine ornatur, ita ut si quando de beneficietia quidquam remiserit, ex antiquorum sententia adulteri videatur regis nota et character. Regem convenit rectam de Deo opinionem et pietatem defendere, et propter zelum pro religione praeclaram esse*. PG 144, cit., coll. 1109-1112.
In some cases, the texts were adapted to the Serbian context: "Iže оть православньіихь кь ратникомь отбэгшіихь 8ко же и ратникьі лэте 9стЬ безбђднђ ubivati" 17.

The words "ἐκ τῶν ῥωμαϊκῶν" ("from the Romans") were translated into the Serbian language as “оть православньіихь” (“from the Orthodox people”), in order to adapt the text to the exigencies of the Serbo-byzantine Empire, whose population was composed by the Serbian ethnic element and by the Greek ethnic one, which tended to reside in the southern provinces. The Byzantines generally referred to themselves with the term Romans (Ῥωμαῖοι), which was also preserved in the Byzantine juridical compilations, and as a consequence of that, it was necessary to change the text, to include the Slavic part of the population living in the northern part of the empire.

The crime of nev7ra (treason) was introduced in the Serbo-byzantine empire through the adoption of the Abridged syntagma and the dispositions of the Code of Dušan 1349-1354 were connected with the discipline provided in the Serbian version of Blastares’ syntagma18.

Code of Dušan § 51. Of Presenting a Son at Court. “And when a man shall present a son or brother at Court, the Tsar shall ask him: "Shall I trust him? " And he shall say: "Trust him as myself. And if he do any evil, let him pay who hath presented him. And if he should serve as others serve in the Tsar’s Palace, he shall himself pay if he do wrong"19.

Code of Dušan § 52. Of Treason. “For treason for any case brother shall not pay for brother, father for son, kinsman for kinsman, if they dwell separately in their own houses: he who hath not sinned shall not pay anything. Only shall he pay who hath sinned, he and his household”20, 21.

---

15 Matije Vlastara Sintagmat, ed. S. Novaković, cit., p. 468.
16 PG 145, cit., coll. 123-126: “Qui instigat romanos hostes aut in eorum manus prodit Romanos, capite plectitur. Qui vero in desertis locis, aut propter mare latronibus opitulantur, quam hostes aperti eo gravius punitur, quo clandestinae insidiae plus periculi ferunt quam apertum bellum. Qui a castris romanis ad hostes transeunt, tanquam hostes absque ullo discriminate occidere licet. Qui adversos salutem imperatoris aut imperii quidquam molitur aut meditatur, summum supplicium  ipse luit, et bona cedunt fisco. Qui ad hostem transfigiunt, et consilia nostra proidunt, stramulatione peruerunt”.
17 Cfr: Proch. 39.3/Eisag. 40.3: “Τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ῥωμαϊκῶν πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους ἀποφεύγοντας ὡς πολεμίους ἔξεστιν ἀκινδύνως φονεύειν”.
According to Serbian customary law, as it was also mentioned in chapter 71, the familiar liability was provided for treason: who had introduced one of his relatives into the tsar court was responsible in case of treason, if they were member of the same household:\(^\text{22}\):

*Code of Dušan § 71. Of the Crimes of Brothers.* “Whoso commit a crime, a brother or son or kinsman, who dwell in one house, all shall pay to the lord of the house, or hand over him who did the crime”\(^\text{23}\).

The member of the family was presented before the tsar, and the tsar asked if he could have been trusted, thus if he was a loyal member. In case of treason his relative was responsible because he was the guarantor.

The crime of treason (nev7ra) was mentioned in the chapter 52 for the people presented at the imperial court. The general discipline was contained in the *Syntagma of Blastares*. The criminal matter was not mentioned in the juridical monuments of the 13\(^{\text{th}}\) and 14\(^{\text{th}}\) century, enacted or granted by the Serbian rulers before Dušan’s reign. It is not possible to say whether the crime of treason was known or not to the Slav populations, but after the enactment of the tripartite codification, the crime became part of the juridical system. The Code of Dušan didn’t impose any sanction for treason because the crime was repressed through the death penalty in the *Abridged syntagma*, in full conformity with Greek-roman law.


Die Verschwörung des Jahres 562 gegen Justinian

Der Umstand, dass die scheinbar so glänzende Regierungszeit Justinians (527-565) auch ihre Schattenseiten hatte und dies von den Zeitgenossen durchaus auch gesehen und thematisiert wurde (bis hin zur Erwartung des drohenden Weltuntergangs), ist inzwischen längst bekannt und scheint in zunehmender Weise auch die aktuelle Forschung zu beschäftigen. Und dass die „autokratische“ Herrschaft Justinians nicht ohne Widerstand seitens verschiedener gesellschaftlicher Kräfte blieb, darf ebenfalls nicht vergessen werden; man braucht nur an den Nika-Aufstand des Jahres 532 zu erinnern.


In meiner Argumentation spielen die argentarii / ἀργυροπράται, die Banker der Spätantike eine nicht unwichtige Rolle. Am Ende der Regierungszeit Justinians (Ende 562) waren Vertreter dieser Gruppe maßgeblich an einem Mordversuch am alten Kaiser beteiligt. Deshalb sollen diese Zeilen sich mit dieser für die Wirtschaft, Finanzpolitik und Politik überhaupt so wichtigen Gruppe befassen.


 Wenige Jahre später griff Justinian das Thema der Organisation der ἀργυροπράται erneut im Ed.7 (a. 542) auf. Auch hier wird die korporative Organisationsform der ἀργυροπράται deutlich (z.B. Ed.7pr.: ... οἱ ἐν τῷ τῶν ἀργυροπρατῶν σωματείῳ usw.), wie auch im undatierten Ed.9. Nach Ed.9.6 war es den ἀργυροπράται möglich, in den Staatsschutz (στρατεία / militia) zu wechseln. Sie konnten sogar ihre Geldgeschäfte fortführen. Für das Jahr 541 ist ein ἀργυροπράτης bezeugt, der ein Hofamt ausübte. Der in einer als Papyrus erhaltenen Kreditquittung erwähnte ἀργυροπράτης Fl. Anastasios führte den Titel eines καστρησιανὸς τῆς θείας τραπέζης, vermutlich ein Posten ohne viele Pflichten. Auch sein Flaviernamen könnte auf eine Beziehung zum Kaiserhof deuten, allerdings ist dies nicht zwingend. Vermutlich hat er das Amt gekauft. Aus Ed.9.6pr. geht hervor, daß die ἀργυροπράται auch den illustris-Titel erwerben konnten, was trotz dessen Entwertung in justinianischer Zeit immer noch die Zugehörigkeit zur höchsten Rangklasse bedeutete. Sie konnten mithin einen hohen senatorischen Rang erreichen, was bemerkenswert ist.

 Die in der Literatur geäußerte Meinung, daß die ἀργυροπράται seitens der staatlichen Finanzbehörden für bestimmte Verwaltungsvorgänge eingesetzt wurden, ist mehr als wahrscheinlich. Besonders Vorsteher der Korporation der ἀργυροπράται (τῶν ἀργυροῦ τραπέζης προεστώτων - N.136.1.2.4; Ed.9.1.6) wurden auch in diesem Zusammenhang gesehen. Sie nahmen eine halbstaatliche Position ein und wurden u.a. bei der technischen Abwicklung der Steuerzahlungen des staatlichen und kaiserlichen wie des privaten Großgrundbesitzes eingeschaltet.


 Im November des Jahres 562 kam es zu einer Verschwörung gegen den Kaiser, an der ἀργυροπράται maßgeblich beteiligt waren. Ob die erwähnten staatlichen Zwangsanleihen dafür als Ursache oder Anlaß anzusehen sind, läßt sich zwar nicht exakt nachweisen, ist m.E. aber sehr wahrscheinlich.
Unsere Hauptquelle für diese Ereignisse ist das Geschichtswerk des Johannes Malalas, wobei hier besonders der Wortlaut der in den konstantinischen *Excerpta de insidiis* überlieferten Fragmente aus dem vollständigen Text zu beachten ist.

Als Verschwörer werden genannt: Ablabios ὁ κατὰ Μελτιάδην ὁ μελιστής (bzw. Μελτιάδου ἀπὸ μελιστῶν), Markellos ὁ ἀργυροπράτης (ὁ τῶν Κλίκων ὁ ἔχων τὸ ἐργαστήριον πλησίον τῆς ἁγίας Εἰρήνης τῆς ἁρχαίας καὶ νέας ὁ κατὰ Αἰθέριον τοῦ κουράτορα), Sergios ὁ ἀνεψιὸς τοῦ Αἰθέριον sowie der ἀργυροπράτης Eusebios. Hinzu kamen der ἀργυροπράτης Isaak, der ἀργυροπράτης Bitos und Paulos, der *optio* der Bucellarier des Belisar.


Und so wurde auch der Namen des ἀργυροπράτης Isaak (ὁ κατὰ Βελισάριον) bekannt, wie auch der des ἀργυροπράτης Bitos und der des Paulos, des *optio* der Bucellarier des Belisar. Damit war die Verbindung der Verschwörer zum greisen Belisar (geb. ca. 500) erwiesen.


Auch Paulos Silentiarios in seiner *Ekphrasis auf die Hagia Sophia* erwähnt das Ereignis:


Deutlich wird ein Geflecht von Verbindungen und Abhängigkeiten, die die ἀργυροπράται, also vermutlich die führenden Vertreter der Korporation, sehr reiche und mächtige Aristokraten sowie führende Staatsbeamte und den Hof umfaßte. Das verbindende Element war der Reichtum der ἀργυροπράται, der sie in die Politik führte.

Die Quellennachrichten, die auf dem ursprünglichen Malalas basieren, weichen voneinander ab. Diese Tabelle belegt das:

Excerpta de insidis, ed. de Boor, 173,30-175,18; Theoph. ed. de Boor, 237,15-238,18; Malalas, ed. Thurn 425-429 (XVIII.141)

Exc. de ins.

Theoph.

Io. Malalas

... τῇ δὲ κε´ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνὸς ἡμέρα σαββάτῳ ἑσπέρας ἐπιβουλὴν ἐμελέτησαν τινες ἐπὶ τῷ φονεύσαι τὸν βασιλέα Ἰουστινιανοῦ καθήμενον ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἑσπέρᾳ. οἱ δὲ τὴν αὐτῆν σκέψιν τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς μελετήσαντες ἤσαν οὗτοι Αβλάβιος ὁ κατὰ Μελτιάδον ὁ μελιστής, καὶ Μάρκελλος ὁ ἀγρυπρόπατης ὁ τῶν Κιλίκων ὁ ἔχον τὸ ἐργαστήριον πλησίον τῆς ἁγίας Εἰρήνης τῆς ἀρχαίας καὶ νέας ὁ κατὰ Αἰθέριον τὸν κουράτορα, καὶ Σέργιος ὁ ἀνεψι 

οὗτοι Αβλάβιος ὁ Μελτιάδου καὶ Μάρκελλος ὁ ἀγρυπρόπατης καὶ Σέργιος, ὁ ἀνεψι 

οὐκ εἰσὶν κατὰ τῷ ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ εἰς τῷ Ἀρμα, ἤνα γενομένη τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς ταραχὴν ποιήσωσιν. ὁ δ‵ αὐτὸς Αβλάβιος καὶ χρυσὸν ἔλαβε παρὰ Μαρκέλλου τοῦ ἀγρυπρόπατου λίτρας ν´ εἰς τὸ συνεργήσαι αὐτῷ. καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐδοκίσαντος ἐθάρρησεν ὁ Αβλάβιος Ἐσσερίω, τῷ ἀπὸ ὢπάτων ἢν λαβὼν καὶ χρυσὸν παρὰ Μαρκέλλου, περὶ τὰς πεντήκοντα τοῦ 

Μηνι νοεμβρίῳ ἱδικτιῶν καὶ ἐμελέτησαν δόλον τινὲς κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως Τουστινιανοῦ τοῦ φονεύσαι αὐτὸν, ὡς κάθηται ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ ἐν ἑσπέρᾳ. οἱ δὲ τὴν κείσειν τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς μελετήσαντες ἤσαν οὗτοι, Ἀβλάβιος ὁ Μελτιάδου καὶ Μάρκελλος ὁ ἀγρυπρόπατης καὶ Σέργιος, ὁ ἀνεψι 

τά τὸν ἑρματοσεριανὸν κατὰ τῶν Ινδοὺς καὶ κατὰ τὸν Ἀρχαγγέλου, ἢν, γενομένης τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπιβουλῆς, ταραχὴν ποιήσωσιν.
ὁ δὲ Αβλάβιος καὶ χρυσίον ἔλαβε παρὰ Μάρκελλον τοῦ ἀργυροπράτου περὶ τὰς ν’ τοῦ χρυσίου ἅλτρας εἰς τὸ συνεπαμύναι καὶ πάντως φονεύσας μετὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Μάρκελλον καὶ Εὐσεβίου τὸν βασίλεα. καὶ δὴ, τοῦ θεοῦ οὕτως εὐδοκησάντος, εἰς ἐκ αὐτῶν τῶν τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν μελετησάντων ὅνομα Αβλάβιος ἐθάρρησεν Ἐσεβίῳ τῷ ἀνθυπάτῳ καὶ κόμητι <τῶν> φοινικάτων καὶ Ιωάννη τῷ λογοθέτῃ τῷ κατὰ Δομεντιζιόλων τὴν αὐτὴν σκέψιν ὅτι:· ἐν ἑσπέρα βουλας ξόμοι ἐπιβήναι τῷ βασίλει καθημένην ἐν τῷ τρίκλινῳ. καὶ δὴ, γενομένης τῆς αὐτῆς σκέψεως, καὶ φανερωθήσεις τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς, εὐθίᾳ Μάρκελλος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης τῇ αὐτῇ ἐσπέρα, ἐν ἣ τὴν σκέψιν τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς ἔμελλον ποιεῖν, εἰσερχόμενος ἐν τῷ παλατίνῳ βουλαγήν, καὶ ὁ τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν φανερώσας Αβλάβιος ὁμοίως καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ σπαθίου. καὶ ὡς προγνωσθήσετε ἐκρατήθη Μάρκελλος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης ἐν τῷ τρίκλινῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ βουλαγίου, καὶ ἀργυροπράτης τοῦ προσδοκιμένου συσχέθηκε ἐναι ὡς ἐπερημητῆσαι, ἐπαγαγὸς ἐαυτῷ πληγὰς τρεῖς κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ βουγλίου ἀπέλθηνεν λαρυγγοτομής ἐαυτῶν.

Σέργιος δὲ ὁ ἀνευφωνέος Αἴθεριος δυνηθεὶς ἐκφυγεῖν προσφυγῆς ἐχρήσατο ἐν τῇ δεσποτὶ Ημῶν ἐν Βλαχέρναι, καὶ ἐκβιλβεῖς ἐκ τῶν ὀρῶν ἐξετάζωμεν κατέθετο, ὅτι καὶ Ἰσάκιος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης ὁντὶ κόμητι φοινικάτων, καὶ Ιωάννη τῷ λογοθέτῃ τῷ κατὰ Δομεντιζιόλων, λέγων, ὅτι· ἐν τῇ ἐσπέρᾳ ταύτη βουλομένη ἐπελθεῖν τῷ βασίλει.· ὁ δὲ μήνυτος τῷ βασίλει εἰρήκατοι αὐτῶς καὶ εὑρεῖς αὐτῶς φοροῦντας κρυπτὰ ἔξοψα. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀργυροπράτης Μάρκελλος ἀστοχήσας τοῦ προσδοκιμένου, σύρας ὁ ἐφόρει ἔφως δέωσεν ἑαυτῷ τρεῖς πληγὰς ἐν τῷ τρίκλινῳ συσχέθηκε καὶ τελεύτησε.·

Σέργιος τε, ὁ Αἴθεριος ἀνέχας, διαδράς προσφυγῆς ἐν Βλαχέρναι, ὅτι εὐθυγορομένως τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ εὐξεσάντας ἐπείσαν ὁμολογῆσαν, ὅτι Ἰσάκιος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης καὶ Βελίσαριος ὁ ἐνδοξοστότατος πατρίκιος καὶ αὐτὸς συνήδει τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἐπιβουλῇ, καὶ Βίτος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης καὶ Παύλος, ὁ οὐρανός αὐτοῦ τοῦ Βελίσαριος, ἐγινόσκον τὴν σκέψιν. καὶ συσχέθηκαν ἀμφιτέρως ἐκδοθεῖσαν ἐκρατίσκω τῷ ἐπάρχῳ, κατέθετο καὶ κατείπον Βελίσαριος τοῦ πατρικίου. αὐτὴν ὅτι ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐξετάζων ὑπὸ ἀγανάκτησαν Βελίσαριος· πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ φυγῇ ἐχρήσατο. καὶ τῇ ἑτὸς τοῦ Δεκεμβρίου μηνὸς ἐπίστολαν ὁ βασιλεὺς σελενίαν ἐνέγκας καὶ τὸν ἀγῶταν πατριάρχῃ Εὐστύχιον, κελεύσας ἀναγωγηθῆναι τῶν αὐτῶν καταθέσεις καὶ ἀκοόσας Βελίσαριος μεγάλος ἐβαρῆται καὶ γέγονεν ὑπὸ ἀγανάκτησαν τοῦ βασιλέως. καὶ πέμυσα ὁ βασιλεύς ἔλαβε πάντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτῶν ἐκάθισαν ἐν τῷ οἰκῷ αὐτοῦ παραφιλλαττόμενον.

Σέργιος δὲ ὁ ἀνευφωνέος Αἴθεριος προσφυγῆς ἐχρήσατο ἐν τῇ δεσποτῇ Ημῶν ἐν Βλαχέρναι, καὶ ἐκβιλβεῖς ἐκ τῶν ὀρῶν ὡς οικα τοῦ βασιλείου σκεψάμενος καὶ ἐξετάζως κατέθετο, ὅτι καὶ Ἰσάκιος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης ἐν τῇ Βελίσαριον τοῦ πατρικίου καὶ αὐτῶς σύνοιδε τῇ αὐτῇ ἐπιβουλῇ. καὶ Βίτος δὲ ὁ ἀργυροπράτης καὶ Παύλος ὁ ὑποστίων.
καὶ ἄμφιστροποί θυμήσατε καὶ ἐκδοθέντων ἔκτασισι. ἐπάρχον, ἐπάρχων πόλεως, συγκαθημένων αὐτῷ καὶ συνεξεταζόντων Κωνσταντίνου κοινώτατοι καὶ Ιουλιανὸς ἀντιγραφέως καὶ Ζηνοδώρου ἀσκηρήτης, ἐκλαμβάνοντος τὰς αὐτῶν ἀποκρίσεις, κατείπον Βελισσάριον τοῦ πατρικίου καὶ ἐκ τοῦτοῦ ὑπὸ ἀγάνακτησιν γέγονεν. ἄλλα δὲ τινές τῶν ξένουμασθέντων ὑπ’ αὐτῶν φυγῇ ἔχρησαντο.

καὶ τῇ πέμπτῃ τῆς δεκαμβρίου μηνὸς ὁ αὐτὸς Βασιλεὺς ποιήσας σελένιον κόμβην κελεύει πάντας τοὺς ἄρχοντας εἰσελθεῖν καὶ τὸν πατριάρχην Εὐστήχον καὶ τινας ἐκ τῶν σχολῶν· καὶ δεξάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ τρικλίνῳ πάντων συναγεθέντων ἔκελευσεν ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὰς καταθέσεις πάντων τῶν ἐξετασθέντων ἐνεκε τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπιβουλῆς, λέγω δὴ Σεργίου τοῦ ἄνεστου Αἰθερίου καὶ Εὐσεβίου τοῦ ἀργυροπράτου καὶ Παύλου τοῦ ὑποπτίωνος καὶ Βίτου. καὶ ἀνεγνώσθησαν αἱ καταθέσεις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐς αὐτῶν τῶν καταθέσεων ἥγανακτήθη ὁ πατρικιός Βελισσάριος καὶ πέμψας ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἐπῆρεν πάντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους Βελισσάριον, καὶ ἐν οὐδενὶ ἀντέστη ἡ αὐτῶς ἀνήρ. καὶ ὑπονοήσεις Κωνσταντίνος ὁ κοινώτατος καὶ Ιουλιανὸς ὁ ἀντιγραφέως, ὡς, φησίν, ὑπέρ Αἰθερίου ποιήσαντες, ὡς οἶα καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦ Αἰθερίου συνειδότος τῇ ἐπιβουλῇ· καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέρας ἔξι πάλιν ἐξητάθησαν οἳ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπιβουλὴν μελετήσαντες.
Angesichts dieser Quellenlage bleiben verschiedene Probleme offen: 1) Wer sollte an der Stelle Justinians zum Kaiser gemacht werden? 2) Wie erklärt sich die Rolle des Ablabios? 3) Wieso war die Strafe so milde?

Dieses Beispiel zeigt (leider) auch, dass es historische Fragestellungen gibt, auf die man keine Antwort zu geben vermag.
The Conspiracy of Michael Traulos against Leo V:  
A Critical Approach to the Primary Sources and Modern Interpretations

Lèse-majesté and the disputing of imperial power is a very interesting issue in the internal history of Byzantium, and one that has been systematically studied, especially in recent decades. In certain cases of conspiracies against and assassinations of Byzantine emperors, however, myth is intertwined with reality and the imaginative narration of the sources has a theatricality aimed at gratifying the reader and giving the events a more dramatic tone. Such is the case of the conspiracy against Leo V the Armenian (813–820) organised by his successor Michael II (820–829).

According to A. Afinogenov (The Conspiracy of Michael Traulos and the Assassination of Leo V: History and Fiction. *DOP* 55 [2001] 329–338) there were two different traditions, “one relatively pro-Michael and vehemently anti-Leo and the other vehemently anti-Michael and relatively pro-Leo”. The first one, which presents Michael as the victim of Leo’s envy because of his bravery, is reflected mainly in the 9th century source of Georgios Monachos, where there is no reference to any involvement of Michael in a conspiracy, and the second, which presents Michael as an ungrateful conspirator against the patient emperor Leo, is depicted in the colourful and detailed narrative of the 10th-century Genesios and Theophanes Continuatus.

According to these two sources, the events took place in the following way: Michael Traulos, whom Leo V had appointed to the office of the domestikos of the excoubitors, was accused of participating in a conspiracy against the emperor. Michael managed, however, to refute the charges against him and to retain his position. But afterwards he began to use “γλώσσαν πρόλαλόν τε καὶ ἱταμόν” against the emperor and his wife, and despite Leo’s warnings he continued to blame the emperor. Leo then asked the logothetes of the dromos Ioannes Hexaboulios and other officials to watch and record Michael’s accusations against him. When these were finally announced to the emperor, Michael was arrested, possibly the day before Christmas Eve, and after being interrogated by Leo V himself was found guilty and condemned to death, and specifically to be thrown into the furnace of the imperial baths. But after the intervention of Leo’s wife, the Augusta Theodosia, the emperor postponed Michael’s execution because of the Christmas feast. Michael was kept in chains in the palace until his imminent execution, but Leo was anxious and frightened, because of a Sibylline oracle, a vision of his own mother and a bad dream he had that foreboded his assassination. For this reason the emperor secretly visited the room where Michael was confined, during the night. He saw him sleeping deeply and tranquilly on the bed of the papias who was responsible for guarding him, while the papias was sleeping on the floor. The emperor was angered and left, while a young eunuch informed the papias and Michael about Leo’s visit. Then in the morning Michael expressed a desire to confess or to make a donation to a charitable foundation, and for this reason asked to see his trusted friend Theoktistos. His request was granted and Michael took the opportunity to tell Theoktistos of his plan for an attack against the emperor and thus to communicate it to his accessories, threatening that he would betray them to the emperor if
they refused to carry it out. In the event his comrades acted immediately, and on the morning of 25 December, disguised as monks and carrying underarm daggers, they entered the chapel of the palace where Leo had gone, alone, to sing the Christmas hymns. After an attack on another person whom they mistook for Leo, the emperor found temporary refuge in the bema and tried in vain to defend himself with the censer and the cross. Leo was finally assassinated, and Michael was proclaimed as emperor, but no one could find the key to unlock the new monarch’s chains. Ioannes Hexaboulos then revealed to the members of the senate and the other attendants that the keys were inside the clothes of the assassinated Leo, and so either Michael was released (according to Genesios) or the chains were broken since the key could not be found (according to Theophanes Continuatus), and Michael was crowned in Hagia Sophia. It is obvious from the above description that the fascinating narrative of the sources is embellished by fictional episodes and at certain points one has to read behind the lines.

Of the other narrative sources we should mention Symeon Magistros and Logothetes (10th c.), who gives a plainer and briefer account, Pseudo-Symeon (10th c.), who summarizes the information we know from Theophanes Continuatus and Genesios, and Ioannes Skylitzes (11th c.), who repeats the information of Theophanes Continuatus.

In this paper, we will focus on the conspiracy that led to Leo’s assassination, which has been the object of renewed scholarly interest in recent years, although certain problems and questions arising from differing interpretations of the sources still remain. In his special study of the subject, D. Afinogenov attempted to distinguish fiction from reality and reveal the real motives and reasons behind Michael’s conspiracy against Leo V. He argued that the emperor fabricated the charges against Michael and that the latter “was probably not implicated in a conspiracy or high treason at the moment of his arrest”, but was then obliged to improvise and to threaten to betray the friends who were to have carried out his plan to the emperor if they did not put it into practice. Michael should, consequently, be considered more as “a disappointed loyalist than a sly conspirator”.


First of all, it cannot be established that Leo V accused Michael Traulos falsely. A successful general himself, Leo cannot have been jealous of Michael’s valour and sought for that reason to kill him, which is one of the two versions of the events presented by Genesios (ed. A. Lesmueller-Werner – I. Thurn, I. 17, p. 15, l. 48-50: “δν βασκαίνων, καθάπερ τιν ς ἐφασκον, θανατῶσαι βεβούλητο”).

Nor does the narrative of Georgios Monachos (ed. I. Bekker, p. 788, l.1-6), who speaks generally about Leo’s arrest of “persons on false charges of high treason out of envy of their bravery and talents”, prove the supposed false charges against Michael. Furthermore, the brief reference of Theosteriktos to the assassination of Leo V (Vita Nicetae Medicii, AASS Apr. I (3rd ed.), p. XXVII, ch. 46-47: “Τινές γάρ τής τάξεως νεωτερίσαντες καὶ ως υπ’ ἀγγέλου ὁδηγηθέντες εἰσήσαν ἀκωλύτως εἰς τά βασίλεια καὶ ἐπάταξαν αὐτόν εἰς τοῦ ἐὐκτηρίου μαχαίραις· ἐδοξεγάρ προσφεύγειν ἐν τῷ
In addition, although Michael was firstly accused of high treason against Leo V, he managed to refute the charge but was not promoted from tourmarches of the phoiroi to domestikos of the excubitors, as Afinogenov believes, since such a promotion cannot be documented. It is only Theophanes Continuatus (ed. M. Featherstone – J. Signes Codoñer I.21, p. 54, l. 4) who refers, mistakenly, to Michael as tourmarches of the phoiroi, while all the other sources speak of Michael the domestikos of the excubitors. It seems that Michael remained in his previous position, for Genesios, recording the reaction of Leo V when he was informed of the charges of conspiracy against him on the part of the domestikos of the excubitors, Michael, states that (I. 17, p. 15. l. 47-48): “ἐκπέμπεται παρὰ βασιλέως διακυβερνᾶν τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ στρατολόγημα”. This passage does not mean that “(Michael) was sent away to a provincial destination to conduct the levy for this same unit”, probably as tourmarches of the phoiroi (in Codoñer’s reading), but that the emperor sent Michael to command the corps that had previously been entrusted to him (p. 15, l. 45-46: “καὶ τὸ τῶν ἑξκουβίτων πεπίστευτο σύνταγμα”), since the pronoun αὐτῷ refers, rather, to Michael (τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ [πεπιστευμένον] στρατολόγημα). Besides, there is no indication in Genesios’ subsequent narrative that Michael moved away from the capital; on the contrary, he was from then on kept under strict watch, which finally led to his arrest and imprisonment.

Then, according to the second version of Genesios’ colourful narrative (I. 17, p. 15, l. 50 ff.), Michael started to speak against the emperor and his wife and, despite Leo’s repeated warnings, did not stop accusing and threatening the emperor. It has been argued – correctly, in our view – that the existence (recorded in the sources) of legends about Leo’s fall from the throne implies the clemency with which he faced implicit or real conspirators (PmbZ). Perhaps his repeated warnings to Michael, independently of whether this version is true or not, also reveal such an attitude. In any case, it seems that Leo did not want to punish or kill Michael, although he could have done so when Michael was first accused of high treason, but he demonstrated patience, probably because of his affection for and kinship with Michael.

Finally, Michael was arrested and it was proved, according to Genesios (I. 17, p. 1, l. 75: “ἐλέγχεται Μιχαὴλ τυραννίδα”), that he was planning to usurp the throne. Theophanes Continuatus also refers to the well-founded accusations of high treason against Michael (I. 21, p. 54, l. 21-23: “καὶ τέλος, τῶν ἑλεγχόντων τὰ τῆς κατηγορίας κατεμπεδοῦντον, κατατίθεται τυραννίδος ἐπίθεσιν μελετῶν”) that were confirmed by the emperor’s interrogation of him. Consequently, a conspiracy did exist.

Afinogenov’s opinion that Michael was not implicated in a conspiracy at the moment of his arrest is, therefore, not convincing. What Michael threatened to reveal to the emperor if his comrades took no action was, in my opinion, their participation in the conspiracy against the emperor, not
the ambush (Genesios I. 19, p. 18, l. 40-44: “ἀκριβολογησάμενος γάρ τῷ Θεοκτίστῳ ὁ Μιχαήλ τά τῆς ἐπιθέσεως, καὶ διαπορθμεύσας κρυφιομύστως τοῖς κεκοινωκόσιν αὐτῷ τῆς ἐνέδρας βαθεῖαν διάσκεψιν, ἐπισχυρίζεται κατ’ αὐτῶν τὴν κοινωνίαν φωράσαι τῷ ἄνακτι, εἴπερ καταμελήσειαν ἄρτι τῆς ἐγχειρήσεως”). The narrative of Theophanes Continuatus, which attributes the organisation of the ambush to Michael’s conspirators, is also clear (I. 25, p. 60, l. 5-7: “τοῖς ἡμῖν κεκοινωκόσι τῆς πράξεως πάντα ἀνειπεῖν διηπείλει τῷ βασιλεῖ, εἰ μὴ τι γένηται παρ’ ὑμῶν γενναῖον τούτου με διασζόν τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς ἐπικτῆς”) as is that of Symeon Magistros and Logothetes (ed. S. Wahlgren, 128, 10, l. 62-64: “πᾶσι τοῖς μετ’ αὐτοῦ συμβούλοις ἐμῆνυσεν, ὡς εἰμὴ σπουδάσητε ἐξελεῖν με τῆς φρουρᾶς, πάντας ὑμᾶς καταμηνύω τῷ βασιλεῖ”), who - according to Afinogenov - is considered as a more trustworthy source for the assassination of Leo V than Genesios and Theophanes Continuatus.

The word σύμβουλος used by Symeon Magistros and Logothetes denotes Michael’s accessories and not just his circle of trusted friends, as has been argued. This is confirmed by the use of the same word in another passage from the same source (136, 84, l. 660-670): "Ἐπεὶ δὲ πολλοῖς τρόποις ὁ θεὸς βούλεται σφάζειν τὸν ἄνθρωπον…συνεχώρησε γὰρ ἐπαναστῆναι αὐτῷ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Στέφανον, ὡσπέρ ποτὲ Ἀβεβαλόῳ ἐπανέστη Δαυὶ τῷ οἰκείῳ πατρί. συμβούλοις ὧν οὕτως πρὸς τοῦτο χρησάμενος τῷ τῷ ἀπὸ μοναχῶν Μαριανῷ καὶ Βασιλείῳ, τῷ Πετεινῷ λεγομένῳ, καὶ Μανουὴλ τῷ Κουρτίκῃ, συνειδότων αὐτῷ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων, τοῦτον τοῦ παλατίου κακὸς κατήγαγε καὶ ἐν τῇ Πρώτῃ νήσῳ ἐξορίσας ἀπέκειρεν μοναχόν". It is clear from the text that the monk Marianos, Basileios Peteinos and Manouel Kourtikes were not simply friends of Stephanos Lakapenos, but conspirators who supported his attempt to dethrone his father Romanos Lakapenos (920-944). Similarly, the persons whom Michael addressed when he was imprisoned had been already implicated in his conspiracy.

Furthermore, it cannot be shown, from the testimony of the Vita of Euthymios of Sardis († 831) written by the future patriarch Methodios (843-847), (ed. J. Gouillard, ch. 10, l. 199-201): “σφάζεται ὁ θηρὶ παρὰ τοῦ ἐχθροῦ καὶ ἐκδικητοῦ αὐτῷ· οὕτω γὰρ καλεῖν τὸν τούτου διάδοχον γραφικώτατα δίκαιον, καθότι ἐχθράς εἰς θάνατον εἰς θάνατον πέιραται ἐπὶ τοῦς συναδροφόνους, καὶ τὸ δόγμα αὐτοῦ”), that Michael punished the murderers of Leo because he wanted to dissociate himself in this way from that murder, as is claimed by Afinogenov, who translates the text as follows: “the beast [Leo V] was slain by his enemy and avenger, for it is right to call thus his successor in full accord with the scriptures, as he, having been hostile even to death, attempted to avenge him against his fellow murderers, as well as in regard to his doctrine”. The scholar believes that the only possible meaning of the phrase “διεκδικεῖν…ἐπὶ τοῦς συναδροφόνους” is that Michael punished the murderers of Leo V. Codóñer observed that the text should not be taken literally, since the author seems to play with the phrase “παρὰ τοῦ ἐχθροῦ καὶ ἐκδικητοῦ” taken from the Psalm 8:3, where God is said to “still the enemy and the avenger” (τοῦ καταλύσαι ἐχθρὸν καὶ ἐκδικητὴν). He also pointed out that it is not explicitly said that Michael succeeded in punishing those who murdered Leo, but merely that he “attempts in turn” (πάλιν πειράται) to avenge Leo in the person of his fellow murderers. Nor does he exclude the possibility that Michael did punish some of the conspirators or even certain of the protagonists, but not all of them, because he needed their support in order to remain in power. He supposes, in fact, that Michael could have punished those who had committed the murder and Theophilos some of the masterminds of Leo’s assassination.
In our opinion, however, the text should be interpreted differently. Michael is presented as the enemy and avenger of Leo, since he had been hostile towards Leo even to death, and had murdered him. Furthermore, Michael avenged him again in the persons of Leo’s fellow murderers (συνανδροφόνους) and in regard to his doctrine. Consequently, the word “συνανδροφόνοι” does not refer to those who murdered Leo V, but to Leo’s instruments, who committed murders against the iconophiles. Such an interpretation fits very well, taking into consideration what follows in the Vita, which says that while initially, after Michael Traulos ascended the throne, there was the impression that the slaughter of the supporters of the icons would cease, the executions of iconophiles were only suspended for a time, while the impiety remained (ch. 10, l. 202-208: “Καὶ τῆς μὲν ὡς ἐν νυκτὶ πειρατεύσεως καὶ ληστρικῆς κατὰ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων φωνοκτονίας ἔδοκεν μικρὸν ἀποπαύειν τὴν χεῖρα, ὡς αἰσχυνόμενος διὰ τῆς τούτῳ προσώπου ὑπαλλαγῆς, ἵνα μὴ φαίνηται αὐτὸς ὁ σφαγεὶς ἐτι καὶ ἐπὶ τούτου διαταττόμενος…Λιθρία δ’ ὁμοίας καὶ ἡλικίας ὑποδείκτης καὶ τῶν ἐλαττωμάτων τριμβευτῆς οὐκ ἐπέλαμψεν, ἀλλ’ ὅπερ ἐχθρὸν, ὑπὸ τοῦτο κατὰ τῶν εὐσεβῶντων φωνοκτόνους χείρ εἰς ὅσον κεκράτητο, οὐ μὴν ἤ τῆς ἀσεβείας σκοτόμηνα λέλυτο”). It can not be argued, therefore, on the basis of the information supplied by the Vita of Euthymius, that Michael punished the murderers of Leo V. Besides, the other sources attribute the punishment of those who actually assassinated Leo V to Michael’s son and successor Theophilos, not his father.

Finally, the information of Theophanes Continuatus (Π.Ι.1, p. 64, l. 1-5): “Ἀνηρηκότες δὲ τὸν Λέοντα οἱ περὶ τὸν Μιχαὴλ, ὡς ἐν τῷ πρὸ τούτου ήμῖν δεδήλωται συντάγματι, τὸν τούτου νεκρὸν σύροντες ἀνηλεὼς τε καὶ ἀφειδῶς διὰ τῶν Σκύλων εἰς τὸν Ἰππόδρομον ἐξῆγαγον, μὴ τινα φόβον ἔχοντες ἡδή διὰ τὸ πλήρη εἶναι τῶν ἐπιβούλων καὶ συνωμοτῶν τὴν βασίλειαν αὐλήν” does not mean that the imperial court was full of plotters and conspirators in general, thus revealing widespread discontent with Leo V, since the passage refers specifically to the conspirators and supporters of Michael, who murdered Leo and managed to secure Michael’s ascension to the throne, preventing any possible counteraction against Michael. Nor it is certain that the movement of Thomas the Slav, for whom there are also two different traditions that have caused various interpretations about this person and his usurpation, began in 819 under Leo V, as it is stated in the letter of Michael II to Louis the Pious (ed. A. Werminghoff, MGH, 475-480) and other sources, or that the revolt of Thomas was favoured by the climate of dissatisfaction against the emperor that finally led to Leo’s assassination.
Anathema as a Church Ban in Byzantium

АНАФЕМА (от ср.-греч. ἀναθηματίζειν 'отлучение от церкви') - отлучение христианина от Церкви, от общения с верными и от церковных таинств, применяемое в качестве высшей церковной кары за тяжкие прегрешения (предже всего за измену православию и уклонение в ересь или раскол) и провозглашаемое в торжественной форме.

Термин. Греческий термин "а." (ἀναθηματίζειν) первоначально обозначал 'нечто посвященное богу; дар, принесение в храм'. Позднее он был использован в греческом переводе Библии (Септуагинта) для передачи др.-евр. термина hêrêm 'нечто проклятое, отверженное людьми и обреченное уничтожению' (ср. Исх. 22, 19; Чис. 21, 2-3; Лев. 27,28 и сл.; Второз. 7, 1-6; 7, 26; 13, 12, 17; 20, 16,18; Ис. Нав. 6, 17 сл.; 7, 11 сл.; 1 Цар. 15, 21; Зах. 14, 11; Ис. 34, 5; 43, 28; Мих. 7,2; Еzek. 44, 29 и др.). Под влиянием др.-евр. hêrêm термин "а." получил специфически негативные коннотации и стал обозначать 'то, что отвержено людьми, обречено уничтожению' и потому 'проклято'.

В этом смысле употребляется термин и в посланиях св. апостола Павла (в Евангелиях он в данном значении не отмечен), ср. 1 Кор. 12,3; 16,22; Гал. 1, 8-9; Рим. 9,3. Ап. Павел в одном месте использует особую форму проклятия: "если кто не любит господа Иисуса Христа, да будет анафема, маран афа" (1 Кор. 6, 22). Добавление маран афа (арам. "Господь близко") интерпретируется канонистами как предание А. "до пришествия Господня", т.е. до Страшного суда, на котором только и может быть решена окончательная участь грешника.

В иудаизме это образцом А. было отлучение от синагоги, которое применялось, в частности, по отношению к исповедавшим вреху в Христе (ср. термин ἀποζσνακάγος в Ио. 9,22; 12, 42; 16,2 - о том же сообщают св. Юстин Мученик и св. Епифаний Кипрский (Adv. haer. – Holl, 1933, Bd. III, 228)).

Использование А. в последующей истории церкви против еретиков, раскольников и грубых нарушителей церковной дисциплины основано на употреблении этого термина в Гал. 1, 8-9 и 1 Кор. 16, 22. Впервые термин "а." был официально применен в канонах собора в Эльвире (ок. 300 г.), а каноническая формула "если кто-либо..., да будет А." утверждалась в церковных канонах начиная с Гангрского поместного собора (ок. 340 г., ср. Гангр. 1-20). В дальнейшем термин употреблялся в деяниях 1 вселенского собора в Никее (после символа веры), в канонах Лаод. 29, 34, 35; Карф. 11, 109, 110-116; Трул. 1; 2 Ник. 1; Конст. 879 г. 3 и др.

В аналогичном значении изредка употреблялся в Византии и термин "катафема" (из греч. καταφέμω - 'нечто преданное проклятию'). "Катафема" в этом значении присутствует в Апок. 22,3. В "Учении 12 апостолов" (Дидахе) этим словом называется Иисус Христос, очевидно, под влиянием Гал. 3,13. В Новом Завете встречаются глаголы "анафематствовать" (ἀναθηματίζειν, ср. Марк. 14, 71; Деян. 23, 12 и 14) и "катафематствовать" (καταφέματιζειν, ср.
Матф. 26, 74). В сер. IX в. константинопольский патриарх Мефодий I (843-847) провозгласил А. и "катафему" ученикам преп. Феодора Студита Навкратию и Афанасию, не пожелавшим осудить сочинения своего учителя, направленные против патриархов Тарасия (784-806) и Никифора I (806-815).


Сущность А. Церковную А. не следует смешивать с так наз. "отлучением" (ἀθορίζω), которое представляло собой временное исключение индивида из церковной общины с запретом участвовать в церковной жизни и (для духовных лиц) занимать церковные должности. Называемое иногда также "малым отлучением", оно, в отличие от А., служило наказанием за меньшие проступки (например, за совершение службы в состоянии запрещения - Апост. 28; за симонию - Апост. 29; за использование светской власти для занятия церковной должности - Апост. 30 и т.п.), не требовало соборного решения и не нуждалось в торжественной форме для своего вступления в силу.

А. в собственном смысле едва ли следует рассматривать как предание сатане, по образцу, описанному например в 1 Кор. 5,4-5 (где апостол Павел предлагает "предать сатане" того, кто взял в жены собственную мачеху) - ведь сам апостол говорит, что предается на мучение только плоть, и то лишь для того, чтобы душа спаслась (ср. также 1 Тим. 1,20 и толкование этого места у св. Иоанна Златоуста в 5 беседе на 1 Тим. - PG 62, 528). Собственно А. представляет собой "великое отлучение", которое полагалось лишь за вероотступничество, а также за упорство в догматических заблуждениях и другие поступки, угрожавшие целостности Церкви и чистоте вероучения. Однако, под влиянием названных апостольских посланий распространенным является убеждение, что А. представляет собой именно предание сатане. Следует в этой связи указать на небольшой трактат "О том, что не следует предавать анафеме ни живых ни мертвых" (PG 48, 945-952), составленный в форме поучения и дошедший под именем св. Иоанна Златоуста (хотя, видимо, и не принадлежащий ему). Автор поучения разделяет тот взгляд, что А. предает человека во власть сатаны (col. 949), но именно поэтому считает её недопустимой, поскольку лишение надежды на спасение противоречит фундаментальному закону христианства - закону любви к ближнему, независимо от чистоты его веры (в связи с этим приводится притча о милосердном самарянине из Лук. 10, 30-37). Допустимым признается лишь анафематствование догматических заблуждений (col. 952). Именно так поступил св. ап. Павел, произнося "да будет А." не против конкретных лиц, а против неправедных деяний (1 Кор. 16, 22 и Гал. 1, 8) (col. 948). Что же касается людей, то суд над ними вершит Высший Судия - те же, кто осуждает других на вечную погибель, присваивают себе Его полномочия и будут жестоко наказаны как узурпаторы высшей власти (col. 949). Данный взгляд на А. нашел свою поддержку, например, у такого видного византийского канониста как Феодор Вальсамон (ХII в.).

В канонистике нередко наблюдаются попытки видеть предпосылки церковной А. в словах Христа: «если и Церкви не послушает, то да будет он тебе как язычник и мытарь» (Матф. 18,17). Следует, однако, иметь в виду, что эта цитата начинается со слов «если
согрешит против тебя брат твой, пойди и обличи его между тобою и им одним» (Матф. 18,15) и т.д., и речь здесь, таким образом, идет о личных отношениях двух людей, а не о единстве Церкви или чистоте вероучения. В канонических эвангелиях нет ни термина A., ни представления об A., близкого к современному ее пониманию - как сказано, впервые это понятие встречается в посланиях ап. Павла.

Из сказанного следует, что проблема необходимости и допустимости A. является весьма сложной. В истории Церкви применение или неприменение A. диктовалось каждый раз целым рядом конкретных обстоятельств, среди которых главную роль играла степень общественной опасности наказуемого деяния или лица. Особую сложность придает проблеме A. ее одновременно богословский и юридический характер. Как показывает история Церкви, формально-юридическое применение A. не всегда встречало одобрение православных богословов.

В средневековье как на Западе, так и на Востоке утверждалось мнение блаж. Августина о том, что св. крещение препятствует полному исключению индивида из Церкви, и даже A. не закрывает окончательно пути к спасению. Тем не менее, предание A. эксплицировалось в раннесредневековой Европе как "предание на вечную погибель" (damnatio aeternae mortis, excommunicatio mortalis), применявшееся, правда, только за смертные грехи и только в случае особенного упорства в заблуждениях и неспособности к исправлению. Неверное мнение об A. как окончательном проклятии грешника и обречении его на вечную погибель нашло распространение и в дореволюционной России, что привело к многочисленным выступлениям против A., прежде всего со стороны образованного дворянства и интеллигенции (особенно после отлучения от Церкви графа Л.Н. Толстого).

Таким образом, согласно православному взгляду, церковная A. представляет собой профилактический (воспитательный) акт изоляции от сообщества верующих лица (группы лиц), мысли и действия которого (которых) угрожают чистоте вероучения и единству Церкви.

Провозглашение A. Ввиду того, что деяния, заслуживающие A., как правило носили характер крупного дисциплинарно-догматического преступления (ересь, раскол), персональная A. применялась в древней Церкви в основном к иерархам (разумеется, после изврежения из сана) и к императорам-еретикам. Ввиду тяжести данного наказания, к нему предпочитали прибегать в самых крайних случаях, когда более мягкие средства воздействия на согрешающих оказывались безрезультатными.

Торжественное произнесение A. над кем-л. первоначально предполагало формулу "имярек да будет A." ((ἀγαθή έξεσέ), т.е. "да будет отлученным, проклятым"; постепенно формула могла принимать иной вид, в котором термин A. уже обозначал не отлученного субъекта, а акт отлучения как таковой: "имяреку - A.". Возможна была и формулировка "анафематствую (-ем) имярека (и/или его ересь)". Ввиду серьезности и ответственности такого шага как предание кого-л. A. уполномоченным органом для этого мог быть

первоначально только представительный собор архиереев, синод во главе с патриархом, а в наиболее сложных случаях - вселенский собор. Даже в тех случаях, когда византийские императоры или патриархи единолично решали вопрос о предании кого-л. А., они предпочитали обставлять это как официальное соборное решение. Известен эпизод из жизни св. Иоанна Златоуста, когда в бытность своего архиепископом Константинопольским он отказался единолично осудить сторонников Диоскора и еретические сочинения Оригена, но наставив на "соборном решении" (καθολική διάγγεις ср. Socr. Schol. Hist. eccl. VI, 14,1-3: Hansen, 335).

С течением времени предание А. стало сопровождаться особым чинопоследованием. При этом предписывалось выносить для поклонения иконы на середину храма, возносить благодарение Богу за творчество Церкви над ересьми, произносить символ веры и изъяснять послушание Церкви, еретикам произносить А., а покровителям церкви – живым многолетие, а умершим вечную память. Полное чинопоследование "творства православия" с провозглашением А. всем еретикам было составлено после преодоления иконоборчества в Византии и приписывается Мефодию I, патриарху Константинополя (843-847). С тех пор это чинопоследование служится в кафедральных храмах на литургии в первое воскресенье Великого поста (т. наз. "Неделя православия").

Каноническая неурегулированность вопроса о порядке наложения А. приводила к тому, что византийские иерархи зачастую предавали А. еретические догмы без соборного решения, от своего имени (ср., например, знаменитые 12 "анафематизмов" св. Кириила Александрийского против Нестория). Эти "анафематизмы", однако, сами по себе не имели реальных последствий для соответствующих лиц, а лишь служили полемическим выражением позиции данного иерарха по поводу неприемлемых с его т. зр. взглядов. В эпоху триадологических и христологических споров персональное, не опирающееся на соборную волну анафематствование получило широкое распространение среди богословствующих иерархов. Известны такие случаи и в период иконоборчества VIII-IX вв., когда изгоняемые иконоборцами православные игумены от своего лица письменно анафематствовали соборные решения еретиков (ср. Theod. Stud., ep. 48, 44-51 - Fatouros I, 131).

А. может налагаться как при жизни, так и после смерти. В последнем случае налагается запрет на поминовение души усопшего, служение панихид и заупокойных литургий, произнесение разрешительных молитв.

В истории христианской Церкви наиболее драматичным случаем применения А. было взаимное анафематствование Римского престола и Константинопольского патриархата в 1054 г., вследствие чего единое христианство разделилось на Западное (католичество) и Восточное (православие).

---


А. во внецерковных целях. Поскольку А. является высшим церковным наказанием, ее использование во внецерковных (в частности, политических) целях нельзя считать каноническим - по крайней мере, оно не имеет опоры в древнем каноническом праве. Однако в условиях тесного сближения церковной и светской власти в православных государствах иногда имел место А. (отлучение от Церкви) политического характера. В истории Византии известны случаи предания А. мятежников и узурпаторов императорской власти. Так, в 1026 г. при деятельном участии императора Константина VIII было принято соборное постановление об А. организаторам и участникам мятежа против светской власти. Аналогичные определения издавались и последующими императорами (в 1171 и 1272 гг.). (Следует заметить, что в 1294 г. патриарх Иоанн XII Космас и епископы не допустили издания аналогичного постановления в пользу Михаила IX). К "политическому" использованию А. прибегали также в период гражданской войны в Византии в 40-е гг. XIV в. Однако и тогда эта практика встретила резкий отпор со стороны ведущих каноников и богословов, как патриарх Филоний Коккин и Матфей Ангел Панарет, которые опирались в своей аргументации на уже рассмотренный трактат (Псевдо?)-Златоуста и мнение Вальсамона. Противники "политической" А., кроме того, совершенно справедливо указывали на то, что узурпаторами был целый ряд абсолютно православных византийских императоров, имена которых, следовательно, должны быть вычеркнуты из диптихов и не поминаться на литургии, что, однако, не происходило. В истории РПЦ был аналогичный случай, когда в соборе 1667 г. возник спор между греческими и русскими епископами относительно допустимости А. для заговорщиков, пытающихся узурпировать власть. Греки, ссылаясь на некое Александрийское патриаршье «собране законов», наставили на А. для таких лиц – однако русские архиереи, признавая законность А. для еретиков и раскольников, не видели оснований отлучать от Церкви лиц, выступающих не против церковной, а против светской власти27.

Внецерковным является и так наз. "апотропеическое" употребление А. - в качестве проклятия за те или иные нежелательные поступки. Так, на многочисленных средневековых надгробиях зафиксированы надписи, грозящие анафемой тому, кто разрежет могилу. Писцокопиисты также часто изрекали на первой или последней странице рукописи письменные анафемы за возможную кражу книги, чтобы отпугнуть потенциальных похитителей. Такие же проклятия иногда призывались на голову тех, кто осквернит или изменит текст книги.

Духовные и юридические последствия А. Официальное провозглашение кого-л. А. (или над кем-л. А.) приводило к изгнанию этого лица из церковной общины, отлучению от св. таинств, запрету посещать церковь и претендовать на христианское погребение. Подвергнутый А. исключался, таким образом, из числа спасаемых членов Церкви - "тела Христа". На Западе само позднее с 9 в. А. полагалось и за общение с лицами, преданными А. (закреплено 3 правилом 2 Латеранского собора 1139 г.). Преданный А. был ограничен в праве выступать истцом и свидетелем на суде, а его убийство не каралось в обычном законном порядке.

Тяжелейшие духовные и юридические последствия А. диктуют необходимость особой осмотрительности при наложении этой кары - так, в уставе Элладской Церкви предусматривается обязательная санкция светской власти на предание кого-л. А.

27 Синайский, с. 58.
Применяя А. к наиболее злостным и не поддающимся исправлению нарушителям церковного мира и единства, Церковь однако не может утверждать однозначно ни того, что преданный А. бесповоротно отключен от спасения, ни того, что снятие А. обязательно приводит к спасению. Во всех случаях конечная участь души предоставляется высшему Божьему суду.

**Снятие А.** Предание А. не является актом, бесповоротно закрывающим путь к возвращению в Церковь и, в конечном счете, к спасению. После искреннего раскаяния, осуждения своих заблуждений и исполнения положенного церковного наказания (епитимии), преданное А. лицо может быть принято обратно в Церковь. Условия епитимии могут разниться в зависимости от возраста, положения и степени раскаяния отлученного. А. может быть снято и после смерти - в этом случае вновь допускаются все виды поминования души, получаящей таким образом благодатное содействие на пути к спасению.

В 1964 г. в Иерусалиме по инициативе Афиногора, патриарха Константинопольского (1886-1972), состоялась его встреча с папой Римским Павлом VI. Это была первая встреча глав Греко-православной и Римско-католической Церквей со времени Флорентийской унии 1439 г. После этого были отменены взаимные анафемы, существовавшие с 1054 г.

**А. в Русской Православной Церкви.** Применение А. в РПЦ обладает рядом сущностных особенностей по сравнению с древней Церковью. История РПЦ, в отличие от византийской Церкви, была бедна ересьми и почти не знала случаев явного отпадения от христианства в язычество или нехристианские конфессии. Зато очень надолго затянулась на Руси борьба с пережитками язычества. В домонгольскую эпоху возник ряд правил, направленных против языческих обрядов – так, прав. 15 и 16 митр. Иоанна II (1076/1077-1089) объявляют «чуждыми нашей веры и отвергнутыми от соборной церкви» всех, кто приносит жертвы на вершинах гор, у болот и колодцев, не соблюдает установления христианского брака и не причащается хотя бы раз в год 28. По прав. 2 митр. Кирила II (ок. 1247-1281) отлучение от Церкви грозило тем, кто в церковные праздники устраивал шумные игры и кулачные бои, причем погибшие в таких боях предавались проклятию «в син век и в будущий» 29. Кроме того, прав. 5 м-та Иоанна отлучает от Церкви непринимающих в русской земле и в великий пост употребляющих мясо и «скверное», прав. 23 – лиц, продающих христиан в рабство «поганым», прав. 25 и 26 – вступивших в кровосмесительные браки, прав. 22 отлучает от причащения лиц, виновных в многоженстве или прелюбодеянии.


28 ЕК II, 83.
29 ЕК II, 183.
Церковное отлучение провозглашалось также против лиц, совершавших тяжкие преступления против государства – самозванцев, бунтовщиков, изменников. Во всех этих конфликтах со светской властью присутствовал, однако, элемент выступления против православия – либо в форме сговора с еретиками (переход самозванца Григория Отрепьева на сторону польских интервентов в нач. XVII в., измена гетмана Малороссии Ивана Мазепы в 1709 г. во время войны со шведами), либо в виде прямых гонений на Церковь, как во время крестьянских войн XVIII в.

«Чин православия», перешедший в Русскую Церковь после крещения Руси, постепенно подвергался здесь изменениям и дополнениям – в кон. XV в. в него были включены имена предводителей «жидовствующих», в XVII в. – имена изменников и самозванцев «Гришки Отрепьева», «Тимошки Акадинова», мятежника Стеньки Разина, раскольников Аввакума, Лазаря, Никиты Суздальца и др., в XVIII в. – имя «Ивашки Мазепы»30. Чин православия, допускавший изменения со стороны епархиальных епископов, с течением времени утратил единообразие – поэтому св. Синод в 1764 г. ввел его новую, исправленную редакцию, обязательную для всех епархий. В 1801 г. чин Православия был существенно сокращен – в нем перечислены только сами ереси, без упоминания имен еретиков, а из имен государственных преступников оставлены (уже в исправленной форме) только «Григорий Отрепьев» и «Иван Мазепа». Позднее, в редакции 1869 г. эти имена также были опущены – вместо них в чине появилась общая фраза о «дерзающих на бунт» против «православных государей». Таким образом, при анафематствовании известных лиц Церковь с течением времени постепенно сокращала их число, избегая называть имена и обозначая этих лиц обобщенно, по причастности к тому или иному догматическому (дисциплинарному) заблуждению или к государственному преступлению.

Большой резонанс в российском обществе нач. XX в. получило отлучение от Церкви писателя графа Л.Н. Толстого, осуществленное в послании св. Синода от 22.02.1901 г. за взгляды, несовместимые с принадлежностью к православию. Отлучение было выдержано в деликатных формулировках: «отторг себя сам от всякого общения с Церковью», «Церковь не считает его своим членом», «отпадение его от Церкви».

30 Суворов, О церк. наказ., 150.
Slavery in Byzantium from 566 until 1453

The chronological frame is, on the one hand, set by the death of Justinian I (565), and the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople, on the other hand.

First and foremost, a word about the sources of slave labor during this period: these were children born to female household slaves, the acquisition of male and female slaves by means of inheritance and gratuitous transfer of ownership, that is endowment, but above of all, the purchase of male and female slaves on the slave market. Another source was the acquisition of slaves by war, that is, by the enslavement of prisoners of war, partly also by means of piracy. As a rule orthodox co-religionists and compatriots (homophyloi) were released, but not Latin (Catholic) foreigners (allophyloi). Slaves however, acquired as prisoners of war, were often sold, exchanged or ransomed. In a very few cases enslavement was imposed as a penalty by the civil and ecclesiastical courts.

Turning now to the legal framework mentioned in my paper’s title. The legal definition of slavery and its modification in the Byzantine Empire can be seen most clearly in the regulations found in the civil norms as decreed by the Emperors. Although the predominant evidence comes from law codes, other sorts of evidence – individual laws and novels or collections of novels, a book of regulations or the list of decrees included in Theophanes’s world chronicle provide additional, more concrete evidence. To a great extent, however, the Corpus juris civilis initiated by Justinian I remained valid and was subjected to a Greek revision or rather an incomplete adjustment under the Emperors Basil I (867-886) and Leo VI (886-912). This revision is reflected in the “the 60 Imperial books” entitled “ta Basilika biblia” (= “ta Basilika/the Basilics”) and formed the collection of the valid “Imperial” law codes, which was probably completed in 888 (Dölger-Müller No. 514a). In this way the Byzantine Empire received a renewed Roman legal foundation in the Basilics. In addition the civil codes were augmented by the canon law, consisting of the rules and regulations issued either by the Byzantine Orthodox Church alone or together with the Emperor. These regulated faith and the religious life of Christians in the Empire.

The law codes of concern to us are the following: the Ecloga, the book of statutes promulgated by Emperors Leo III. and Constantine V. in 741 (DöMü 304); the Eisagoge (formerly Epanagoge), from 885/6(?) [the last year of Basil I; DöMü 505b], a code, which was only valid for a few months; and the Prochiron (Procheiros Nómos), promulgated 907 (?) by Leon VI. (DöMü 549a).

The following individual laws and novels concern slavery to a greater or lesser degree: the reaffirmation by Justin II. in 572 of Justinian’s novel 144 against the Samaritans (and other heretics), DöMü 25b; the (questionable) novel by Phokas (602-610) concerning taxes on ships which sailed through the Bosporus with slaves on board, DöMü 161; the novel concerning marriage announced by empress Irene in 780 (DöMü 338); 22 of the 113 novels by Leo VI (from 886/9, in part later). In addition we have the (2.) novel issued by Romanos I Lakapenos as early as 928/929 against the drive of the “powerful” (dynatoi) to acquire land (DöMü 628) and two novels by Constantine VII. Porphyrogennetos (944-959): One (DöMü 678) concerns the inclusion of the value of existing,
but now to be freed slaves in intestate inheritance, while the other novel (Dömü 679) concerns the
treatment of runaway slaves. The so-called -novel on monasteries by Nikephoros’ II. Phokas from
964(Dömü 699) is only marginally pertinent, whereas the individual novel, probably dating from
971, issued by Emperor John I Tzimiskes concerning a “slave toll” ((Dömü 754) is important. So,
too, is the novel enacted by Alexios I Komnenos in 1095 (DöWirth 1177, 1178), which served a
double purpose, to be explained later. John Kinnamos reports indirectly about a decree issued by
Manuel I Komnenos (1143-1180) against self-selling as a slave, but since current research considers
it to refer only ostensibly to slavery we can disregard it.

Finally we have two other works, consisting of regulations, to consider: one is the famous list
of measures, known as the so-called “10 evil deeds” of Emperor Nikephoros I dating from 809/10,
where however only a single one the (Dömü 377) is of interest; the other work is the even more
famous Book of the Eparch (the Eparchikon biblion) issued by Leo VI in 912 (Dömü 556a).

After this overview let me provide further information on the intention and purpose of the
sources I’ve just mentioned, beginning with the Ecloga. After a period of crisis in which knowledge
of valid legislation had declined, the Ecloga reinforced essential parts of Justinianic legislation in a
modified form, combining this with a number of new supplements. There are 18 titles, often divided
into chapters (with sub-sections): title 8 concerns “manumission/release and (re)enslavement”, also in
relation to prisoners of war. **Ecl. 8.1-4** reinforces the various types of release that had been regulated
by Justinian’s CIC and canon 85 of the Concilium Quinisextum/Council in Trullo from 691/692. While
8.1,4 is partially new, **8.1,6** is completely new: For the first time 8.1,4 allows a master or mistress or
even “their children with the parents’ consent” to free a slave by having him baptised. And according
to **8.1,6** a person who continues to be held in slavery although he has been granted his freedom,
should “turn to the Holy Church or to the relevant official” and prove his status in order to have “the
benefit of his emancipation”. Title **8,2** determines that a free man who is “taken prisoner of war by
foes” and sold as a slave by them (to a Byzantine, of course), should regain his status as a free man
from his new master, if the slave can “pay the price [previously] arranged” with the master. If he (the
slave) is not able to do this, “the master who has bought him should retain him as a hired serf until he
has received the sum agreed on”, but “judges should determine the value which is to be credited to the
ransomed [τῷ ἀγορασθέντι] annually in lieu of pay” (E.H.Freshfield: A Manual of Roman Law. The
Ecloga…rendered into English, 1926, 89 wrote erroneously “to the ransomer”).

This regulation curbed slave trafficking in part since it put a stop to resale. According to Yuval
Rotman (Byzant. Slavery and the Mediterranean world, 2009), however, it also opened the door to
the practice increasingly followed by the Byzantine Empire of exchanging (or ransoming) prisoners
or slaves with foreign powers. The regulations in Ecl. **8.4,1-2** are also new: a slave who has returned
from captivity as a prisoner-of-war, “and has inflicted any damage on the enemy for the benefit of
the state” should be released. A person who has escaped from captivity without inflicting damage on
the enemy “should remain a slave for five years” before being given his freedom. According to **Ecl.**
**8,4,2** a slave who defects to the enemy, and then returns in remorse, should remain a slave lifelong
on account of his desertion.

The regulations for slaves in **title 17**, the part of the Ecloga which concerns itself with criminal
law, are in part modifications or innovations. For example **17,12** “the master of a slave who has
committed theft” should “pay compensation” if he “intends to retain this slave”; otherwise “he
should present him to the person he had robbed, in full ownership.” This regulation was adopted
by the *Eisagoge* and the *Prochiron*, but not by the *Basilics*. The compensation should evidently be understood in such a way that the person robbed receives both the goods and the compensation due. Regulation 17, 17 deals with this too: someone who “abducts, hides or conceals someone else’s slave” must not only return the slave but also “present the owner with a further slave or with the price for one”. That means, unlawful appropriation (*plagium*) of a slave is now legally separated from unlawful appropriation of a free person which is treated in title 17, 16.

The reform of the older regulation lies in the fact that the price is now left unspecified in contrast with the sum of 20 solidi, fixed by Justinian (Cod. 6,1,4). In addition it is no longer necessary to pay the double value in compensation which it would be for stealing an article/*furtum* (cf. Ecl. 17,11), that is two slaves or their value. This is (by Sinogowitz, Studien z. Strafrecht der Ecloga) taken to be evidence for the fact that the Byzantines no longer considered slaves “simply a commodity, as they had in earlier times”. The old exemption from punishment for fornication with slaves in one’s own possession, is rescinded by Ecl. 17, 21, which now determines: “Local officials” are to clarify the facts and then sell the slave in another province, the proceeds going to the state. Intercourse with a female slave not in one’s own possession is regulated in 17,22: the fine and compensation is given as 36 Nomismata (that is roughly a quarter of the annual average assets of ca. 2 pounds/litrai in gold) to be paid to her master by a well-to-do (*entimos*) culprit. This far exceeds the normal value of a slave which is estimated at 10-20 Nomismata (see the price list contained in the *Prochiron*).

The *Prochiron* adopted this regulation and improved on it. The novel issued by Irene mentioned above states that “no-one may enter into lawful marriage with a girl of slave status”; a state of affairs which had, according to the Ecloga’s editor Ludwig Burgmann, “been allowed, implicitly but also quite obviously in the *Ecloga*. “ Later Emperors had not confirmed this prohibition because they did not share Irene’s willingness to comply with the quote “maximum demands made by the church”, as Burgmann put it!

Regulations in the *Eisagoge* concerning slaves and their release are found in particular in title 37 (on manumission and freedmen/women/*peri eleutheriôn kai apeleutheriôn*), title 40 (on penalties) and in the almost analogous passages of the *Prochiron*, title 34 (on manumission) and 39 (*Peri poinôn/on penalties*). Both law codes adopted most of their criminal law from the *Ecloga*. Indeed “criminal proceedings against slaves were [also] permitted (by Justinian’s time at the latest)”, meaning that they were no longer “exempt from punishment.” Thus it was in Spyros Trojanos’s words “expressly prescribed for some serious offences that the culprit’s legal status was irrelevant for the prosecution”, or other factual findings were formulated in such a way that “only slaves could have committed them.” (Troianos, Bemerkungen zum Strafrecht der Ecloga, FS Svoronos 1986, 56,58).

The only pertinent one of Nikephoros I’s “evil deeds” that I mentioned above involves taxing the purchase of slaves, because, according to Theophanes “those who had bought household slaves/oiketika somata outside Abydos and especially in the Dodecanese were to pay an impost of 2 Nomismata per head.”. Hence the emperor, or rather the fisc, wanted to profit from the slave trafficking in the Aegean as far south as Rhodos.

Of the 22 novels of Leo VI which concern slaves, the following should be highlighted: No. 38 allowed Imperial slaves to dispose of their own property. No. 40 rules that slaves owned by captives
who die intestate and without issue should not fall to the state but be released. **No. 59** forbids a free man to sell himself into slavery. **No. 60** forbids castration, also for slaves; should it be carried out, the slave must be released. **No. 67** states that a man who defects to the enemy twice should be sold into slavery for three years – and if he defects more than three times he is to be sold into slavery for good. **No. 100** allows a free person who desires to marry a slave to sell himself to a master of his choice. Both should be released at his death together with their children. If the free partner does not desire to become a slave, and cannot ransom his partner, he may work for the master for wages of 2 Nomismata per year until he has paid off the stipulated sum. **No. 101** states that a manumitted slave who marries a slave may either renounce his manumission and remain a slave until his master dies, or pay the price stipulated for the manumission of his partner. If he attempts to achieve the release by force (without paying) he must remain a slave because of his lack of respect. Of the 35 novels by Leo VI which deal with ecclesiastical issues, only Nos. 5, 6 and 9-11 refer to slaves. They were issued so as to eliminate discrepancies between (secular) civil and canon law. The late Marie Theres Fögen, however, almost totally denies that Nos. 9-11 about “escaped slaves who were consecrated as clergy, monks or even bishops” could have had any effect “since they were irrelevant, marginal regulations.” In general she also sees in the “very abstractly stylised novels of Leo VI a retreat and concentration on the symbolic.” But she does, in her commentary on **No. 49**, point out that Leo VI consciously revoked the option authorized by Justinian and confirmed by Dig. 22,5,7, of treating testimony given by slaves as “valid if no other evidence was available” in the *iudicia publica*. The very fact that Cod. Iust. 6,23,1 (dealing with the acceptance of a slave as witness to a will) is missing from the *Basilics* is a strong indication that Leo actively intervened in this way.

Let’s now turn to a one-off decree of **John I Tzmiskes**. This concerns a tax on the slave trade and decrees that officers and soldiers may sell or give their prisoners-of-war and other people enslaved during the war tax free (that is free of “kommerkion”) to comrades in arms or serving officers. This is also true for slaves, presented by a soldier “to persons in the capital or in the provinces”, or those “sent to his own property or to his relatives”. But for slaves sold in the marketplace to a local archon who had not taken part in the war, the buyer must pay a tax, and likewise if he then sold them again. If a local archon who had not taken part in the campaign buys slaves on the army’s return and sells them to his friends, the buyer must also pay the tax. For slaves captured during the siege of a stronghold by marines cooperating with cavalry no tax is due. If, however, the marines buy slaves in the market from a slave dealer or from Bulgarians, then taxes are due. Marines who fraudulently acquire slaves in times of peace must pay the tax and will also be prosecuted. If slaves are sold or given to marines by cavalry officers during a joint operation of navy and cavalry then no taxes are due. In the whole text the slaves are designated only by the term “psycharia”. - This novel of 971, of which a critical edition has recently been published in the Frankfort Series *Fontes Minores* 12 by Martin Vucetić, is the reaction to the increased number of enslaved prisoners-of-war caused by John I Tzmiske’s campaign against Bulgaria and the resulting upswing in trade. According to its editor it regulates “which of the enslaved prisoners-of-war were to be taxed and which slaves were tax free.” Through this novel the Emperor apparently intended to increase the flow of cash into the public purse and – by means of tax relief – to heighten the soldier’s motivation to take part in campaigns.

The series of imperial novels on slaves ends with the novel issued by **Alexios I Komnenos** in 1095 and this served a double purpose: It prohibited the masters of slaves who had filed a suit for manumission on the grounds of being descendants of (free) Bulgarians (not of Bulgarian
prisoners-of-war) from producing counter witnesses. Slaves, however, were permitted to produce counter witnesses if their master sued them. On the other hand, slaves were allowed (for the first time) to have their own marriage consecrated by the church; their masters were called upon to respect this wish. If they refused they forfeited these slaves. This rule was slow to take effect as we can see in records of ecclesiastical courts from the 12th C. However, we should keep in mind, that this church marriage concession for slaves did not lead to manumission nor did it change a slave's legal status.

We now come to the Book of the Eparch, which Leo VI issued as a book of rules having the force of law. It is according to its editor Johannes Koder “the most important written witness to the history of Constantinople’s economy.” We must remember, however, that the BoE is incomplete and does not include all trades, professions and guilds. The 22 titles of the BoE mention freedmen and slaves several times. It does not differentiate between what a *doulos* and an *oiketes* may do, although it does differentiate in its use of these terms. According to Koder (JÖB 41/ 1991) *doulos* “is used in express contrast to *eleutheros* when the same situation has differing consequences for freemen and slaves as far as sentence, surety when setting up a business or the explicit definition of job specifications is concerned.” The term *oiketes* is used (as Koder states) “when referring to activities which the owner is going to authorize or commission the *oiketes* to carry out. It is also used when the legislator declares that a particular profession may not be practised by *oiketai* (for example the profession of someone who prepares silk, that is a *katartarios*) and finally in the particular case where the sale of highly specialised workers from silk production ‘to outsiders or foreigners’ …is prohibited. In general, …the BoE tacitly assumes that slaves possess a legal and social status which allow them to work as entrepreneurs in most professions.” As far as penalties are concerned, it is striking that in BoE 2,8 (on the goldsmiths) slaves who exceed the maximum allowed weight when buying gold bullion (for further processing) without giving notice to the master of the goldsmiths are punished with confiscation. And according to BoE 12,9 (on the soap boilers) slaves who do not follow the regulations concerning the seals of the scales used in the soap industry are punished by being handed over to the Imperial household.

Turning to the church, there are only a few decisions taken by the so called *Synodos endemousa* at Constantinople, which concern slaves, the most important being the regulation about church *asylum* for slaves. Although the church did not originally offer *asylum* to slaves who had committed an offence, the following resolution was passed in 1059 prompted by a particular case (Grumel-Darrouzès 887). The Church would protect slaves seeking asylum out of sympathy and, acting in a maternal spirit, would save them from capital punishment. However, by selling them to religious or church institutions they were sentenced to lifelong slavery with no hope of achieving freedom. They were to remain conscious, in this way, of their crime and to repent. In this particular case a slave who had confessed to murder was committed entirely into the care of the Bishop of Priene after he had donated 24 Nomismata, to serve him and his successors. No bishop or cleric could sell him outside the church or give him any chance to escape the Synod’s punishment. If he did manage to escape he was threatened with even harsher conditions, while the bishop and the bishopric were to be punished under church law. Some other cases in which slaves were involved can be found in the late Byzantine Patriarchal records. All of them are registered in the index, volume 7, of the *Regestes des actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, prepared by Jean Darrouzès in 1991.

II Of the surviving juridical texts which were never enacted three are often cited and were long considered to be laws: the *Nomos Georgikos* (The Farmer’s law), the *Nomos Rhodion Nautikos*
(The Rhodian Sea-Law) and the Nomos Stratiotikos. They are generally found – according to L. Burgmann - “in the context of legal guidebooks from the 8th and 9th C – the Ecloga, Eisagoge, Prochiron and Epitome – and their derivatives” The Nomos Georgikos is structured in 85 paragraphs and was evidently often used. Originating from the 7th-9th C, we find many manuscripts from the 10th C onwards, as is shown by Igor Medvedev’s critical edition. It deals with peasant regulations and customs for an area rich in vineyards but not in olive groves. Slaves are only mentioned in § 45-47 and 71-72 “in connection with cattle rustling … and with the delivery of cattle to shepherds”. Capital punishment for slaves guilty of losing a herd of cattle or of stealing cattle is also mentioned.

The Nomos Nautikos is a collection of regulations for maritime jurisdiction, compiled between the 6th and the 8th C, perhaps even as late as the second half of the 9th C. § III 15 discusses slaves on board ship. The Nomos Stratiotikos was compiled by 900, and probably much earlier. Regulation 22 records that a person who is conscripted and evades service by fleeing, is to be enslaved for betraying his own freedom.

Revealing insights into the status of slaves from the viewpoint of the civil legal courts in the capital city are found in the collection known as the Peira. According to the Prolegomena to the PmbZ II, it was compiled around 1040/50 probably for teaching purposes by an “assistant and admirer of the judge Eustathios Rhomaios (ca. 970-1040).” It consists of 75 titles and 1048 chapters. According to Helga Köpstein’s central article about “Slaves in the Peira” [Fontes Minores 9,1993] “slightly more than 100” of the 1048 chapters, “thus 10%, address legal questions about slavery or mention slaves or freedmen.” The critical edition of the Peira is currently being prepared by Dieter Simon and Diether R. Reinsch.

Further source material of legal or at least juridical character consists of Byzantine treaties with other states, because they also deal with slaves in several aspects, thus treaties with the Califate, with the Rus’, with the tribes of the Hamdanids or the Banu Habib. Amongst late Byzantine treaties the most remarkable for us is that concluded with the Mamluk-Sultans in 1281 (DöWi 3054b). Finally we know several wills, which mention slaves and give details about manumission: the will of the Cappadocian landowner Eustathios Boilas in 1059 is the most detailed one.

Bestimmungen zum Hochverrat in mittelbyzantinischen Rechtsbüchern

Versucht man, einen vormodernen „Staat“ nach der Stabilität seiner Führungsspitze qualitativ zu bewerten, so schneidet das Byzantinische Reich eher schlecht ab: Dass sich der Kaiser während seiner Herrschaft mit Verschwörungen auseinanderzusetzen hatte, war mehr Regel denn Ausnahme. Nicht selten erlag der basileus einem Komplot und verlor dabei neben Herrschaft auch sein Leben.31 Diese Instabilität an der Spitze des Byzantinischen Reiches war insofern bis zu einem gewissen Grade systemimmanent, als erstens das Kaisertum im Prinzip jedem offenstand und zweitens der Kaiser selbst zwar eine sakrale Person war, eine erfolgreiche Usurpation jedoch gleichwohl ex eventu als Ausdruck göttlichen Willens gedeutet werden konnte. Zwar spielte der dynastische Gedanke über weite Phasen der byzantinischen Geschichte eine bedeutende Rolle, doch gab es selbst zu diesen Zeiten, in denen ein vergleichsweise hoher Grad an Stabilität zu erwarten gewesen wäre, zahlreiche Umsturzversuche, die letzten Endes bloß nicht von Erfolg gekrönt waren. Ganz abgesehen davon konnte der Kaiser natürlich auch von einem Mitglied seiner eigenen Familie gestürzt werden. Das Kaisertum war folglich für seinen Inhaber ein hochgradig gefährliches „Amt“. Ralph-Johannes Lilie berechnete etwa für die mittelbyzantinische Zeit (602–1204), dass über 50 Prozent der Kaiser durch eine Usurpation an die Macht gelangten.32


Angesichts der großen Anzahl an – oftmals erfolgreichen – Umsturzversuchen liegt der Verdacht nahe, dass dies – gerade im Falle einer Herrschaft mit schriftlich fixierter Rechtstradition, wie es das Byzantinische Reich war33 – auch seinen Niederschlag in juristischen Texten fand, und


zwar insofern, als dem Hochverräter durch die hieraus abgeleitete Rechtspraxis in aller Deutlichkeit und Schärfe die Konsequenzen seines Handelns vor Augen geführt und er dadurch idealiter von einem derartigen Versuch abgehalten wurde.


gesinnten Nachbarn. Zu diesen Handlungen zählten somit, wie gleich zu zeigen sein wird, beispielsweise auch Kollaboration, Desertion, Anstachelung des Feindes sowie die Preisgabe kriegswichtigen Wissens.

**Ecloga**

In der im Jahr 741 promulgierten *Ecloga* (Εκλογή τῶν νόμων) der Kaiser Leon III. und Konstantinos V., die sich gemäß ihrer *Inscriptio* als Auswahl des justinianischen *Corpus iuris civilis* begreift, ist der 17. Titel der Bestrafung von Kriminaldelikten gewidmet (Ποινάλιος τῶν ἐγκληματικῶν κεφαλαίων). Dieser setzt sich aus 53 bzw. 54 Kapiteln zusammen, von denen zwei Abschnitte das Strafmaß für Hochverrat festlegen. In Kapitel 3 des 17. Titels heißt es:

> Wer gegen den Kaiser konspiriert oder Anschläge plant oder eine Verschwörung gegen den Staat der Christen unternimmt, dem gebührte es zwar, unverzüglich zu sterben, da er auf die Vernichtung des Ganzen sann. Damit aber nicht Leute, die vielleicht mit anderen verfeindet sind, diese ohne Verfahren töten und später zur Verteidigung vorbringen: „Er hat gegen den Kaiser geredet“, muß ein solcher auf der Stelle unter strenge Bewachung genommen und der ihn betreffende Sachverhalt an den Kaiser berichtet werden; und weiter muß man so verfahren, wie dieser selbst untersuchen und beschließen wird.


---

41 Vgl. Ecloga (wie Anm. 5) S. 124 f.
43 Ebd. Inscriptio (S. 160 f.).
44 Codex Justinianus (wie Anm. 9) 9.7.1.1 (S. 373): Unde integris omnibus ad nostram scientiam referatur, ut ex personis hominum dicta pensemus et, utrum praetermitti an exsequi rite debatur, ceseamus.
45 Ebd. 9.8.3 (S. 373).

In Kapitel 53 des 17. Titels der Ecloga wird darüber hinaus ein Vergehen thematisiert, das Hochverrat auf einer anderen Ebene darstellt: das Überlaufen zum Feind, das bereits in den Digesten als Hochverrat im Sinne eines Majestätsverbrechens definiert worden war.66

„Deserteure, d. h. diejenigen, die zum Feind überlaufen, sollen mit dem Schwert bestraft werden.“47


Eisagoge und Prochiron


Derjenige, der gegen das Wohlergehen des Kaisers sinnt, wird getötet und enteignet.49


46 Digesta (wie Anm. 8) 48.4.2: aut qui exercitum deseruit vel privatus ad hostes perfugit.
48 Vgl. zur umstrittenen Datierung insb. A. Schminck, Studien zu mittelbyzantinischen Rechtsbüchern (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte, Bd. 13) Frankfurt am Main 1986 und Th. E. van Bochove, To Date and Not to Date. On the Date and Status of Byzantine Law Books, Groningen 1996.
und seine Charakterisierung als ein Streben nach Vernichtung des „Ganzen“, sondern auch die in der *Ecloga* eingebauten expliziten „Mechanismen“, um dem Missbrauch von Denunziationen einen Riegel vorzuschieben, was natürlich umgekehrt nicht bedeutet, dass der des Hochverrats Verdächtigte nun ohne Verhandlung sofort mit dem Tode bestraft worden wäre. Vielmehr ging es auch in dieser Bestimmung darum, was derjenige, welcher aufgrund der genannten Straftat bereits verurteilt worden war, als adäquate Strafe zu erwarten hatte. Mit Exekution und Konfiskation entspricht das Strafmaß demjenigen, das bereits in der von den Kaisern Arkadios (395–408) und Honorios (395–423) im Jahr 397 erlassenen so genannten *lex quisquis* festgelegt worden war.50


> Es ist erlaubt, diejenigen, die sich von den römischen [Gebieten] zu den Feinden flüchten, wie Feinde ungefährdet zu töten.51

Fahnenflüchtige durften demnach von jedermann getötet werden, ohne dass dies für diesen zu juristischen Konsequenzen geführt hätte. In eine ganz ähnliche Richtung gehen *Prochiron* 39.19 und *Eisagoge* 40.22:

> Die Feinde und diejenigen, die zu ihnen überlaufen, werden mit dem Schwert bestraft.52

Hier werden also Überläufer bzw. Fahnenflüchtige mit dem Feind selbst gleichgesetzt und ihnen entsprechend mit Exekution gedroht. Dass Desertion bzw. Fahnenflucht schon in den *Digesten* als Majestätsverbrechen definiert worden waren, wurde bereits erwähnt.53

Über diese – auch gemäß der *Ecloga* explizit zu sanktionierenden – Vergehen hinaus finden sich in *Prochiron* und *Eisagoge* weitere Tatbestände aus dem Bereich des Hochverrats, die allesamt mit entsprechender Härte bestraft wurden.

Bereits das erste Kapitel des jeweiligen Titels beider Rechtsbücher beschreibt ein Vergehen und seine Bestrafung, das sich in der *Ecloga* nicht findet: das Anstacheln des Feindes und das Verraten von Landsleuten an den Feind.

> Derjenige, welcher Feinde anstachelt oder Römer den Feinden verrät, wird mit dem Tode bestraft.54

Die Charakterisierung der Aufwiegelung von Feinden als Hochverrat hat ihre Grundlage in den *Digesten*, wo es als Majestätsverbrechen (crimen maiestatis) definiert wurde.55

---

50 *Codex Iustinianus* (wie Anm. 9) 9.8.5 (S. 373): […] ipse quidem utpote maiestatis reus gladio feriatur, bonis eius omnibus fisco nostro addictis.


53 Vgl. oben Anm. 16.


55 *Digesta* (wie Anm. 8) 48.4.1.1 (S. 844): Maiestatis autem crimen illud est, quod adversum populum Romanum vel adversus securitatem eius committitur. quo tenetur is, […] quive hostibus populi Romani nuntium litterasve miserit signumve dederit fecerit
Ebenfalls keine Entsprechung in der *Ecloga* haben zwei weitere Bestimmungen aus den beiden Rechtsbüchern, welche den Transfer kriegswichtigen Materials bzw. Wissens betreffen. In *Prochiron* 39.9 und *Eisagoge* 40.11 heißt es:

*Niemand darf den Barbaren weder bearbeitete noch unbearbeitete noch eherne Waffen verkaufen, denn sonst wird er mit dem Tode bestraft.*

Die Übergabe von Waffen an den Feind wurde bereits in den *Digesten* unter Strafe gestellt. In ähnliche Richtung stoßen zudem auch *Prochiron* 39.38 *Eisagoge* 40.40:

*Derjenige, der die Barbaren lehrt, ein Schiff zu bauen, wird mit dem Tode bestraft.*

Auch wenn diese Bestimmung auf *Codex* 9.47.25 basierte, besaß sie um die Wende vom neunten zum zehnten Jahrhundert höchste Aktualität: Gerade nach der muslimischen Eroberung Kretas in den 820er Jahren war die Ägäis als geographischer Kernraum der Byzantiner eine stets bedrohte Region geworden. Im Jahr 904 wurde mit Thessaloniki sogar die zweitwichtigste Stadt des Reiches von muslimischen Verbänden erobert und geplündert. Dass unter diesen Umständen gerade die Sanktionierung der Weitergabe maritimen Wissens in den beiden makedonischen Gesetzbücher Eingang fand, kann daher nicht verwundern.

Darüber hinaus sanktionierten *Prochiron* 39.17 und *Eisagoge* 40.20 auch das – bereits an anderer Stelle erwähnte – Überlaufen zum Feind in Kombination mit dem Verraten kriegswichtiger Pläne:

*Diejenigen, die zu den Feinden überlaufen und ihnen unsere Pläne verraten, werden an der Furca gehängt oder verbrannt.*

Im Vergleich mit der „einfachen“ Fahnenflucht, die mit dem Schwert bestraft wurde, war das Strafmaß in diesem Fall mit dem Hängen an der Furca oder dem Verbrennen noch unwürdiger, was auf die Schwere des Vergehens verweist.

**Fazit**

Die Bestimmungen der drei untersuchten Rechtstexte zum Hochverrat basieren zum überwiegenden Teil auf Normen, die bereits in das justinianische *Corpus iuris civilis* Eingang gefunden hatten, wobei sich – umgekehrt betrachtet – in diesem eine ganze Reihe von Bestimmungen finden, die in die drei mittelbyzantinischen Rechtsbücher nicht aufgenommen wurden. Während in der *Ecloga* der Kaiser Leon III. und Konstantinos V. an hochverräterischen Handlungen lediglich

---


57 *Digesta* (wie Anm. 8) 48.4.4 (S. 844): cuiusve opera dolo malo hostes populi Romani commeatu armis telis equis pecunia aliave qua re adiuti erunt.


59 *Codex Justinianus* 9.47.25: *Hís, qui conficiendi naves incognitam ante peritiam barbaris tradiderunt, capitale supplicium proponi decernimus.*
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Towards the Study of Microstructures in Byzantium
(Introduction)

More than three decades have passed since Alexander Kazhdan advocated the study of microstructures in 1982, and scholarship has been slow to respond. Research on the social and economic history of Byzantium has concentrated on the upper levels of society, where the evidence is abundant and relatively easily accessible. This has resulted in a top-down explanatory model that attributes decisive influence on all matters of internal politics to emperor and patriarch.

In this panel, by contrast, the focus is on horizontal forms of organization or collaboration between social equals, their role in contemporary politics and culture and their representation in the sources. The range of individuals involved in such groups is broad: village peasants, urban craftsmen, soldiers, monks, even aristocratic circles of pious women. The spaces in which they operate are equally diverse: the provinces of the Empire as well as the imperial capital of Constantinople, city streets and private homes, parish churches and monastery chapels, the hippodrome and the theatron. There is great variety in the impetus for the formation of these groups and in their durability over time: political unrest and financial gain, aesthetic pleasures and pious motivations can all contribute, at different times and in different constellations, to bring people together.

What these groups have in common is their origin in the initiative of men and women who exercised their own personal agency and agenda, and their independent existence outside the direct reach of the power structures of church and empire. Over the long history of the Byzantine Empire, many other groups of similar or different nature were formed that still need to be explored. The degree to which such groups contribute to the stability and durability of the Byzantine Empire remains an open question. Also in need of clarification is the methodological question of the identification of such groups as social ‘structures.’ The six papers in this panel, individually and collectively, thus raise a number of important issues in a field that invites much further study.
Solidarities in a Provincial Context

The Village

The village is the dominant grouping in the provinces. As a fiscal unit, it is fairly well known on account of the information contained in various archival, legal and narrative sources. When it comes to its social aspect, we tend to think about it as a microstructure, a microcosm, given that it is basically a small settlement with a small population. The village, however, is in reality a macrocosm, in which a variety of relations among its inhabitants develops as a result of its fiscal unity: because of that unity the villagers are primarily obliged to exploit the lands and the natural resources belonging to the village and for this reason they come into various relations with their co-villagers, either relatives or non-relatives.

For the state, the village is a legal entity: its inhabitants are capable of acting collectively and lay claims to natural resources either inside or outside the community. The best examples demonstrating this are the cases of purchase of abandoned land, known from the archives of Athos. But the villages' legal competence is clear already in the Farmers' Law, where the possibility of dispute between villages, or between villages and persons is predicted. Disputes are settled with the testimony of the older or more respectable dwellers, but often took the form of oral “agreements among gentlemen”, without the assistance of experts (νομικοί) that were often lacking in small rural communities. Even at later times with all the surviving archival material we cannot be sure that dispute settlements took a written form. These methods of action undoubtedly strengthened the communal feeling of village residents while keeping the problems within the community. The same result was achieved with the drawing up of a particular document, the ἀσφάλεια/διάλυσις, which is basically a private document, binding for all the signing parties. A remarkable case comes from the archive of the monastery of Lavra (1008). It concerns the inhabitants of the village Radochosta, in which apparently there was no nomikos. For this reason the document was drafted by a private person whose basic capacity was “nephew of the tourmaches and spatharokandidatos Nikolaos”. Fourteen peasants, among them several oikodespotai, placed their signa at the beginning of the document, which was signed by the spatharokandidatos Nikolaos, a droungarios, an oikodespotes, and three clerics. It is certainly noteworthy that communal consciousness legalized these transactions by bringing the villagers together and circumventing social differences.

The villagers protected their communal space, which was vital for their prosperity. They could claim as community property installations that had been arbitrarily erected within the village circumscription under the provision that they would reimburse the owner of the investment. In a rural context watermills, olive oil and wine presses were very important. The peasants asserted very strongly their free access to water supplies, woodlands and pastures. Such stipulations are found in
the Farmers’ Law, and monastic archives preserve the history of similar cases. The inhabitants of Menikon in Crete claimed the destruction of a mill plus reimbursements for their damaged produce from the owner (1118). In 1321 the inhabitants of Chantax in the region of Strymon destroyed the mill of the Chilandar monastery themselves. On the other hand, there was no restriction for the erection of such installations on communal land by the villagers provided that there was no damage to individual farmers. A significant detail found in the archive of Lavra records how the villagers secured their claims to resources found near their village: when the *clasmatic* (abandoned) land of the chersonese of Pallene was finally sold to the monastery of Peristerai, it was recorded in the corresponding document that the inhabitants of the region would have free access to water sources and pastures and would be able to collect wood for daily use (*ξυλον, δαδιον*).

Inside the rural communities, social unity is by no means self-evident. The Farmers’ Law already distinguishes among owners, lessees, *paroikoi* and *penetes*. Groupings within the villages other than families sometimes make their existence very visible. Farmers generally tend to expand theircultivations, a process in which their solidarity manifests itself. The most notable case is in my opinion that of the *paroikoi* of the *episkepsis* of Sampson near Miletos, who, in their agony to assert their claim on a domain allocated to the monastery of Stylos, claimed that they were free farmers – but they were, in reality, state *paroikoi* (1211). A few years later, the *paroikoi* of Potamos village, close to Smyrne, engaged their *pronoarios*, Syrgares, to represent them to the authorities in their effort to claim reimbursements from the monastery of Lembos for their investments in the region Sfournos. Two remarks can be made on these occasions: first, working on a particular estate creates a collegiality among farmers as a result of the fact that they share common interests; this type of solidarity may cut across village borders, thus creating partially overlapping solidarities. Second, the agency of the *pronoarioi* is patently obvious. The *archontike prostasia* is a phenomenon that we know also from middle Byzantium. The difference from the 12th c. onwards, however, is that it stabilizes within the *pronia* institution. Peasants invoke the aid of the “archons”, who are in most cases beneficiaries of the state. Kekaumenos in the 11th c. had already described which forms might the archons’ mediation take. For Kekaumenos, their intervention ability in rural affairs is granted and non negotiable. The *pronoarioi* acquire a similar role as they are called to represent, defend villagers or arbitrate in their disputes. Again, Asia Minor offers many examples: that of Anna Botaniataina at Priene/Sampson, of Syrgares and Eirene Branaina at Smyrne are the most notable. In a document from 1224 it is recorded that “*the paroikoi of the Sampson estate have always been powerful* (*σθεναροὶ*) because they have been commanded, supported and protected by great people and *familiars* (*οἰκείων*) of the emperors”.

The expansion of the *pronia* institution is not the only reason for the growth of separate solidarities in an agrarian context. Smaller groups, such as families or soldiers can also develop into separate poles within the villages. In the law of 928 the emperor Romanos I noted that extended families often resorted to violence against their co-villagers. In the second edition of the Novel, probably dated to between 934 and 947, it was added that their actions were premeditated (*ἐκ προνοίας*). But since Byzantine society was structured on the bestowal of privileges thus creating many partially overlapping, but internally homogenous, circles of beneficiaries, there can be no doubt that the most visible group of beneficiaries in middle Byzantium were the soldiers. From the late 7th c. at the latest the soldiers are installed in their villages and their paternal houses. Their privileges (salaries, tax exemptions etc) and the fact that they are armed, creates a social stratum with a particularly powerful profile in the provinces, but evidence on their solidarities –probably based in most cases on the fact that thematic
units were locally recruited – is sparse. Tenth century sources inform us that soldiers appeared at camp together with their ὑπηρετούμενοι (assistants). According to the Novels, these are distinguished between soldiers normally attached to the service of their superiors and those who “belong to the community”. Indeed this information, meager as it is, suggests the creation of obligations and possibly of clientele relations in the communities, between peasants and soldiers of the same village, or soldiers and other soldiers, inside or outside their own community.

The fratriai/fatriai

In the Life of St. Euthymios the Younger we read: “His parents were noble (ἐυπάτριδες) and just at the same time, and stimulated each other’s virtue to the point of antagonism until one of them take the lead in virtue from the other; because they despised promotion (ἀναβάσεως), but zeal was prodding them, and there was an honorable rivalry between them and a salutary fatria around them desired not only by those living in the same village, but also by those whose life and dwelling had been allotted further away”. There can be no doubt that the author intended to give a religious tone to the text but his choice of words and of ancient terminology (ἐυπάτριδες, φατρία) together with military terminology (ἀνάβασις) is unique and unreported in the Byzantine narrative sources; it transfers the competition described to both religious and military level, since it is further clarified that the family was subjected to military strateia. I did not manage to come to a conclusion about whether the fatria refers to the nuclear family of Euthymios, or to his extended family living in the same village or in the wider area. In any case, the fratria in antiquity was an assemblage based on family and this particular family apparently was an example for the inhabitants of Galatia.

The content of the term fatria/fratria in Byzantium is ambivalent; it signifies either the extended family with relatives and clients, but also the conspiracy as a result of the influence of the Roman law, in which case the Roman factio is meant – particularly in the Basilica, which translates directly from the Digesta. The punishment for “conspiracy or fratria” is in most cases death; particular stipulations have been included in Canon law and in the Tactica for the military. The Byzantine lexicographers are aware of the confusion: while they recognize that a fratria is all about family and religious practices, the most analytic entries also note that for the Romans it meant “rebellion” (κίνημα). The synonyms provided are also of interest: the fratores are also called ἑταῖροι (comrades), σύμμαχοι (allies), the fratria is also called σύνταγμα, σύστημα, or even συμμορία.

There can be no doubt that in Byzantine narrative sources the connotations of these terms are primarily negative; most of the references indeed concern conspiracies or uprisings. The Byzantines, however, seem to have knowledge of fatriarchal groupings, even though mentions are extremely rare. Among them we distinguish the ἐταυριώτικος φατρία of caesar Bardas; Skylitzes Continuatus relates also that the Cappadocian soldiers withdrew from Mantzikert κατὰ φατρίας καὶ συμμορίας. But the fatria which relates to family is part of the aristocracy’s social projection. Apart from the Life of St. Euthymios, we also find it in the Chronicle of Monembasia regarding the Skleroi (φατρία τῶν ἐπονομαζομένων Σκληρῶν) and in the Enkomion of the martyrs of Satala, relating to St. Eugenios who was connected to St. Eustratios through family, fatria and alliance (πατρίδος καὶ γένους καὶ φατρίας καὶ δὴ καὶ τῆς κατὰ φιλίαν οἰκειότητος). In the time of the political consolidation of the aristocracy, the references begin to increase. Among them two are very characteristic of aristocratic social perception: the extensive comparison by Attaleiates of the fatriai of Botaneiates and Bryennios based on service at the higher military commands, and the φατρία λαμπρά συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων of John VI Kantakouzenos, which refers to his supporting network.
The *fatria* in Byzantium becomes an aristocratic feature that not only corresponds to the social level of the families, but also to their social depth and the expansion of their social and political influence. As such, the *fatria* is a grouping that penetrates the social structure of Byzantium by creating horizontal circles of allegiance bound with each other with vertical ties. It comes then as no surprise that there was a discussion in the 12th c. about legalizing these networks. But Balsamon only knows the *fatriai* as conspiracies, so he completely rejects the possibility of attributing legality to them, even if they are formed for the greater good, such as the defense of a city against the enemy. Nevertheless, the fact that testimonies increase from this time onwards is indicative of the tolerance towards expressions of aristocratic identity and political differentiation. An example of distinct *fatriai* allied for the same political purpose is that of the *fatriai* of Didymoteichon, which belonged politically to Kantakouzenos during the second civil war of the 14th c.

**Confraternities**

The issue of the confraternities in Byzantium is rather complicated as a result of the homogenous treatment in the bibliography of various phenomena that seem to refer back to ancient traditions. The situation being such, it is better to try to distinguish these phenomena and their development in middle Byzantium and to pose more questions, rather than give definitive answers.

A series of terms found in the sources appear to denote “confraternities”: σπουδαίοι, φιλόπονοι, σύντροφοι, φιλικοί, διακονία, ἀδελφότης. Their provenance is differentiated, as the terms come either from civic evergetism (σπουδὴ καὶ φιλοπονία in Roman inscriptions) or from the alleged Roman “precursor” of the confraternities, the collegia. Ἀδελφότης denoting a group of people other than a monastic one is very rare in Byzantium, because primarily it is recognized as a relation that leads to society (κοινωνία), a very powerful legal relationship. Διακονία, on the other hand, is a Greek word for providing services, it is therefore quite common. While groups described with these terms appear to function in cities, belonging to such a group is not part of people's public image. Indeed I found only one inscription from Tyraion of Phrygia which made mention of two *spoudaioi* who had a tomb constructed apparently for themselves and for a third person.

A series of issues is connected to these groups: first, some services were delivered by particular groups –normally professional ones– in the cities in return for tax reliefs. To this category I would classify the references to the burial of the dead and some of the references to the λούσματα. The first task was transferred to the Church perhaps already in the 4th c., and the practice is well known from various sources relating to the burial of the dead in Constantinople and Ephesos. In a different method the taxes of some professionals were allotted to διακονίαι of the λούσματα in middle Byzantium, as 10th c. notes relating to the alienation of workshops appear to indicate (this method actually recalls the *solemnia logisima*, meaning the taxes of taxpayers allotted for the benefit of a third party). The state also guaranteed the minimum of the services relating to public baths, taken into consideration that there existed in the 11th c. an *offikion* of the δουλεία εἰς τὰ λούμα (sic). On the other hand, the service of the baths of the poor and the sick instituted in Constantinople by Paul of Antioch in the 6th c. developed into the foundation of two institutions. While they didn’t survive for long, the practice of providing a bath and a descent meal to the poor appears to have continued and was probably complemented with prayers and ceremonies performed by priests. However, it is not at all certain that the service took the same form in the provincial towns visited by Paul, much less that it survived in middle Byzantium. Lastly, when we are talking about voluntary association with
a particular philanthropic work attached to it such as helping the sick or poor, we must consider almost certain that there was a type of reward, such as the distribution of rations by the institution involved, or of the payment of a small salary, as indicated in the Lives of Eastern Saints. The third type of confraternity is significantly different and relates to icon veneration. The references we have concern St. John Prodromos, Theotokos of Hodegoi and Maria Rhomaia in Constantinople, Theotokos of Hodegoi and probably St. Demetrios in Thessalonica, and Theotokos of Naupaktos in the region of Thebes.

It is basically considered that confraternities’ members are not bound by vertical ties. If people of the same social level unite for a common action, then these groups rise above social boundaries found in any time in any society. Still, there are details in the stories told that we cannot ignore, such as the distribution of rations or rewards, which may indicate that joining such a group might have been a way of living for many “volunteers”. Also of note is the fact that some participants concealed their social status, which means that participation was not part of their public image. When it comes to institutions for which such groups worked, we should also take into consideration that their foundation and function preconditioned contributions and benefactions by other individuals or organizations, that may or may not have belonged to the group. So the question arises, which is the real “confraternity”, the circle of benefactors, or the circle of volunteers? In my opinion, not all the *diakoniai* attested in the sources, and those attested through the seals, relate to confraternities.

We only have two Typika that allow us to take a look at the internal organization of confraternities. Both were signed by the members, but similarities end there. The earlier one, that of the *διακονία τῶν ἀπρονοητῶν* of Theodore Studites, occupied with the burial of the poor and foreigners and the visit to the sick and imprisoned, functioned with its members’ donations and possibly those of other persons. The confraternity was supposed to hold memorial services and meals on particular days of the year and its members were expected to follow a code of behavior. The confraternity of Thebes functioned on the model of the Theotokos Hodegetria with the main task to carry the icon of Theotokos of Naupaktos to a separate parish every month. It is interesting in this case that the icon’s initial place was at the female monastery of the Archangel Michael, a *metochion* of the monastery of Steiris, and that the first to sign the document was the *hegoumenos* of the monastery of Dafnion of Athens. The members of the confraternity came from the wider region of Thebes, Athens and Euboea. Only in the first case, however, do we have concrete evidence that there was a leader, the *προκαθηγούμενος*. On the other hand, the *filikon* of St. John Prodromos in the 7th c. was probably directed by a *trapezites*, who was at the same time the *arcarios* (treasurer) of the group. The duties of the first men were apparently to check the members for their behavior and the fulfillment of their obligations; they were authorized to impose fines and apparently they handled the confraternity’s assets and provided the necessary materials for the ceremonies (vigils, processions). Relating to this aspect, however, we might ask how much the charismatic personality of certain individuals leads to the formation of “confraternities” and how much are they as well a field for clientele relations to function or even to be newly created. There is no doubt, for example, about the striking personality of Paul of Antioch, or of Sisinnios, who founded an *ἀδελφότης* of men and women somewhere in Cappadocia. We also know from the Miracles of St. Artemios that the members of such a group appeared at the ceremonies dressed in official or special ceremonial clothing (λαμπροτέρως), and the more distinguished among them with their servants or retinues (ἐλευθερικὴ ὑπουργία). In later times it is not certain that all these rules were maintained, but it
appears that the processions of holy icons were indeed very impressive. On the contrary, one of
the testimonies on the λούσματα suggests that the service may not have always been considered a
honorary burden; it was possible to send a servant instead of appearing personally while at the same
time upholding the “honor” within the family and indeed, transmitting it to the next generation.
Nevertheless, the λούσμα is the only diakonia for which we have actual proof that new members
were admitted with a modest prayer.

Lastly, it is worth noting that most of these confraternities had legal competence. This is obvious
already in the case of the λούσματα mentioned above, that were normally taxed. It is also derived
from the existence of the seals of diakoniai, that were attached to the official correspondence. The
most important testimony, however, is that of the confraternity of Hodegetria at Thessalonike: the
confraternity owned καταλλακτικά εργαστήρια, which it exploited under emphyteotic lease. The
confraternity’s representative at their sale had the title of oikonomos, but he was also the megas
oikonomos of the metropolis of Thessalonike.

Monasteries and churches

Village churches are as expected a point of reference for the population of agrarian communities.
Apart from forming a religious space common for all its inhabitants, the church’s personnel normally
belongs to its most distinguished social stratum and its presence in transactions among villagers
brings legality to their actions and bridges social differences within the village. Under the direction
of a nomikos – who in most cases is also a priest – representatives of the upper village stratum sign
documents of simple paroikoi thus validating their alienations – again, the best examples are found
in the Lembiotissa archive near Smyrne.

As a building, however, a church is not only a sacred place for religious ceremonies or a space
in which transactions are carried out, but also a space for the social projection of peasants and
villagers notwithstanding their social position. This is an ancient habit of which we lose track in
middle Byzantium, but it reappears in the 13th c. The donations of villagers for the erection or
renovation of churches is well known in late antiquity through elaborate inscriptions, in which the
names of the donors are recorded together with the amount of money donated and the mosaic
surface covered by that amount. From the 6th c. onwards the inscriptions become simpler without
the catalogue of donors, as we find it, for example, in the church of St. Tryphon in Troas: “for the
blessing of the villages and … their houses whose names God knows”. In the same period, there are
several references in narrative sources –mostly lives of saints– to the generosity of peasants when
a new monastery was erected in their region. The most eloquent descriptions are found in the Life
of St. Euthymios the Younger regarding the erection of Peristerai in the outskirts of Thessalonike,
and in the Life of St. Nikon regarding his monastery in Lakedaimon. But in the 13th c. and later
the habit of mentioning the donors by name along with their donations returns. It is particularly
evident in Lakedaimon (especially in Mani), but it is also observed in Thasos, Crete, Naxos, Cyprus,
Epirus. The donations in these cases are not only amounts of money, but also small pieces of land,
olive trees, vineyards, and thus the inscriptions also become proofs of transactions. It is interesting
that in a couple of instances the inscriptions mention the πρόκριτοι or the κοινὸς λαός, the γενεαί,
κληρονόμοι and κτήτορες. This type of social terminology not only points to the social stratification
within the communities, but also to the progressing delimitation of the social classes in Byzantium,
based on descent and inheritance.
In Asia Minor we know the case of a small church in Genikon village; the peasants validated with a document its allocation to Lembiotissa, thus proving that they owned the church. The Lembiotissa archive offers examples of small churches/monasteries with a few kellia around them built by private persons on their own land. Their foundation was followed by donations of land by the co-villagers, followed by their allocation to Lembiotissa. It is worth mentioning that this phenomenon is described very well in Basil II’s Novel of 996. This type of foundation created collectivities of limited size within rural communities. Members of the same family as well as co-villagers were expected to be tonsured in these monasteries, but according to the stipulation of Basil II they would have to gather more than eight or ten monks to be considered a real monastery. For this reason most of these foundations were transferred to the ownership of larger monasteries which could afford their maintenance –in Athos, where we observe their evolution better, the small monasteries were sold, Lavra and Iviron monasteries being in most cases the buyers.

Some final remarks

All through this paper I strove to avoid extensive references to well known structures such as the family or the fiscal unit of the village. The most important questions that require an answer, in my view, are not those relating to confining these structures to their manifestations and describing them, but those that would lead us to an explanation regarding their internal organization, the rules that regulated their function, their placement and role within a wider society that is dominated by an extremely centralized state, and the position of individuals in these structures and its meaning. To the degree that middle Byzantine organizations such as the “confraternities” are differentiated from their late antique precursors, participation in them was not part of the individuals’ social self projection, otherwise our information would have been abundant. When entrance is limited or restricted, then participation also becomes a privileged situation for those involved. However, this conclusion does not apply to villages and their inhabitants; living in a particular settlement really defines people’s space of social action and becomes part of their identity. In this context it is understandable why ancient notions of the wider family such as the fatria survived in middle and later Byzantium. The fatria is a vehicle for social self definition that may cut across local borders and even take up political characteristics. But in no case can it be considered that these organizations totally covered the Byzantine provinces and that Byzantine society was structured in homocentric, horizontal groupings of people. In the end, it was possible to live outside such groupings, and that was Byzantium’s greatest achievement in the middle ages.
Solidarities and Factions: Soldiers and Monks between the Two Iconoclasms

Societies or social formations consist of complexly interconnected sets of social practices, and these practices – ways of doing and behaving, determined by context, function and perceived needs - have the effect of both promoting the physical - biological - reproduction of groups and individuals, on the one hand, and creating institutional patterns of behaving, through which systems of belief and social organization are maintained and reproduced. Such systems cannot exist in isolation but in turn overlap with those around them spatially. Social anthropology shows that most societies quickly evolve stratified hierarchies of access to resources, and that access by one group or stratum to more resources than others brings with it a consolidation of social power within that group in comparison to others - regardless of the process through which selection occurred. At the same time, social groups evolve in relation to resources and in proportion to their ability to control and manipulate resources, and they structure their relationships through patterns of behavior which are in turn determined by concepts of person and identity. Hierarchization, the development of complex notions of status, social honour, rights and privileges depending also on age and sex as well as wealth and access to resources, gendered roles and concepts (determined in their turn by notions theories about identities and the behavior appropriate to them) are inevitable facets of medieval East Roman as they are of all human social systems.

I want to compare two specific groups as examples of interest-groups whose identities cut across socio-economic and regional boundaries, but which nevertheless exemplify the limits of such functional identities – monks on the one hand, and soldiers on the other. They are worth comparing also because, ideologically, monks were soldiers of Christ, fighting a spiritual battle for the souls of the faithful, while soldiers, responsible for the physical defense of the Christian oikoumene, represented the other side of the fight against evil, however defined. One can conduct this discussion at a general level, but I want to place it in the specific context of the later eighth and early ninth centuries and in particular the politics of the restoration and then condemnation of devotion to images in 787 and 815.

Monks, organized in distinct and identifiable communities, led by individuals who represented them to the broader public and to the authorities, both secular and ecclesiastical, shared many features in common with soldiers. They represented a particular sector of eastern Roman society, acted as a focus for popular piety and mythology, to some extent as a focus for lay education, as a source of theological and political pressure, and – at least potentially - as a source of spiritual purity or strength, depending on the context and situation. They generally lived, ate and worshipped communally, even if within their communities there were considerable organizational and disciplinary differences; they were managed from an economic and logistical point of view by those appointed to manage their affairs by their abbots, and they were represented to the outside world likewise by individuals appointed to particular positions. Similar considerations apply to soldiers,
and especially soldiers of the elite units established under Constantine V and his successors. Soldiers enjoyed a particular legal status, inscribed in Roman law, of which a central element was the existence of a specific military peculium, which meant the right of disposal of property gained through their state service or through inheritance freely. They enjoyed a range of fiscal privileges also, which set them apart from the civil population of the empire. Soldiers were to a degree independent of other social loyalties, serving the state in a more or less unmediated way in a purely military hierarchy of power. They acted together to their common advantage, both at a highly localized level and on a more general basis. Soldiers’ grievances were frequently associated with their immediate economic situation and conditions, and this also lent to them a specific common identity. Soldiers were regarded as a specific element in the make-up of society. In the late ninth or early tenth century, the emperor Leo VI notes that they are one of the pillars of the Roman polity, along with the tillers of the soil. Unlike peasants, soldiers were united by common organizational imperatives, behavioral code, and specialized technical language of command. The ordinary, non-military population often found themselves in conflict with the interests of the soldiers, especially where the supplying and quartering of troops was concerned. Soldiers had been guaranteed a specific place in the Christian order of things since at least the fourth century, and they were in any case the visible representatives - whether en masse or individually - of the existence of the Roman state. They were the ‘fellow-soldiers’ of the emperors themselves, who referred to them symbolically in the ninth and tenth centuries as ‘their sons-in-law’ and saw themselves as their spiritual father. Soldiers were often closely integrated into local society, recruited from particular localities and served in the same units, tending thus to share similar loyalties and a similar ‘common sense’ of how their world worked.

Soldiers and monks thus had much in common from the point of view of their cohesion and organization in groups, their solidarity and identity as a group or as a set of sub-groups, as a set of ‘micro-structures’ within a larger social-cultural body. Yet there were also important differences, which I will consider in the following discussion.
Multiple Hierarchies:
Monastic Officers, Ordained Monks, and Wearers of the Great and the Small Habit at the Stoudios Monastery (10th-11th Centuries)

Byzantine monasteries were complex institutions. The communities that they harboured were not random collections of atomised individuals but clearly stratified social systems. Moreover, there existed multiple hierarchies, which were based on quite different criteria. The present paper analyses a monastic rule that was composed at the Constantinopolitan monastery of Stoudios in the late tenth century. This text mentions three different hierarchies - monastic officers such as oikonomos and docheiarios; priests and deacons; and the wearers of the great and the small habit - and attempts to correlate these hierarchies with each other in order to diffuse tensions that might arise between them.

Before we can delve into the discussion a few words need to be said about the Stoudios Typikon. The original text is lost and must be reconstructed through comparison of later adaptations. The most important witness is a Church Slavonic translation of a rule that the Constantinopolitan patriarch and former Stoudite abbot Alexius (1025-1043) had given to a monastery of the Theotokos, which he had founded in the capital. This now lost rule was undoubtedly based on the Stoudios Typikon since the Church Slavonic translation contains numerous references to Stoudite traditions. Independent confirmation comes from five texts dating to the twelfth century, the rules of the Southern Italian monasteries of Patirion, Soter and Trigona, and the rules of the Pantokrator and Mamas monasteries in the capital itself. Each of these texts contains stipulations that are also found in the Typikon of Alexius. These stipulations can therefore be claimed for the Stoudios Typikon.

Monastic Officers

The first hierarchy to be considered is that of the monastic offices or diakoniai, which ensured the survival of the community. In this context, too, the Stoudios Typikon emphasises the absolute supremacy of the abbot. Not only the officers but also their deputies should be directly appointed by him. Moreover, he could depose any officer who did not live up to his expectations. Similar stipulations are found in other monastic rules of the time. Yet this does again not mean that they are a true reflection of reality. From the Catecheses of Symeon the New Theologian we know that monks banded together, forming friendships, and lobbied the abbot to give them offices, which they then regarded as their personal fiefs. Symeon speaks about his own community but we can assume that the situation at Stoudios was no different.

However, it would be wrong to conclude that all evidence gleaned from the Stoudios Typikon is untrustworthy. The information that it gives about the various offices and their ranking is most likely accurate. This information is contained in a list of diakonetai. Versions of this list are found in three adaptations of the Stoudios Typikon. Through comparison of these versions we can establish that the original text contained the sequence of oikonomos, docheiarios and ekklesiarches, followed
by *skeuophylax*, *apothekarios* and *nosokomos*. The order in which the officers appear undoubtedly reflects their relative status within the hierarchy of the *diakoniai*. A look at other rules helps us to identify features that are specific to the Stoudios *Typikon*. The Petritzos *Typikon*, the Evergetis *Typikon* and the Patmos *Typikon* list the *oikonomos*, the *ekklesiarches* and the *docheiarios*. Here the sequence of *ekklesiarches* and *docheiarios* is thus reversed. We can conclude that the Stoudios *Typikon* gives the *ekklesiarches* who was in charge of the organisation of church services an unusually low rank within the monastic hierarchy.

**Priests and Deacons**

This does not mean, however, that at the Stoudios monastery the liturgical dimension was deemed to be of lesser importance than was the case elsewhere. At this point we need to turn our attention to another figure, the head priest of the monastery. In the Stoudios *Typikon* the head priest was given an important role. This is evident from two passages that explain who should take over the functions of the abbot when he was absent from the monastery or otherwise incapacitated. The first of these passages concerns church services. We are told that the *ekklesiarches* should not sound the board and the priest should not perform the liturgy without having obtained a blessing from the abbot. However, when the abbot is absent, this task is performed by the *oikonomos*, and when the *oikonomos* is also absent it is performed by the head priest. Here we get a glimpse of an alternative hierarchy where the head priest has the third rank after the abbot and the *oikonomos*. The same pattern can be found in the description of the ritual observed during meals in the refectory. There we are informed that the abbot must give the signal and bless the drink before the monks can eat, but that this task can also be performed by the *oikonomos*, or alternatively by the head priest. Significantly, the Evergetis Synaxarium, which contains the same stipulations, has in each case the sequence of abbot, *oikonomos* and *ekklesiarches*.

The very title of *protopresbyteros* implies the existence of a hierarchy consisting of priests, deacons and sub-deacons. This hierarchy had its origin in the lay church. The absence of the *protopresbyteros* from the list of officers in the Stoudios *Typikon* suggests that at the Stoudios monastery the two hierarchies were regarded as being separate from one another. That this was not a matter of course can be seen from a comparison with the Petritzos *Typikon* where the ordained monks are inserted as a group into the sequence of monastic officers between the *ekklesiarches* and the *docheiarios*. This arrangement suggests not only that the *ekklesiarches* was higher ranking than the priests but also that he had some kind of authority over them. It may be for this reason that the Petritzos *Typikon* makes no mention of a *protopresbyteros*.

That such merging of the two hierarchies is not found in the Stoudios *Typikon* is surely significant. One of the reasons for this separation was no doubt the size of the monastic community: Nicetas Stethatos proudly speaks of the great monastery of the Stoudites. It must have led to a tendency towards specialisation and division of labour. Such specialisation in turn may have caused members of each hierarchy to see themselves as a distinct group with its own agenda. Here comparison with the texts from the Evergetis monastery is instructive. The Evergetis *Typikon* focuses on the hierarchy of the *diakoniai* and makes no mention of the hierarchy of ecclesiastical ranks. References to priests only occur in descriptions of church services where they perform their various liturgical functions. The Evergetis Synaxarium where one would expect more detailed information is equally reticent about this topic.

How important a role the ecclesiastical hierarchy played at Stoudios can be seen from a passage in the Stoudios *Typikon* that sets out how monks should behave during church services. This passage
contains detailed instructions about the order of precedence. There we can see that the Stoudios Typikon recognised the existence of an alternative hierarchy of priests and deacons that, during church services at least, overrode the hierarchy of monastic offices. The docheiarios and the other high-ranking officers had to content themselves with the position that reflected their ecclesiastical rank. Only for the oikonomos an exception was made, no doubt because he was considered to be the abbot's lieutenant.

The discussion so far suggests that the focus on the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the Stoudios Typikon was unusual at the time. In addition, it can be argued that it was a relatively recent development. At this point we need to return to the description of the ritual observed during communal meals. As we have seen all eventualities were covered. When the abbot was absent the oikonomos took over his role and when the oikonomos, too, was absent the head priest stepped into the breach. However, this basic pattern is then modified: we are told that when the oikonomos is not a priest he only gives the sign for the meal to begin but asks the head priest to perform the blessing. This shows clearly that it was not considered acceptable for a lay monk to give blessings even if he had as high a rank as the oikonomos. This implicitly negates the claim that monks could be equal or even superior to priests, which was made at the time by Symeon the New Theologian. As is well known, Symeon had argued that monks were better confessors than lay priests. In the course of the eleventh century this point of view came under attack from the lay church, which insisted that the ability to give absolution was conferred through the act of ordination. Later Constantinopolitan rules show that in time even monastic milieus came to accept this argument. They stipulate that simple monks can only hear confession if they have a special dispensation from the patriarch. In light of this controversy the Stoudios Typikon can be considered ‘modern’. Despite its relatively early date it already has an ‘ecclesiastical’ rather than a monastic character. The hypothesis that the rise of the priests was a recent phenomenon finds support in the earlier Stoudios Hypotyposis. The Hypotyposis has come down to us in two versions. The later version frequently mentions ordained monks as a group and once even refers to the protopresbyteros, features that are still lacking in the earlier version. This attests to the growing importance of priests and deacons in the tenth century.

The Stoudios Typikon gives the clear impression that at the Stoudios monastery the ordained monks were in the ascendancy, making the most of their special status. However, we need to remember that its stipulations do not necessarily reflect contemporary practice. To some extent they may only have been an expression of the views of its authors. In this case one could argue that the priests, and the head priest in particular, had a hand in the compilation of the Stoudios Typikon, which would have served as a vehicle for their aspirations. This would also explain why monastic officers are characterised as trouble-makers. Comparison with the Petritzos Typikon reveals the significance of this detail. The author of this text also envisages a case where ordained and lay monks clash. Yet here the potential culprit is not a monastic officer but a priest who is not content with his place in the community.

**Wearers of the Great and the Small Habit**

Matters were complicated even further by the existence at the Stoudios monastery of yet another hierarchy, the distinction between the wearers of the great and the small habit. This distinction seems to have had its origins in the eighth century. Its fully developed form can be seen in the eleventh-century Life of Lazarus of Galesion. This saint received the small habit in an Anatolian monastery and then went to the Sabas monastery near Jerusalem whose abbot conferred on him the great habit. At the Stoudios monastery the custom was only introduced after the death of Theodore who in one of his letters had rejected it categorically.
The treatise *On Stoudite Customs* of the Stoudite monk Nicetas Stethatos shows the extent to which the distinction between the two habits structured the daily life of the monks. The interactions of wearers of the great habit followed a complex ritual, which differed considerably from the manner in which wearers of the small habit greeted each other. The *Typikon* of Alexius gives a similar impression. There penances and funerary rites vary according to whether a monk wears the great or the small habit. This raises the question: how does the distinction between the two habits relate to the other hierarchies that existed at the Stoudios monastery? A partial answer is given by a passage in the Stoudios *Typikon*, which informs us that ordained monks coming from other monasteries could only perform the liturgy after they had received the great habit. The purpose of this arrangement is clear: it is to prevent confusion between the two hierarchies. There can be wearers of the great habit who are not ordained but each ordained monk must be a wearer of the great habit. The Stoudios *Typikon* attests to this practice when it stipulates that the abbot should be chosen from among the ordained monks or from among the non-ordained wearers of the great habit. A passage that is only found in the *Typikon* of Alexius confirms this pattern. There we read that during the elaborate ceremony of the *aspasmos* the two choirs should genuflect before abbot and oikonomos in the following order: first priests, then deacons, then the other wearers of the great habit, and finally the wearers of the small habit. Here we are clearly in the presence of a finely calibrated system. The ecclesiastical hierarchy asserts itself at the highest level: there we find priests who are at the same time wearers of the great habit. However, at the next level the alternative hierarchy makes itself felt: wearers of the great habit who are not ordained are on a par with their colleagues who have attained the rank of deacon. Such attempts to harmonise different hierarchies were most likely not confined to the Stoudios monastery. A similar scenario is found in the *Life* of Lazarus of Galesion where we are told that the abbot of the Sabas monastery sent the saint off to be ordained priest immediately after he had been given the great habit. However, it is possible that the extension of this system to the deacons is a specifically Stoudite trait.

At this point one would like to know how the hierarchy of the monastic offices fitted into this framework. Unfortunately the Stoudios *Typikon* contains very little information about this matter. No mention of diakonetai is made in the description of the ritual of the *aspasmos*. However, it can be argued that monastic officers found themselves at the second level. As we have seen earlier, the text assumes that at least some of them were deacons. In this case, too, the priests would thus have maintained their primacy.

**Conclusion**

Analysis of the Stoudios *Typikon* and other Stoudite texts has shown that there existed multiple hierarchies within the Stoudios monastery, which were based on different criteria, but that ways had been found to correlate these hierarchies in order to minimise conflict. The first hierarchy was that of the monastic officials who were responsible for the administration of the monastery. The list of officials in the Stoudios *Typikon* by and large tallies with similar lists in other monastic rules. For example, the highest-ranking official is the oikonomos. There is, however, one idiosyncratic feature. The ekklesiarches who in other rules is second only to the oikonomos is in the Stoudios *Typikon* demoted by one rank. The significance of this discrepancy reveals itself when we turn our attention to the second hierarchy, that of priests and deacons. The highest-ranking member of this group, the head priest, emerges as a rival of the ekklesiarches. In other monastic rules the ekklesiarches
takes over the ceremonial duties of the abbot when both the abbot and the *oikonomos* are absent. At the Stoudios monastery, however, the head priest has assumed this role. The fact that the head priest does not appear in the list of monastic offices suggests that the two hierarchies were clearly separated. This is again in contrast to other rules where priests and deacons seem to have been subordinated to the *ekklesiarches* as a regular member of the hierarchy of monastic offices. There can be no doubt that ordained monks had a privileged position in the Stoudios *Typikon*. Only members of this group were allowed to give blessings. Even the *oikonomos* had to rely on their services if he was a layman. Moreover, in the church the order of precedence followed the ecclesiastical hierarchy and not the hierarchy of the monastic offices, with the sole exception of the *oikonomos*. Problems that might have arisen from this discrepancy seem to have been contained because all officers were at least deacons. The existence of a third hierarchy, that of wearers of the great and the small habits, introduced a further complicating factor. In order to minimise tensions it was stipulated that all priests and deacons should be wearers of the great habit. Other Stoudite sources suggest that the stipulations of the Stoudios *Typikon* were never fully implemented. However, there can be little doubt that these stipulations reflected the views of the ordained members of the community who are also the most likely authors of the text.
The revival of popular involvement in the political life of Constantinople after the 10th century has drawn much attention by modern historians. Less effort has been directed, however, towards problematizing the Byzantine historiographers’ inclination to often project an image of the people as a single political body, acting with a single will towards a common cause on the occasion of revolt. Based on an analysis of the 1042 revolt as an exemplary case here, I shall seek to scrutinize how such an image is constructed and what questions it does raise about the authorial intention behind it.

The political meaning of the term *people* is diachronically ambiguous, since it is employed either to designate a whole and an integral body politic or that part of the whole, which is excluded – *de facto* or *de jure*, depending on the historical era – from politics. This ambiguity is also evident in the connotations of the different terms employed in a rather inconsistent manner by élite authors to designate the people of the Constantinopolitan city-state. For instance, the terms *sympasa polis* (the entire city) or *demos* usually have an inclusive political meaning, bearing the positive connotation of an integral body politic, i.e. the city as a People. Instead, terms such as *ochlos, plethos, agoraion genos* bear a derogatory connotation, being mainly intended to distinguish a part of the whole, the (common) people within the People, that usually consists of those lower strata that are often characterized as imprudent, fickle and violent.

This diachronic biopolitical fracture that “makes the people what cannot be included in the whole of which it is a part as well as what cannot belong to the whole in which it is always already included”, is roughly delineated by Niketas Choniates in his comment on the political role of the Constantinopolitan masses (*plethos*) in the light of civil unrest in the late-twelfth century (*Historia*, 233-34):

>The masses in any other city rejoice all together in disorder and are hard to be constrained. But those of Constantinople are the most tumultuous of all. They rejoice in rashness and deviate from the right path inasmuch as they consist of citizens of various origins and their mind is, so to say, as variable as their crafts are varied. …At times, they are disposed to sedition at mere rumour and are more destructive than fire, …while, at other times, they cower frightened at every noise and bend their neck to whomsoever wishes to trample upon it. As a result, they are fairly accused of suffering from an inconsistent disposition and of being untrustworthy. Neither did the people of Constantinople ever seek to do the best for themselves, nor did they heed others who made proposals for the common good… Their indifference to the rulers is preserved as if it were inborn. Whom they exalt today as a just leader, this one they ridicule before long as a malefactor, demonstrating that they do both without reasoning due to their ignorance of what is best, and to their unstable mind.\[205\]
Certainly, this derogatory image of the Constantinopolitan plebs must be addressed with caution, insofar as it reflects the political morale of an élite member, privileged with participation in political decision-making. A closer reading, though, shows that Choniates’ statement does not condemn popular involvement in political affairs per se. His criticism rather focuses on the character of this involvement, which he sees as determined by natural instincts, instead of sober political criteria, and as lacking an orderly and responsible expression of political stance.

Of course, such criticism would have made much more sense, had the author directed it against the political system itself, which lacked any regularized mechanism that favoured the commoners’ participation in political affairs as an orderly political body. However, Choniates as a conservative adherent of the imperial establishment conveniently overlooks this aspect of the problem and, among other things, takes issue with the main means that occasionally turned the common people into a political actor, namely sedition. Indeed, the author blames the plebs’ seditious activity for being apolitical, arguing that it revolted with no good reason other than mere rumour, the main pursuit of such activity being destruction, whereas it could as easily remain apathetic and passively sustain oppressive policies.

In this respect, instead of denouncing Choniates’ derogatory image of the people’s political role as mainly a product of élite snobbery, one should rather examine at closer range certain issues that his criticism brings into perspective. By reproaching the common people for remaining indifferent and inconsistent in the face of oppression, the author seems in fact not to condemn the political act of sedition on principle, but rather the people’s lack of correct political criteria as to when such an act could politically make sense. Considering Choniates’ high level of literacy and his notion of the ideal emperor as an homme d’état, the latter argument seems to interrelate with his good knowledge of the imperial city-state’s history, in which many emperors had not faced popular resistance or revolt, even though they had ruled – at least by the author’s standards – as absolute masters and not as solicitous administrators of public affairs.

Read in this light, Choniates’ statement spotlights the contingency of the phenomenon of revolt in Constantinople, which had little to do with a regularized political means of popular involvement in politics. Moreover, it contests common people’s ability to act as a political body and revolt with their own political agenda, aiming to influence political affairs according to their own interests – which in the author’s view should coincide, of course, with the common interest of the established order. If this image of the common people seems to contradict the reports of Byzantine historiographers – including those of Choniates – on the formers’ agency as quasi a political class in certain Constantinopolitan uprisings, a close reading of such events can help us measure the actual ability of the commoners to act as a distinct and conscious political body in revolt against the author’s arguments.

The revolt of 1042 against Michael V is well documented by Psellos, Attaleiates and Skylitzes. Psellos – due to age and position at the court – is the principal eyewitness as his lengthier and more detailed account demonstrates, which will serve here as a basis for an analysis of the revolt’s microstructures. Contrary to the other two authors, Psellos provides insights into the uprising’s background, demonstrating who had a real motive to depose the emperor. He reports that, after coming to power, Michael was hostile to state officials and intended to strip them of their privileges in order to restore the freedom of the people and base his power on them (Chron. 5.15). As has been noticed,
this reveals the emperor's intention to challenge the status quo in a manner favourable to the common people. Moreover, the emperor was in conflict with the Patriarch. This means that, contrary to the commoners, certain élite factions had good reasons to dislike Michael V and wish for his deposition.

In this context, the Byzantine authors unanimously present the banishment of empress Zoe as the cause of the revolt against him. For Psellus in particular, the violation of dynastic legitimacy was the reason for the commoners' radical change of attitude towards Michael. As opposed to Attaliateis and Skylitzes who place Zoe's banishment on the 18th of April (Easter Sunday) and present the outbreak of the revolt as occurring the day after (Historia 13; Synopsis 418), Psellus' account indicates that the banishment took place sometime before Easter and that Michael continued to enjoy the favour of the people, despite Zoe's absence from his side in public ceremonies (Chron. 5, 21-23). This fact questions the constructed image of the commoners in the historiographical accounts as intransigently loyal to the empress and the dynastic ideal.

Be that as it may, what can be deduced as common ground from all three contemporary authors is that the Constantinopolitan citizenry single-mindedly opposed the violation of dynastic legitimacy. Again, Psellus provides the main bulk of the information about the role of different social groups in the revolt (Chron. 5, 25-26). He reports that, after the news had spread, the entire city (ἡ δὲ γε ἕξυππασα Πόλις) was dissatisfied with the emperor's action. The officials, the clergy and the court were concerned about the empress' fate. The craftsmen prepared themselves for great deeds of daring, while the mob was on the move, motivated by the will "to exercise tyranny against the tyrant". The image of the common people as instigators of the revolt is particularly interesting if we consider that Michael's deposition contradicted, in fact, their social interest, since his rule was favourable to them according to Psellus' testimony. Therefore, the discourse of élite authors allows for two interpretations: either the masses were not capable of discerning and acting according to their social interest or they were willing to put it aside for the sake of a higher political cause, the defense of the imperial system's legitimate function (identified here with the protection of dynastic rights). This higher cause happened to fully serve the social interest of certain élite factions.

Keeping this in mind, Psellus' narrative seems to follow a certain pattern: The legal-politically illegitimate act of a coup against the emperor (tyranny) – but ethically justified in the author's view due to Michael's tyrannical action against the empress – is ascribed to the mob. The élite, even though minded against the emperor, is carefully exonerated from any responsibility for the outbreak of violence. Psellus uses military terms to describe the formation of the people into a force that marched against the palace. He reports on men bearing axes, swords, bows and spears (Chron. 5, 27). This evidence along with the previous statement on the craftsmen that prepared themselves "for great deeds of daring" poses some questions about the spontaneous character of the revolt. To begin with, the role of the guilds as city-militia can explain the ability of a part of the commoners to find and skillfully handle military weaponry, such as spears and bows, which untrained civilians would not be able to handle. Moreover, the rebels' ability to lay proper siege to the palace in the final phase of the revolt, as Skylitzes shows (Synopsis 419), is explained if their forces consisted of city-militia from the guilds, and of defectors from the palace-guard.

In this light, one may distinguish two major groupings of commoners participating in the unrest. The one consisted of members of the guilds that were well armed and prepared to move in an organized manner against the palace. The other was the mob who was neither properly armed
nor organized but, according to the sources, took advantage of the exhortations of certain agitators in the marketplace and rioted. The different role and aims of these two groupings are evident, if one takes a closer look at their actions in the process of the revolt.

From the reports of all three authors it is clear that the mob plundered both in the marketplace as well as in the houses of elite members, in churches and monasteries. According to Psellos, the booty was put up for sale in the market during the following days (Chron. 5, 29). Considering that the conflict lasted less than two days, it becomes obvious that the main concern of those plundering was not to attack the palace and depose the emperor, but mainly to cause destruction, expropriate things of value and safely store them for later use. This indicates that, contrary to the constructed image of the citizenry as a single body moving against the palace with one purpose, a part of the people did not join the uprising driven by a political motive. This is also indicated by Attaleiates when he observes that the mob plundered the riches that had been unjustly hoarded at the cost of the poor (Historia 15).

The part of the commoners that was keen on attacking the palace consisted mainly of the organized and militarily-minded members of the guilds. The motives of their well-directed and disciplined actions call for further inquiry. To begin with, the rebels’ first effort to sack the palace was unsuccessful. Moreover, the nobilissimus Constantine was able to cross from his house to the palace without any resistance, even though his retinue was armed simply with daggers as opposed to the rebels’ heavier weaponry (Chron. 5, 31). All this suggests that the rebellious force neither consisted of the largest part of the citizenry nor did it control the city, as the sources want us to believe.

The turning-point of the revolt occurred when the emperor ordered the empress back to the palace and made her appear in public. Psellos’ account is evidently perplexed in his effort to justify the rebels’ reaction. He says that they were afraid that the empress’ presence would undermine the revolt and that the emperor would be able to undo it with her help (Chron. 5, 33). This is a curious statement, if one considers that the main cause of the revolt was to restore the empress to her legitimate position in the palace. In fact, in this part of the account Psellos’ effort to hush up the leading role of élite factions in a coup against an emperor that threatened their privileges comes to an abrupt end. At this point, a member of the élite openly takes the leadership of the rebels that turn to Theodora, Zoe’s sister and a dynastically legitimate heir to the throne, in order to counterbalance the waning legitimacy of their cause, i.e. regime change. Moreover, the church of Hagia Sophia is revealed as the rebels’ headquarters – a fact coinciding with Patriarch Alexios’ implied leading role in the instigation of the uprising.

The rebels’ army, reinforced by defectors from the palace guard, regroups and lays siege to the palace again, thus forcing Michael and Constantine to seek refuge in the Stoudion monastery, where a group of armed civilians blockaded them. The detailed presentation of this incident by Psellos is revealing about the organized and centrally directed character of the actions of armed civilians (Chron. 5, 39-45). The latter did not lay hand on the fugitives but waited for an official with his soldiers to arrive. After negotiations had failed, he ordered the arrest. The armed party of the allegedly uncontrollable plebs not only acted in a disciplined manner – as soldiers following orders, but also did not proceed with the blinding of Michael and Constantine before a messenger from Theodora arrived with the relevant order. These actions provide further evidence that the outbreak, the development and the outcome of the revolt had little to do with a spontaneous reaction of the
politically sensitive commoners. The fact that the emperor had made his plan to banish Zoe known to the élite before putting it into effect had provided those politically threatened factions of the court and the senate with the necessary pretext and enough time to organize their reaction. If Zoe’s banishment from the palace offered a useful pretext, the event that set in motion the revolt was the emperor’s failed attempt on the Patriarch’s life. The ability of certain élite factions to coordinate their actions and form an armed force with city-militia from the guilds and defectors from the palace-guard determined the success of the coup.

In light of this, the events of 1042 seem to correspond to, rather than to contradict, Choniates’ main premises about the character of the commoners’ involvement in politics through sedition. These did not revolt as a distinct political body with their own political agenda. A part of the plebs was always ready to take advantage of disorder in the city in order to riot and plunder. Another part, mainly the members of the guilds, had a more political role in revolts due to their institutionalized position in the socio-political order of the city-state. This position linked them to the élite and made them an important political factor when élite factions decided to unite in action against an emperor. As the guilds’ controlled actions against Michael V show, their political activity served the cause of those that had a real interest in deposing him.

The case presented here stresses, therefore, the need to seek to distinguish between the use of the image of the ‘People’ in the accounts of élite authors and the actual role of various groups of commoners in Constantinopolitan revolts. In historiographical hindsight, the citizenry’s image as a political body with a single will and purpose served to justify the legal-politically illegitimate act of tyranny, thereby exonerating those élite factions that politically profited from it. This image, however, hardly testifies to the commoners’ ability to act as a political class and organize revolt as bottom-up political activity. If élite factions had the potential to exert influence on the guilds and manipulate the mob’s inclination to rioting, extensive plundering and destruction in parts of the city was the price they had to pay for using revolt as a means to pursue their political goals. The readiness of parts of the politically excluded and economically oppressed commoners to riot and pillage, when the order of the city got out of balance, represents probably the more genuinely popular aspect of revolts. This also points to the constrained character of common people’s politicization within the imperial system, which explains why popular sedition never posed an actual threat to the stability of the imperial establishment.
I have borrowed the term ‘mesostructure’ to characterise the two social entities examined in this paper, because they stood half way between the macrostructures and microstructures of Byzantine society. I have also coined the term ‘mediostructure’ to reflect the fact that *synaxis* and *theatron* not only mediated between the smaller and the larger social units, but were also the structures that mediatised Byzantine culture. What distinguished them from all other Byzantine social structures is that they were defined by performance. They occupied dedicated, permanent performance spaces. They met at regular intervals, and they followed codified procedures. Yet they had no social or institutional existence beyond the duration of the events they performed. Performance was what brought them together and held them together, whatever other ties may or may not have bonded individual members.

*Synaxis*, literally a gathering or meeting, was the technical term for a church service, and notably the Eucharistic liturgy. A *theatron* was a place of public entertainment, together with its spectacles and spectators. Without qualification, the term normally referred to the classic Roman adaptation of the ancient Greek theatre for the performance of mime-shows and pantomimes. But it also applied to any type of mass entertainment venue for games and shows: the athletic stadium, the arena for *venationes* and gladiatorial shows, and most significantly for Late Antiquity and Constantinople, the circus or hippodrome for chariot racing. The Hippodrome of Constantinople was the only one of these venues to survive anywhere in the Roman world, and it absorbed the functions of all the others, though on a greatly reduced scale.

*Synaxis* and *theatron* were visibly distinguished by the very different arrangement of their performance spaces. The theatre consisted of a central performance area surrounded by a tiered auditorium, which was classically semi-circular in shape, but in its variations could be completely circular or oval or could extend the ends of the semi-circle to form two long, parallel, facing spectator stands, as in the stadium and the circus or hippodrome. In addition, certain types of theatre featured permanent, ornamental backdrops that were lavishly decorated with statuary: in the classic, semi-circular theatre, this was the *scenae frons*; in the Hippodrome, it was the central plinth, the *spina* that divided the racetracks. The *synaxis*, from the 3rd century, was held in a purpose-built structure that normally took the form of a rectangular hall and more rarely had a centralised, circular or octagonal, plan. Both types of building were based on the *Repräsentationsarchitektur* of the Roman Empire, which was designed to create a frame and a focus for the epiphany of power. With its apse and bema at the eastern end, the Christian basilica, like the basilica of the emperor or the magistrate, was an audience hall rather than an auditorium.

The layout of the *theatron* assumed a clear distinction between performers and spectators, and was built around the centrality of the performance in the orchestra, arena and *skene*. However, it imposed no internal barriers, apart from the *scenae frons* that hid the performers off-stage, and the parapets that
protected the front rows of spectators from the violence of performances in the arena. The hierarchy of spectator seating was understood rather than emphasised in the architecture of the auditorium, except in the hippodromes of the imperial capitals, where the emperor and his entourage had their own loggia that communicated directly with the Palace. The religious synaxis, by contrast, made no clear distinction between performers and spectators, performance space and spectator seating. As in an audience held by the emperor or a magistrate, its performance was a process of interaction between the assembly and the epiphany of the presiding authority. On the other hand, the synaxis did maintain a strict hierarchy of performance, with the most important rituals being conducted by the ordained clergy of priests and deacons. This division between clergy and laymen was underlined by the barrier, originally consisting of a low parapet, that separated the sanctuary from the nave.

The architectural differences between the church and the theatre reflected the very different cultural traditions within which the theatron and synaxis had evolved. The theatron took shape in the civic festivals associated with the civic pagan cults, including the cult of the divinised ruler, of the Greco-Roman world. The synaxis developed out of the ritual meals and prayer meetings that were held in Christian homes, with echoes of Jewish cult practice. Both its private, domestic tradition and its Jewish affinities gave the early church an inbuilt tendency to suspect and reject the public world of the Greco-Roman theatre, with its pagan ritual associations, its displays of violence and indecency, its loud music and immoderate laughter.

For a time in the 4th century, theatron and synaxis had the potential to coexist peacefully, since the imperial adoption of Christianity allowed the Church to ‘go public’, and stripped the theatre of pagan ritual. It is clear from the famous denunciations of the theatre and hippodrome by John Chrysostom that his congregations in Antioch and Constantinople found it all too easy and natural to frequent both synaxis and theatron; they thought of the church and the theatre as complementary cultural venues, not as mutually exclusive alternatives. Chrysostom used every trick in the book to polarise the two, by literally demonising the theatre in sermon after sermon, and he succeeded brilliantly. Other Christian preachers echoed his comments, and secular intellectuals, even pagans, did not rush to the theatre’s defence. Chrysostom’s teacher, the sophist Libanius, merely observed that the theatre was worth preserving because it taught the young the basics of mythology. Such sentiments were no match for Chrysostom’s relentless drive to have the theatre abolished. He had his way two hundred years later, when all the theatres in the Roman world closed their doors, apart from the Hippodrome of Constantinople. Although this was immediately due to a lack of public funding, it reflected a change of priorities - there was no lack of money for new churches. Moreover, it is quite clear that the theatres did not close because the churches took over the entertainment industry. Liturgical ritual made a point of not imitating the ‘satanic pomp’ of the stage: it conspicuously avoided dramatic action, impersonation, sensational narrative and instrumental music.

Thus, apparently, the synaxis eliminated without incorporating the theatron, and Byzantine public culture, which had initially developed in the polarised symbiosis of the two, now gravitated overwhelmingly towards the church, with the single entertainment venue of the Hippodrome providing only a very limited and intermittent alternative. What happened, then, to the cultural space traditionally occupied by the theatron since the very beginnings of the classical polis? How did Greek culture survive the demise of its primordial performance venue? Could it continue to exist without the theatre in some form or other? Could even the synaxis continue to function without the challenge of the theatron? The answer, I believe, is that Byzantium maintained continuity by surrounding and suffusing itself with virtual theatre.
In a sense, the Roman elite had been living with virtual theatre long before their conversion to Christianity. They were used to reading the works of the great ancient dramatists as school texts, without ever seeing them staged. At the same time, the schools of rhetoric cultivated the idea that the composition of rhetorical discourse for performance before an audience – whether in the schoolroom, the council chamber, the audience hall, the outdoor assembly, or indeed the church – constituted an intellectual alternative to popular theatre. The reception and re-use of this metaphor in the middle Byzantine period has been one of the most important discoveries of contemporary scholarship on Byzantine literature, although it still awaits a dedicated study. After the revival of higher education in Constantinople in the 9th century, the idea of rhetoric as theatre took off and became, arguably, the driving force for literary innovation and sophistication in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Its impact can be seen in many trends of the period:

- The increasing dramatisation of narrative, whether historical or fictional, through the application of the whole range of ‘creative writing’ techniques taught by ancient rhetorical theory.
- The composition of mini-dramas.
- The increasing use of dialogue as a medium for the presentation not only of satire but also of theological argument
- Increasingly explicit and self-conscious reference to the performance context of rhetorical works through the use of key words such as theatron and epideixis.
- The appearance of ‘theatre criticism’, in the appreciation of oral delivery
- The use of language and imagery from classical drama to describe contemporary tragic events.
- The rehabilitation of ancient drama by the great late twelfth-century teacher and writer Eustathios in his treatise on hypocrisy.

It is remarkable how these trends come together and culminate in a generation of authors active around the turn of the 13th century. They form a critical mass that gives a tantalising hint of cultural breakthrough in pre-Fourth Crusade Constantinople. But whatever the unfulfilled potential for the recreation of real theatre, we can reasonably identify the innovations that promoted the growth of virtual theatre in 12th-cc Byzantium. One was the proliferation of aristocratic households that created a demand for secular entertainment and provided patronage and venues for rhetorical performances. The other was the development of school exercises that taught ‘creative writing’ techniques and encouraged competitions, both within schools and between schools.

Rhetorical performance was virtual theatre because it did not have a dedicated venue, it involved only a solo performer, and it required no stage props, costumes, masks or music. On the other hand, rhetorical theatre continued two real characteristics of ancient entertainment culture: it was exhibitionist and it was agonistic. The ancient theatron had been a place of contest, especially in the spectator sports of the arena. It was the agonistic tradition of the theatron that was kept alive in the Hippodrome, and also provided a metaphor for the adoption of virtual theatre by the church.

The binary opposition of synaxis and theatron was compromised in all sorts of ways that call into question the formal rejection of the latter by the former, and suggest that the attitude of total rejection, as voiced by accomplished performers like John Chrysostom, was in itself a theatrical stance. To start with the layout of the performance venues, we may question the extent to which they
were poles apart. The one surviving theatre, the Hippodrome, combined a central performance axis with a transverse hierarchy of spectator space that focused attention on the imperial box and thus turned the arena into a massive audience hall. The church building had several theatrical features. Most conspicuously, it had a raised pulpit, the ambo, in the middle of the nave, for the reading of the Gospel, but also for the staging of other events, like imperial coronations in Hagia Sophia, and public announcements. The *synthronon*, the seating for the bishop and cathedral clergy in the sanctuary, was a semicircle of tiered stone benches that occupied the main apse, facing the altar and the congregation. The immediate inspiration for this arrangement may have been the judicial tribunal or the municipal council chamber, but the resemblance with the theatre auditorium was not lost on the Byzantine observer. A 12-century description of Hagia Sophia likens it to the *sphendone*, the curved end of the Hippodrome, and the image is already implicit in the sixth-century ekphrasis by Paul the Silentiary.

Andrew White has trenchantly dismissed the idea of any connection between the sanctuary barrier of the church and the *scenae frons* of the theatre. Yet while the *templon* started as its existence as a low parapet that blocked access, but not visibility, it eventually became an opaque screen of icons and curtains that hid the Eucharistic rite from view, enhancing the mystery of what happened ‘off-stage’. At the same time, however, the linear focus on the ritual of the altar and the sanctuary was refracted by the architectural and iconographic changes that shaped the middle and late Byzantine church building. The widespread adoption of the domed cross in square plan emphasised the vertical axis of the interior space, defined by the apex and centre of the main dome that dominated the nave. Thus while the iconographic programme that covered the upper surfaces still pointed to the apse, where the Incarnation was depicted over the sanctuary, its vertical hierarchy peaked in the dome, over the non-officiating congregation. As a result, the congregation was able to participate directly, without clerical mediation, in the liturgy of the angels, prophets and/or apostles and evangelists who circled above their heads around the central spectator figure of Christ Pantokrator. Their sense of being caught up in the heavenly liturgy was intensified in the late Byzantine period with the proliferation of narrative scenes, and the shift from mosaic to fresco that covered the whole interior surface with icons down to floor level. A recent study has drawn attention to the theatricality of their depiction. The spatial and iconographic arrangement of the middle and late Byzantine church thus further blurred the material distinction between human performers and spectators, while enhancing the spiritual experience of the economy of salvation that was unfolding around them. The ritual of the synaxis was studiously undramatic, but its setting invited the contemplation, the theoria, of drama.

Around the pulpit, at the centre of the congregation, were grouped the choir, who mystically represented the Cherubim, according to the most solemn hymn of the Divine Liturgy. The cathedral choir of Hagia Sophia was hardly a reincarnation of the chorus of Attic theatre, although they were called by the same name, choros. But the introduction of music, albeit purely vocal, into the *synaxis* was a concession to the taste and expectations of a theatre-going public. So too was the colourful, rhetorical and dramatic actualisation of sacred events in the prose homilies and the metrical hymns that were increasingly added to the liturgical cycle.

The Church’s attitude to virtual theatre is most fully articulated, like its condemnation of real theatre, in the homilies of John Chrysostom. His wide range and frequent use of theatrical metaphors blur the theoretical distinction between *synaxis* and *theatron*, and present the latter without negative
connotations. He uses the word of many situations involving a spectacle or performance before a crowd, such as Christ’s preaching and miracles, or Nebuchadnezzar and his fiery furnace. Most strikingly, he occasionally applies the metaphor to the church where he is preaching, apparently contradicting his statement elsewhere that “This here is no theatre”. The contradiction has misled some scholars, but there can be no doubt what Chrysostom means when, shortly after his move to Constantinople, he flatters his congregation by proclaiming that even though “that church [Antioch] is senior in years, this one is more fervent in the faith; there the congregation is greater and the theatre more splendid, but here there is more endurance, and a greater display of manhood”. The mention of endurance and bravery strikes an agonistic note, and implies a link to Chrysostom’s favourite theatrical metaphor, that of the Christian life as an athletic contest. The image derived from St Paul, but it also drew on a contemporary sporting event, the Olympic games, which Chrysostom often evokes in specific detail, and usually in a positive sense. This is reminiscent of another favourite analogy, which he also draws, ultimately, from the Bible, but develops with detailed reference to another contemporary institution: the comparison between the imperial court and the Kingdom of Heaven. Sometimes he combines the two images, describing the Christian’s struggle for perfection as a performance in a theatron where God presides over an audience of angels and saints. In this sense, the tribunal of the Last Judgement is a theatre, and the ultimate synaxis becomes the ultimate theatron.

To conclude, Chrysostom played a decisive part in the conception of a virtual theatre that offset the destruction of the real theatre to which he contributed by his polarising, demonising rhetoric. He effectively sacralised, by his preaching, the secular institution of rhetorical theatre. By setting high standards of ecclesiastical rhetoric, he and the Cappadocian Fathers laid much of the groundwork for the renaissance of secular rhetoric and the explicitly theatrical turn that this took in the middle Byzantine period. By his use of theatrical metaphors, he encouraged the notion that the synaxis was a theatron of salvation, and, more generally, he left Byzantine culture with the tacit recognition that without theatron, there could be no theoria.
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Women Supporting Women:  
A Reading of Some Twelfth-Century Homilies on the Theotokos

The impetus for my contribution to this Round Table comes from an ongoing interest in the Kokkinobaphos Homilies. I want, tentatively, to use the homilies as a witness for the existence of a group of women, a 'sorority', that was devoted to an icon of the Theotokos.

The members of this panel, and most of its audience, are probably well aware that the Kokkinobaphos Homilies are a set of six sermons on the Theotokos. They are to be found in two famous illustrated manuscripts from the mid-twelfth century: Vaticanus graecus 1162 (= V) and Parisinus graecus 1208 (=P).¹ My interest, however, is only incidentally in the illustrations and is instead directed to the homilies' texts. My attention was drawn to both texts and manuscripts as a result of explorations into the life and activities of the enigmatic sevastokratorissa Eirene.² It is now generally accepted, on the basis of his letters to her preserved in a contemporary manuscript,³ that the homilies’ author, Iakovos (or James) of Kokkinobaphos, was Eirene’s spiritual father.⁴ It is also generally accepted that the homilies’ two manuscripts, and also the homilies themselves, are part of the patronage that Eirene exercised, though there is no scholarly agreement on the extent of her involvement in their production.⁵

The homilies are six in number. The first deals with the conception of the Theotokos (celebrated on 9 December), and focuses on the sterility of her mother Anna (whose feast day is on 9 September); the second is on the birth of the Theotokos (celebrated on 8 September); the third is on her presentation in the temple (celebrated on 21 November); the fourth deals with her allocation to Joseph on reaching puberty (with no corresponding feast day); the fifth is on the annunciation to her of her forthcoming

¹ Digitized images are now available on-line for both manuscripts: Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana,Vat. gr. 1162 (http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1162); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 1208 (http://mandragore.bnf.fr/html/accueil.html, and follow the links).

² On Eirene see E. Jeffreys, 'The sevastokratorissa Eirene as patron', in M. Grünbart, M. Mullett and L. Theis, eds., Female Founders in Byzantium and Beyond, Vienna, 2014 = Wiener Jahrbuch der Kunstgeschichte 60/61, 2011/12 [published 2014], 177-94.

³ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 3039; see E. Jeffreys and M. Jeffreys, eds, Iacobi Monachi Epistulae (Turnhout, 2009).

⁴ Nothing is known of Iakovos apart from his authorship of the letters and the homilies. The location of Kokkinobaphos is equally unknown although the existence of a monastery with that name, dedicated to the Theotokos, is attested by a non-scribal ownership note in a manuscript now in the Vatican (Vat gr. 338), and by 11th- or 12th-century seals with Bulgarian find spots; see Jeffreys and Jeffreys, Epistulae, xxii.

child (celebrated on 25 March); and the sixth is on her vindication from charges of unchaste living after her pregnancy had become apparent (with no corresponding feast day).

The homilies are inadequately published in an edition in Migne’s *Patrologia Graeca* 127. This largely derives from the one made by Cardinal Ballerini in the years immediately preceding the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception in 1854. Ballerini’s edition is based on the Vatican manuscript only. Virtually all of homily 4 is omitted, homily 5 is published as homily 4, and half of homily 6, published as homily 5, is also omitted. A modern edition is a desideratum, and one is in preparation.

The homilies present curious features.

First, the content. As is apparent from the list above, the homilies do not all correspond to the liturgical feast days of the Theotokos, with the fourth and sixth homilies referring to events found only in the apocryphal *Protevangelium of James*. Although constructed as a panegyric biography, as it were – a narrative amplified with eloquent praise – the homilies do not cover the whole of the life of the Theotokos. Their narrative does not extend to the birth of her child, a strange omission; nor does it cover the last stages of her life – in particular her Koimesis (or Falling Asleep, Dormition and Assumption), which generated a major feast and much homiletic literature. Indeed the point at which the Kokkinobaphos homilies conclude, with the testing of Joseph and Mary with the ordeal by ‘bitter water’, is one that is usually passed over in the Marian homiletic tradition. The homilies are thus unsatisfactory by any obvious definition: they seem not to be an obvious liturgical tool, much less a complete life of the Theotokos.

Second, the way in which they are composed is not usual. Large portions of Iakovos’ homilies are constructed out of extensive quotations from those of George of Nikomedea, with other passages arguably also excerpted from other authors. As Theodora Antonopoulou has pointed out, there are some parallels for this practice in homily collections made in the tenth century, described as ἐκλογαί, the term also used by Iakovos to describe his homilies. It is, however, a technique which Iakovos takes to extremes in his writings, especially in his letters which present an elaborate and frequently awkward cento of borrowed and adapted phrases. In the homilies there are frequently

---

6 *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 127, cols. 543-568: homily 1; cols. 567-600: homily 2; cols. 599-632: homily 3; cols. 697-700: homily 4, small portion only; cols. 631-660: homily 5, printed as homily 4; cols. 659-698: homily 6, printed as homily 5, and with the second half of the text omitted.


8 This presumably is why Ballerini omitted them from his edition. The *Protevangelium* was, of course, the chief narrative that provided the underpinning for the development of the Marian festivals in the first Christian centuries: as discussed in I. Karavido-poulos, ‘On the information concerning the Virgin Mary contained in the apocryphal Gospels’, in M. Vassilaki, ed., *Mother of God: Representations of the Virgin in Byzantine Art* (Athens, 2000), 67-76.

9 *Protevangelium* 33-34, based on Numbers 5.5-30, especially 5.24.

10 Thus Iakovos: Homily 1 is drawn entirely from the first three homilies of George of Nikomedea, as pointed out by Ballerini, *Sylloge*, 159 and 163.


disconcerting juxtapositions of ecstatic panegyric derived from George of Nicomedia, bald narrative taken from the *Protevangelium*, and rather banal, sermonizing logic-chopping for which no parallels have yet be traced and might be due to Iakovos himself.\(^\text{15}\)

These infelicities of content and style may have led to the homilies' limited reception, for the texts did not enter the homiletic repertoire to any serious extent: of the six later copies only one is medieval.\(^\text{14}\) While some of the illustrations, such as the typological image of the Couch of Solomon,\(^\text{15}\) are idiosyncratic, many are drawn from a well-established repertoire; in either case it is difficult to say that the homilies had more than a limited resonance, though parallels can be seen in, for example, the fourteenth-century mosaics in the Kariye Djami.\(^\text{16}\) It may be, of course, that the books were confined to a largely inaccessible palace environment; certainly they have remained in pristine condition.

So these six somewhat anomalous homilies which were made up into two lavishly decorated books, one small and the other twice the size,\(^\text{17}\) present a number of interpretative puzzles.

Commentators recently have been drawing attention to the female typology of the images of the Theotokos in the Kokkinobaphos illustrations – spinning, holding a book, accompanied by a young boy, whether servant or step-son.\(^\text{18}\) That such images are abundant in the manuscripts is no surprise since the Theotokos is the central figure in the narrative. She is the focus of the homilies: it is emphasized that it is through her that salvation will come to humankind. But perhaps this emphasis reflects the homilies’ relevance to a female audience or readership.

One can also point to a number of small details in the text of the homilies which perhaps can be seen as deriving from a female focus, or included by a writer alert to female preoccupations. For example, in Homily 1, Anna passionately laments her childlessness (§§9-11);\(^\text{19}\) throughout Homily 2 Anna is depicted as delighting in her maternity; in Homily 3 Anna rearranges the child's clothes at the start of the procession so as to make the best effect (§6), Anna and Joachim are amazed that the child did not look back at them as she went into the temple (§§23-23), the preacher comments that perhaps women would have been more appropriate than priests to care for the child (§6); in Homily 4 the preacher comments that, despite her previously sheltered life, the girl did not flinch at the shabbiness of Joseph's house (ll. 490-518); in Homily 6, the girl wondered what to say to Simeon since she was not used to speaking with men unknown to her (§5); Elizabeth recognized that her foetus had leapt for joy since the movement did not pain her (§21); Mary attempted to conceal her pregnancy by wrapping

---

\(^{13}\) That about 98% of the wording of Iakovos’ letters is made up from traced quotations permits reluctance to assume that Iakovos ever composed independently.

\(^{14}\) A. Ehrhard, *Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1952), 523-524, n.1. The medieval manuscript is BAV, Barb. gr. 583, pp. 115-132 (14\(^\text{th}\) cent.); see Ehrhard, *Überlieferung*, 476-477; this needs further investigation. Other manuscripts include BAV, Ottob. gr. 409, ff. 1-29 (16\(^\text{th}\) cent.) and at least four 19\(^\text{th}\)-cent copies in Greece (perhaps derived from Ballerini). The entries in Pinakes (pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr) under Iacobus Coccinobaphus are instructive.

\(^{15}\) This appears as the frontispiece to the fourth homily, at V f. 82v and P109v; see S. der Nersessian, *Le lit de Solomon*, *Recueil des travaux de l'institut d'études byzantines* 8 (1963), 72-82 and K. Linardou, *The Couch of Solomon, a monk, a Byzantine lady and the Song of Songs*, in R. Swanson, ed., *The Church and Mary* (Woodbridge, 2004), 73-85.


\(^{17}\) The dimensions are P 21.2 x 16cm and P 33 x 22.5 cm.

\(^{18}\) As in the papers cited in n. 5 by M. Evangelatou, C. Hennessy and K. Linardou.

\(^{19}\) Paragraph numbers (§) are taken from the *PG* edition and line numbers (ll.) from the draft edition.
her cloak around her body and standing behind furniture (ll. 668-687). Several of these comments are found in passages where no source has been identified, while others are present in an identified source text; in both cases they can be taken asindicative of Iakovos’ intentions. However, we must be wary of a facile correlation of female subject-matter with a female audience, as Claudia Rapp has demonstrated in her study of the reception of collected lives of women saints.20

It has recently occurred to me that the puzzling aspects of the Kokkinbaphos Homilies could be solved if we envisage the homilies being read in conjunction with the veneration of an icon of the Theotokos. I suppose any icon could be appropriate, but I have been particularly struck by one that is now in Sinai.21 This shows the Theotokos seated with the Christ-child on her lap while on the icon frame surrounding her are figures of the Pantokrator, apostles, Adam and Eve, Anna and Joachim, with Old Testament patriarchs and prophets holding scrolls with Biblical quotations.22 The icon has been dated to the mid-twelfth century, while its place of production and its provenance are unknown. The theology motivating this image has been subtly explicated by the late Titos Papamastorakis as a complex statement on “the procession of the Incarnation of the Word” in which, of course, the Theotokos has a central role.23 In essence that too is the message of the Kokkinobaphos Homilies, though a detailed examination of possible points of comparison must be made elsewhere.

For the time being and in the context of this panel I would like to extend this thought to envisage the homilies as meeting the needs of a devotional group of women, instigated by the sevastokratorissa Eirene. Two points need to be considered: the evidence for such groups, and reasons for involving the sevastokratorissa.

The case for the existence of confraternities in Byzantium from late antiquity to the fifteenth century is tenuous but persistent.24 A confraternity many be defined as a group of, usually, lay men and women who meet to further a charitable or religious objective; the most usual objectives were to provide a seemly Christian burial for the dead,25 to maintain a public bath26 or to venerate an icon or holy person. It is this last category that is relevant to the present context. The best known instance

---


23 T. Papamastorakis, in Vassilaki, Mother of God, 314-115, with reference to this icon (no. 28).


26 P. Magdalino, ’Church, bath and dukonia in medieval Byzantium’, in R. Morris, ed., Church and People in Byzantium (Birmingham, 1990), 165-190.
concerns the Hodegetria icon whose Tuesday processions and ritually-clad devotees are well known from twelfth-century texts and later pilgrim observations as well as attested in a fresco and icons. Similar processions and icon veneration are recorded in the Theban confraternity document of the eleventh century (with men and women in the group) and in Epirus in a comparable Epirot group from the thirteenth century (again with a mixed membership). Processions are also referred to by Eustathius of Thessaloniki in 1185 in connection with three churches in Thessaloniki. In Constantinople Friday night processions (presbeiai) with an icon of the Theotokos from several churches (e.g., Blachernae, Pege) developed supporting associations which are known from eleventh-century seals belonging to their leaders (protoi). It has been suggested that the wide diffusion of the apocryphal Apocalypse of the Theotokos and the Apocalypse of Anastasia was owed to their popularity with small local groups of the devout.

However, to the best of my knowledge, not one of these groups is made up of women only. The case I am making here is thus for something exceptional that can help account for anomalies in an exceptional pair of manuscripts produced in the environment of an exceptional woman. As wife of a sebastokrator (son of a reigning emperor), Eirene was one of the highest ranking women in the Byzantine élite, and was exceptional in other ways too. She was exceptional in the patronage she exercised. She may also simply be exceptional because we have more information about details of her life than for almost any other Byzantine woman – thanks to the letters and verse addressed to her by two people closely associated with her, her spiritual father Iakovos and her secretary/poet Manganeios Prodromos. There are, however, large gaps in our knowledge of her. We do not even know her family of origin, and the information from Iakovos and Manganeios is confused and chronologically unclear.

However we know from the works they dedicated to her that Eirene did bestow patronage on Constantine Manasses, John Tzetzes and Theodore Prodromos, quite apart from Manganeios Prodromos who benefitted from closer long-term employment. We know from Iakovos’ letters that she enjoyed literary contests, which perhaps can be interpreted as a reference to a theatron over which she presided. Several of Manganeios’ poems are predicated on a gathering of family members. Eirene had a deep devotion to the Theotokos, as witnessed by the presentation of votive liturgical items in some of the best known churches dedicated to her; this devotion was shared by at

27 B. Pentcheva, Icons and Power: the Mother of God in Byzantium (University Park, Penn., 2006), 109-141; Sevcenko, ‘Servants of the Holy Icon.’
28 Wiita and Nesbitt, ‘A confraternity’.
29 Prinzning, ‘Spuren’.
32 J. Baun, Tales from Another Byzantium (Cambridge, 2007), 372.
34 E.g. MP 41 describing a multi-generational family festivity, with plant and bird symbolism for the persons involved (Marc. gr. XI.22, ff. 41-47), or MP 56 where a group of older women seem to speculate on the marriageability of an 8- to 10-year old girl (Marc. gr. XI.22, f. 57v). In the absence of the long promised edition of Manganeios Prodromos (MP), which will use the poem numbering in Mioni’s catalogue, the basic bibliography can be found in E. Mioni, Biblioteca Divi Marci Venetiarum codices graeci manuscripti, vol. 3 (Venice, 1970), 116-131 and P. Magdalino, The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos 1143-1080 (Cambridge 1993), 494–500 (with additional bibliography up to 1993).
least one of her daughters.\textsuperscript{35} Eirene had Manganeios compose and present votive verses on her behalf to be read out in several churches in the course of orthros.\textsuperscript{36} An icon of the Theotokos Hodegetria was celebrated in the chapel in Eirene's house (oikos; the location is unknown) with fervent pleas for the Theotokos' intercession on Eirene's behalf: could the weekly procession from the Hodegon monastery ever have been diverted to this chapel?\textsuperscript{37} It is intriguing that the homilies end with the vindication of the Theotokos after an unjust accusation from a sykophantes, which has provocative parallels with Eirene's many laments of unjust charges brought against her, also by a sykophantes.\textsuperscript{38}

Eirene had an icon in her chapel. By the scenario I envisage, of the two copies of the homilies written by her spiritual father the smaller one would have been for her private reading and devotions in connection with the icon, while the larger one was for public reading in the chapel to aid in congregational devotions, with the congregation made up of women from Eirene's entourage and family. This is not particularly controversial. What is controversial is to conjure up an icon to explain the truncated nature of Iakovos' homiletic text, and a group of women to support Eirene in her devotions. However this supposition does seem to me to make sense within Byzantine social structures, especially those revealed by many of the 148 poems of the Mangana corpus. I shall continue to explore its implications until proven wrong.

\textsuperscript{35} Eirene: icon veils - MP 89-94 (E. Miller, ed., ‘Poésies inédites de Théodore Prodrome,’ \textit{Annuaire pour l’association pour l’encouragement des études grecques en France} 17 (1883), 33-35); chalice and paten - MP 95-96 (ibid., 37-38). Daughters: icon veils - MP 97-98 (ibid., 40-41); wall bracket – MP 99 (ibid. 41).


\textsuperscript{37} MP 72.23.

\textsuperscript{38} Homily 6, ll. 942-944 (V 178v, P 237v); cf. Iakovos, Letter 39 (ed. Jeffreys) and MP 43.214 ff., 48.106, 53.85, 92.4.
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Presentation

Le but de cette table ronde a été de considérer la production littéraire byzantine au moment de la création de chaque œuvre littéraire, dans l’immédiateté de l’activité de l’auteur, et non dans ce qu’on a appelé la « fortune » d’un écrivain ou d’un ouvrage, son poids dans la tradition postérieure. Les axes de recherche proposés aux participants étaient

1) L’auteur et la création littéraire dans la société byzantine
2) La création littéraire et l’intertextualité
3) Les aspects matériels de la création littéraire
4) La première circulation des ouvrages

Les interventions, confiées à des chercheurs confirmés ou à des jeunes chercheurs, ont examiné plusieurs domaines de la production littéraire, avec des positionnements fort intéressants que ce soit en ce qui concerne le caractère de l’écrivain, le rôle du manuscrit dans la constitution d’un autographe, le développement de cet autographe jusqu’à sa publication, les enjeux politiques et sociétaux ou simplement individuels dans la construction de l’ouvrage, et cela à travers des exemples tirés de la toute première époque byzantine, à l’époque paléologue, mais aussi de la production post-byzantine du Mont-Athos, dans un milieu qui a préservé et continué la tradition ancienne. En outre, le choix a été fait de constituer un recueil d’études qui traitent non seulement des théories propres à la considération du caractère littéraire d’un ouvrage, mais aussi des différentes branches de la production écrite, de l’hagiographie aux études juridiques, des circuits savants aux commentaires, des positionnements sociaux à l’idéologie impériale, des chroniques entre personnalité et dimension publique. Naturellement, c’est souvent le manuscrit qui nous parle le plus, et qui révèle des éléments insoupçonnés dès qu’on l’approche avec un regard centré sur l’activité elle-même de l’auteur.
Réalisation de soi, réalisation des oracles : Byzance à la fin du XVIIIème siècle.
Réflexions sur l'expression du « moi » dans le Livre des Règnes de Césaire Dapontès

Toute l'œuvre de Césaire Dapontès, moine athonite du XVIIIème siècle célèbre pour sa prolixité, pose la question de la paternité littéraire et de la revendication de celle-ci.

L'ensemble des œuvres copiées de sa main est immense, et pourtant les œuvres dont il revendique lui-même la paternité « véritable » sont peu nombreuses.

La plupart des œuvres recopiées de sa main ont cette physionomie : autour d'un « texte-noyau » écrit par un auteur autre que lui-même, sont rassemblés selon différents modes de petits textes additifs dont certains sont de lui. L'ensemble a donc en général un aspect fort disparate pour un œil moderne ; souvent, seule la typologie permet de distinguer des « ensembles dans les ensembles ».

C'est à cet assemblage de différentes « parties d'œuvres » que Dapontès appose son nom ; mais très souvent, dans le détail de l'œuvre, on ne sait pas qui a écrit quoi.

Or il se trouve que malgré cette physionomie des œuvres attachées au nom de Dapontès, nous avons la certitude que lui-même possédait une idée très précise de la différence entre une œuvre « véritablement de lui » et une œuvre « moins véritablement de lui », même si dans son esprit, cette distinction ne correspond pas à l'idée que nous avons aujourd'hui de la paternité littéraire: certain type de travail littéraire relevant pour nous de la paternité littéraire, par exemple, pour lui n'en relève pas. Quoiqu'il en soit, on remarque en certains endroits de l'œuvre de Dapontès un souci surprenant de souligner quelles sont les œuvres qui sont « véritablement les siennes » : le but explicite de ces revendications est d'éviter que lesdites œuvres ne passent à la postérité sous le nom d'un autre auteur.

Il s'avère donc que l'étude exhaustive des différents « types de paternité littéraire » relatifs à chacune des œuvres attachées au nom de Dapontès est un travail fondamental à mener avant toute considération sur Dapontès. Si ce travail n'a pas encore été mené de façon systématique à ce jour, il faut cependant mentionner l'étude phare de Mahi Paizi-Apostolopoulou sur la paternité effective d'un texte célèbre attribué à tort à Dapontès (Μάχη Παΐζη-Αποστολοπούλου, « Το χειρόγραφο του «Χρονογράφου του Δαπόντε» και η λύση ενός αινίγματος – Το χειρ. Κυριαζή 4 της Γενναδείου », Ο Ερανιστής, 24 [2003] 85–94).

Parmi les tâches que je me suis fixées pour la réalisation de mon doctorat, j'ai par conséquent jugé nécessaire d'établir en préambule un état des lieux précis de toutes les œuvres attachées au nom de Dapontès, à partir du visionnage et de la description précise de tous les manuscrits actuellement disponibles.

Mon travail de doctorat consiste à éditer, commenter et traduire partiellement l'une des œuvres les plus foisonnantes et monumentales de Dapontès inédite à ce jour, le Livre des Règnes, à partir de deux manuscrits conservés au Mont Athos. Cette œuvre a été conçue dans la dernière période de sa vie, alors qu'il officiait comme moine dans la Sainte Montagne à l'issue d'une vie plutôt agitée et brillante dont je ne parlerai guère ici.
Ce qui frappe extrêmement le lecteur à la lecture des œuvres véritablement revendiquées comme les siennes par Dapontès, est la présence explicite du moi.

Je ne considérerai pas ici les deux œuvres les plus particulières à cet égard de Dapontès, le Journal de Bord Tenu en Dacie (ou Ephémérides Daces) et le Jardin des Grâces. Le premier en effet n’est pas considéré par son auteur comme une « œuvre véritablement de lui » et reste en tout point marginal ; le second est un cas limite dans la mesure où il évoque de près la notion moderne d’autobiographie, qui n’est pas mon sujet ici.

Dans presque tout le reste des œuvres revendiquées par Dapontès comme étant les siennes propres, le moi apparaît de façon très particulière ; sa présence est intermittente : tantôt implicitement diffuse, tantôt étonnamment explicite: pendant la lecture d’un même manuscrit en effet, par une série d’indices plutôt complexes, le lecteur est conduit à établir de lui-même, en fonction de sa sagacité propre, un rapport entre tel épisode où rien d’objectif ne renvoie à l’auteur, et tel autre où sans crier gare, par surprise souvent, l’auteur se met soudain carrément en scène: les liens s’établissent par la vertu propre du lecteur.

Par rapport au reste de ses œuvres revendiquées, Le Livre des Règnes fait apparaître un moi spécifique, que je me propose d’analyser ici dans le cadre de cette Table Ronde.

Le Livre des Règnes se présente a priori comme une description résumée des règnes des 93 empereurs chrétiens de Byzance, de Constantin Ier à Constantin XI.

Par l’écriture de ce sujet historique qui pour lui constitue une technique ascétique religieuse précise, Dapontès fait parvenir à évoluer son égocentrisme naturel vers une certaine forme d’altruisme et surtout vers le contact immédiat salvateur avec Dieu : l’écriture de l’histoire lui permet en effet de se projeter d’abord lui-même dans l’histoire en assimilant événements et personnalités historiques à événements intimes et personnalité propre; par ce biais, ensuite, l’écriture de l’histoire permet à Dapontès de questionner, d’interpréter le sens-même de l’histoire, plus exactement de questionner le projet divin que révèle l’histoire, à la lumière de cette ascèse intime ; enfin, il se trouve que le Livre des Règnes s’adresse très objectivement à un public précis, ce qui là encore constitue une surprise : tout le travail mis en activité dans l’écriture de cette œuvre obéit donc à un impératif de transmission sociale, sur lequel il convient de s’interroger, puisqu’il donne au « moi » un rôle particulier.

* * *

Les études biographiques sur Dapontès réalisées à ce jour, toutes incomplètes qu’elles soient, ont révélé que Dapontès mentionnait en plusieurs endroits de ses œuvres un élément fondamental de sa vie séculière passée : ses excès vénaux alors qu’il était haut dignitaire à la cour du Prince (ou Domn) de Moldavie Ioan Mavrocordat. Quelques études très stimulantes ont aussi révélé que Dapontès avait aussi été dans la même période sujet à une forte jalousie réciproque qui l’avait opposé à un autre dignitaire, Antonache Ramadan : cette jalousie l’a finalement conduit en prison, accélérant sinon provoquant son entrée ultérieure dans les ordres.

Le Livre des Règnes confirme nettement ces éléments et les met en perspective : il s’agit, pour Dapontès devenu moine, de se guérir du mal inhérent à sa nature (légocentrisme, avec toutes ses ramifications : orgueil, vénalité, jalousie), en utilisant ce même mal devenu un bien, c’est à dire en éradiquant cet égocentrisme naturel condamnable en pratiquant un égocentrisme introspectif salutaire : en d’autre termes, de se fustiger, de ruminer longuement ses fautes passées, de façon à vaincre sa mauvaise nature en se fondant progressivement en Dieu.
C'est ici que la « littérature » et surtout l'écriture de l'histoire prend tout son sens pour Dapontès. Ecrire l'histoire devient une technique insérée dans un travail général plus vaste de repentance (μετάνοια). Dapontès procède ainsi d'ailleurs dans d'autres de ses œuvres : il convient pour lui de combattre et soigner le mal par le recours à l'exemple tiré de l'histoire. Ainsi, s'il est question de fustiger sa propre jalousie, l'histoire des empereurs de Byzance fournira un ou des épisodes où l'on voit la jalousie punie ; même chose pour la rapacité pécuniaire, la luxure etc...

Ce sens donné à l'écriture de l'histoire suit la lignée d'autres œuvres byzantines. Elle suit aussi l'œuvre qui fournit le modèle de base du Livre des Règnes, les quatre Livres des Règles de la Bible des Septante (répertoriés dans le canon catholique sous les noms de Livres de Samuel et Livres des Rois) qui racontent les règnes des rois d'Israël et de Juda de Saül à Sédécias. Il faut aussi mettre en relation le Livre des Règnes avec son presque homonyme Livres des Rois du persan Firdowsî (Xème siècle), qui lui aussi raconte l'histoire des Empereurs de Perse dans le but d'apporter un enseignement moral et religieux relatif au présent : la ressemblance du sujet d'ensemble, l'insistance du Livre des Règnes de Dapontès sur les Rois des Rois Sassanides au détriment des Achéménides et surtout des Arsacides, le parallélisme entre les luttes des Romains contre les Perses, des Ottomans contre les Russes d'une part, et des Touraniens contre les Iraniens de l'autre, la nature du rôle récurrent d'Alexandre le Grand, nous conduisent à étudier avec sérieux les relations profondes qui unissent les deux textes.

Cette mise en perspective de l'histoire des empereurs byzantins avec la propre histoire personnelle de Dapontès le conduit plus précisément à ce qu'on pourrait nommer aujourd'hui une projection, ou une sorte d'identification avec les empereurs de Byzance : cette identification s'opère avec tous les empereurs de façon implicite, avec certains en particulier de façon explicite. Dapontès assume surtout ce type d'assimilation avec des empereurs et hommes d'état qui ont comme lui connu la repentance : l'impératrice Irène l'Athénienne, Basile Ier le Macédonien, Isaac Comnène, Alexis Ier Comnène et le général Bélisaire sous l'Empereur Justinien; plus généralement, l'économie globale du Livre des Règles révèle que les règnes les plus longuement traités sont les règnes d'empereurs ayant connu un épisode de repentance: Constantin Ier, Théodose II, Justinien, Nicéphore Ier, Basile Ier le Macédonien, Romain Ier Lécapène, Michel IV le Paphlagonien, Constantin IX Monomaque, Alexis Ier Comnène, Manuel Ier Comnène et Michel VIII Paléologue. Dapontès “se projette” aussi explicitement sur d'autres personnages pour d'autres motifs que la repentance: l'Empereur Constantin Ier, Ptolémée XV Césarion et Saint Césaire de Nazianze sont par exemple mis en résonance particulière avec lui pour des raisons que je ne détaillerai pas ici.

Cette “projection” de Dapontès sur les personnages qui ont créé l'histoire est le lieu d'une sorte de glissement particulièrement spectaculaire: pour Dapontès, écrire l'histoire transcende en fait les simples résonances entre sa propre existence et celle de personnages connus: toute l'histoire de Byzance devient en elle-même sa propre histoire spirituelle.

* * *

Dans le Livre des Règles, toute l'histoire de Byzance, à travers ses empereurs, devient histoire psychique intime de l'auteur: comme l'auteur, Byzance a connu la faute (en raison de l'orgueil, de la vénalité, de la jalousie etc... de ses empereurs et chef) faute qui a finalement entraîné sa conquête par les Ottomans ; comme l'auteur, Byzance doit passer, pour assurer son expiation, par une nécessaire phase de repentir : la domination ottomane du XVème au XVIIIème siècle; comme l'auteur, Byzance connaîtra, à condition de bien se repentir, sa rédemption et donc sa résurrection, c'est à dire le retour sous la
souveraineté chrétienne des terres jadis byzantines: c'est là que l'œuvre de Dapontès prend tout son sens. La période ottomane est à considérer comme une épreuve voulue par Dieu pour permettre aux anciens sujets byzantins de l'Empire Ottoman d'exercer la repentance de leurs péchés passés ; d'autre part, Dapontès considère l'histoire du temps présent : écrite entre 1772 et 1774, le Livre des Règnes est conçu précisément au moment où, à la faveur de la 6ème Guerre Russo-Turque, les troupes russes (qui ont encouragé le soulèvement des chrétiens du Péloponnèse) franchissent le Danube, pénètrent en « Bulgarie » ottomane et avancent « sur la route de Constantinople » : les Russes, pour Dapontès, sont des agents involontaires de la providence divine et vont permettre le rétablissement imminent de l'Empire Chrétien dont la capitale sera Constantinople. Ainsi, arrivé au terme de son existence à l'issue du processus de repentance qu'il a engagé pendant toute sa vie monastique, Dapontès pense assister au retour imminent de la Constantinople chrétienne : celle-ci, en fait, est pour lui l'antichambre de la Cité Céleste de Dieu ; Dapontès prévoit donc une fin de l'Histoire toute proche.

C'est en ce sens qu'il faut comprendre l'impressionnante série d'oracles qui émaillent le Livre des Règnes prédisant le retour de la Byzance Chrétienne à la fin de l'Empire Ottoman : ces oracles, relatifs à différents moments de l'histoire romano-byzantine et persane, annoncent non seulement la régénérescence de la Byzance chrétienne à la fin du XVIIIème siècle grâce à l'intervention des Russes, mais aussi la régénérescence spirituelle de Dapontès parvenu à la fin de sa vie. Ces oracles annoncent l'homme régénéré, l'homme nouveau : l'Histoire se termine au moment même où l'homme atteint Dieu.

***

Tout texte est le produit d'une circonstance, et s'adresse forcément à quelqu'un.

Dans le Livre des Règnes de Dapontès, de même que le « moi » a une présence intermittente tantôt implicite tantôt explicite, de même la présence de l'autre (c'est à dire le destinataire) s'avère intermittente, implicite et explicite. Le destinataire est implicitement présent de façon évidente, par exemple, quand on considère ce qui a été dit sur les oracles : démontrer presque algébriquement que les anciens oracles des traditions romaine et persane sont actuellement sur le point de se réaliser, implique l'intention d'entrainer l'adhésion d'un destinataire: Dapontès, porte-parole de la tradition romano-chrétienne, persuade en effet obligatoirement un interlocuteur.

Souvent, dans le Livre des Règnes comme dans de nombreuses œuvres byzantines, on relève la présence discrète d'un destinataire oratoire: l'auteur en effet, s'adresse épisodiquement à un « παῖς » oratoire, à des « ἀδελφοί »; en d'autres endroits, Dapontès enjoint des « βασιλεῖς », des « ἀρχοντες » et des « στρατηγοί », à prendre exemple sur ceux dont il raconte l'histoire. Mais là encore, cette « adresse » faussement oratoire est un trompe-l'œil : en réalité, au détour d'un épisode, le παῖς se transforme brusquement en un enfant (ou plutôt un jeune homme) réel dont on peut sans grande difficulté saisir l'identité historique ; les ἀδελφοὶ deviennent de vrais moines identifiables, et les βασιλεῖς mêmes, les ἀρχοντες et les στρατηγοὶ deviennent aussi, par voie de conséquence, des personnages de l'actualité du XVIIIème siècle.

Lorsque l'on parcourt l'œuvre de Dapontès, on se rend compte en effet que le personnage de l'enfant spirituel (le πνευματικός) revêt une importance particulière ; d'ailleurs, l'une des œuvres attribuées à Dapontès mais sans doute seulement recopiée par lui, écrite en turc ottoman bien qu'en caractères grecs et intitulée Livre Très Utile à l'Ame : Enseignement donné à l'Enfant Spirituel, Canons de Saint Jean le Jeuneur et Conseil au Repentant (Βιβλίον ψυχοφελέστατον περὶ τὸν Πνευματικόν, τοὺς κανώνας τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Νηστευτοῦ, καὶ συμβουλὴν πρὸς τὸν...
λόγον περὶ ἐξόδου ψυχῆς, καὶ τῆς δευτέρας παρουσίας μετὰ προσθήκης διαλόγων δύο κατὰ ἀλφάβητον, Venise, 1746) est recopiée sur le même manuscrit que tout un ensemble de textes groupés sous le nom de « Livre Sacré » . Ce type d’indice, adjoint à d’autres, nous enjoint à penser qu’en réalité, le παῖς mentionné dans le Livre des Règnes est probablement l’enfant spirituel de Dapontès dont on connaît l’existence par la dédicace de l’une de ses œuvres. Le mot « enfant » désigne sans doute aussi le fils de l’ex-Prince (ou Domn) de Moldavie Ioan Mavrocordat, Alexandru Mavrocordat, qui fut très proche de Dapontès, et destinataire explicite du Jardin des Grâces. Dans le Livre de Règnes en général, le thème des vertus didactiques de l’histoire (qui élève l’âme et conseille celui qui l’écoute et à qui elle est destinée) est très développé.

Les « ἀδελφοί » ne se contentent pas non plus d’être seulement le public monastique oratoire massé autour d’un Dapontès déclamant ses vers à la façon byzantine. Ils deviennent eux aussi de véritables moines identifiables du Monastère du Xiropotamos (ou du Koutloumousion) du Mont Athos où se trouvait Dapontès au moment de la rédaction de son texte. En effet, en un moment du Livre des Règnes, Dapontès appelle ces moines directement en tant qu’êtres précis (il évoque même leur jeune âge) et les enjoint directement à quitter le monastère, à prendre les armes et faire la guerre au côté des Russes contre les Ottomans et les milices albanaises qui ravagent le Péloponnèse depuis 1770 ; cet appel à la guerre concerne sans doute aussi son fils spirituel et Alexandru Mavrocordat dont les terres sont alors envahies par les Russes.

Par voie de conséquence, il y a de fortes raisons de penser que les empereurs, les seigneurs et les généraux à qui s’adresse régulièrement Dapontès dans le courant du Livre des Règnes sont eux aussi amenés à s’incarner en de véritables personnages. Nous en avons une preuve indirecte: Dapontès raconte très longuement l’histoire d’un général bien véritable de la 5ème Guerre Russo-Turque victime de son orgueil, et cite clairement le Feld Maréchal Rumiantsev qui occupe la Moldavie au moment même où il écrit. Les « empereurs » sont de façon certaine le Pâdişâh ottoman Sulṭan Muṣṭafâ III (sur le point de mourir au moment où le Livre des Règnes s’achève), probablement aussi les souverains de Moldavie et de Valachie prisonniers par les Russes : Dapontès les pousserait ainsi éventuellement à se retourner contre l’Empire Ottoman ; ces βασιλεῖς peuvent aussi désigner l’Impératrice de Russie Catherine II et Joseph II de l’Etat Habsbourgeois: Dapontès leur délivrerait ainsi des admonestations.

Enfin, le Livre des Règnes s’adresse à tout lecteur, car Dapontès dit espérer son édition future. Dapontès délivre à ce lecteur les clefs pour la compréhension de l’histoire à l’aide de la tradition byzantine, qui voit son aboutissement dans les événements qui touchent l’Empire Ottoman en 1772-1774 ; il lui procure en outre des clefs pour comprendre le monde dans lequel il vit, des conseils pour se tourner vers Dieu et atteindre ainsi paix et libération spirituelles : son livre enseigne les vertus du repentir et l’appel du pardon. Il annonce aussi très certainement les prémices d’une future « personnalité révolutionnaire moderne » en ceci que pour pousser à l’action politique immédiate, il faut rendre plus explicite le lien des exemples du passé avec la situation et les personnages de l’actualité : pour agir, il faut d’abord se percevoir comme une personnalité définie, affirmée ; la tradition nourrit l’action politique et a pour vocation d’enseigner à agir.

On doit aussi mesurer que pour démontrer tout cela, Dapontès a recours au véhicule « sacré » de l’écriture, qui concentre en quelque sorte toute l’essence de l’immortalité de Byzance.
Lorenzo Maria Ciolfi
École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris, France;
lorenzomaria.ciolfi@gmail.com

Georges de Pélagonie en son bureau.
Les différentes étapes de rédaction du Βίος τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου


En feuilletant ces pages, le lecteur est immédiatement frappé par les interventions évidentes et abondantes du scribe sur le texte (corrections, ajouts dans les marges, suppression de passages entiers et récritures). Ce dernier montre une écriture informelle, de petit module, avec un ductus agile mais sûr, riche en majuscules, ligatures et abréviations qui, sur la base de l’analyse paléographique, peut être datée à la fin des années soixante ou, au plus tard, au début des années soixante-dix du XIVème siècle : c’est-à-dire au moins quinze ans après la soi-disant « Bataille de Péra », opposant la flotte impériale et celle de Gênes entre 1348 et 1349, dont le récit constitue le terminus post quem pour la composition du Βίος.

Un an après l’étude de Heisenberg, dans un article spécialément consacré à ce Βίος, N. Festa avança une hypothèse intéressante : en examinant les corrections, les révisions et les mises à jour dans le texte transmis par le codex du Vaticain, il supposa que ces cahiers ne transmettaient pas une simple copie de l’ouvrage, mais le brouillon, l’outil de travail, de l’auteur lui-même ; cependant, en raison du « silence » du manuscrit à ce sujet, il n’a pas pu aller plus loin dans ses supputations, ni n’a su identifier ou proposer un nom pour le compositeur de la Vie.

Des nouveaux détails se firent finalement jour en 1927, quand G. Moravcsik signala la présence du Βίος de Vatatzès dans un autre manuscrit contenu dans la bibliothèque des Papes, le Vat. gr. 2129 :
il s’agit d’un codex qui appartenait à Marcos Mamuna (1457-environ 1515) et puis à Georges de Corinthe († 1560), le neveu d’Arsenios Apostolis, comme nous l’apprenons de nombreuses notes de possession et ex-libris dispersés tout au long du volume. Dans ce témoin, transmis dans une sorte d’appendice (pp. 673-701) qui semble n’avoir pas été incluse dans la table des matières originale – l’ensemble du manuscrit montre en effet une mise en page différente, sur deux colonnes –, le Bioç a été copié par Manuel Gregoropoulos († 1532), un copiste actif entre le XVème et le XVIème siècle : son écriture est une minuscule petite, très compacte et élégante, tracée avec un ductus agile et caractérisée par un bêta en forme de cœur, par des ligatures particulières pour le phi et par des légères fioritures à la fin de la ligne. En plus d’une brève note faisant référence à la date du décès de l’empereur, réalisée à la fin du texte entre deux motifs décoratifs simples, Manuel ajouta également le terme « τοῦ Πελαγονίας » au titre, une clarification qui devrait être très probablement référée à l’auteur de l’œuvre.

Si Heisenberg supposa que l’auteur de la Vie était un moine anonyme provenant de Magnésie, où les restes de l’empereur avaient été transférés – en tant que reliques – du célèbre monastère de Sôsandra à l’arrivée des Ottomans (au tout début du XIVème siècle), l’indice fourni par le scribe du Vat. gr. 2129, par contre, nous amène vers Georges de Pélagonie. Également connu en tant que Georges le Philosophe, il est en fait le seul savant byzantin du XIVème siècle que nous connaissons sous ce nom, et sur qui nous avons malheureusement très peu d’information provenant de ses propres ouvrages, à savoir : un pamphlet polémique Contre Palamas datant du début des années Soixante du XIVème siècle et récemment publié par I. Polemis sur la base de l’Ambr. gr. 223 (D 28 sup.) ; un traité grammatical inédit – que je suis en train d’éditer avec la collaboration d’Erika Nuti –, copié en 1421 par un certain Mathieu, higoumène du monastère de Saint-Nicolas τῶν Τριποτάμων (dans le quartier homonyme de Véria ?) dans l’actuel Petr. gr. 615 ; enfin, peut-être, une oraison d’encouragement pour les populations grecques sous l’oppression des ennemis.

Ce Georges laissa des traces claires de lui dans un codex très célèbre d’Aristote, l’Ambr. gr. 512 (M 46 sup.), dont l’importance a été déjà soulignée par G. Prato. Il posséda ce manuscrit après Théodore II Lascaris (1254-58), le fils de Vatatzès, et commenta ironiquement la note selon laquelle le sage empereur avait lu complètement le volume (f. Iv) : « μὴ τοῦτο τις λεγέτω (λεγέτω) ὡς ἀνεγνώσθη παρὰ τοῦ δείνος ἡ βίβλος· οὐ γὰρ ἀρκεῖ τοῦτο μόνον ἄλλ’ ἀναγνωθεῖσα καὶ ένοηθη, πλὴν ὡς ἄν έχου, ἐπαινετὸς ὁ ἀναγνοῦς· δοκεῖ γὰρ εἶναι φιλομαθής· καὶ πολλῷ βελτίων τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀνασχομένου ποτὲ· ἀλλὰ καὶ (καὶ) supra lineam) πολλὴν ἀβελτηρίαν (sic!) τῶν ταύτα μετιόντων καταγινώσκοντος ». La provenance de cette note particulière est également confirmée par une indication anonyme sur la marge gauche de la même page, « Γεωργίου φιλοσόφου τοῦ Πελαγωνίας », et par Jean Chortasménos (1370-1437) : possesseur du manuscrit après Georges, agissant en cette occasion dans le rôle de paléographe, il précise que « τινές φασι τοῦτο, τοῦ κυροῦ Γεωργίου εἶναι τοῦ Πελαγονίας τό· μὴ τοῦτο τις λεγέται… ». Ces éléments suggèrent qu’il s’agissait vraiment d’une note autographe de l’auteur supposé de la Vie de Vatatzès.

Ensuite, lorsque l’on compare ces quelques lignes à l’écriture des cahiers du Vat. gr. 579 que l’on supposait être de Georges sur la base de l’indice du Vat. gr. 2129, nous pouvons confirmer l’identification proposée par Chortasménos : non seulement la forme des lettres et des ligatures est similaire (voir, par exemple, le gamma majuscule haut, qui présente le trait horizontal final décoré avec une sorte de boucle ; le kappa majuscule avec le sommet du troisième trait ascendant ; le ny

---

1 N.B. λεγέτω ώς ἀνεγνώσθη πα-] sur grattage.
minuscule avec le premier trait perpendiculaire à la ligne d'écriture ; le *tau* haut réalisé d’un seul temps en faisant descendre le trait verticale à partir du coin supérieur droit de l’horizontale ; γάρ est aussi particulière que la ligature pour le double *lambda*, mais aussi le *ductus* est également souple.

Compte tenu de ces éléments, nous parvenions à une double conclusion : le *Bίος* de Jean III Vatatzès a été écrit par Georges de Pélongie, tout comme l’ouvrage contenu dans les cahiers du Vat. gr. 579.

Une fois que l’identité de l’auteur et l’autographie de la copie de la *Vie* de Vatatzès ont été prouvés, les interventions qui apparaissent le long de ce témoin prênnent automatiquement une signification tout à fait particulière, car ils nous permettent de lire en perspective diachronique la genèse de l’ouvrage et pourtant d’approcher les choix personnels d’un auteur au cœur de la période byzantine tardive.

Dans cette perspective, notre attention ne se concentrera pas sur l’inclusion des conjonctions simples et/ou des particules, pas décisifs pour le sens global du texte – soit que ce type d’intervention constituait la réponse immédiate à de simples oublis soit qu’il représentait la tentative des changements superficiels de style –, ni sur la correction des lapsus évidents (comme dans le § 18, lorsque Georges corrige l’erroné « ἄρθυμον » avec « ἀρρθυμον ») ou des banales erreurs de iotacisme (« ἤργασται » remplaçant « εἴργασται » au § 23) : en fait, ils ne peuvent pas nous fournir des informations utiles à l’étude de l’évolution du texte en question. Pour les mêmes raisons, nous ne prendrons pas en compte les cas dans lesquels l’auteur recourrait au grattage afin de récrire son texte.

En outre, les cas de suppressions offrent des cas très particuliers : tout bien considéré, en fait, où l’auteur met des points immédiatement au-dessus ou au-dessous de mots, il ne semble pas vouloir effacer la portion de texte ainsi marqué – qui, si éliminée, prêterait de sens la phrase restante – mais il désire seulement mettre en évidence les passages qui selon lui mériteraient une ultérieure révision (comme dans le cas de « ῥίζης ἀγαθοῦ », dans la phrase « τὸ δ’ ἐκ πονηρᾶς ῥίζης ἀγαθοὺς φῦναι κλάδους τοῦτο σπάνιον γε » dans le § 6). En une unique occasion, en effet, Georges se comporte d’une manière différente et procède au biffage définitif d’un passage, après l’avoir signalé par des points (« κηδεμόνι τε καὶ σωτῆρι », au § 10).

Cela étant dit, nous pouvons maintenant passer en revue les cas où l’auteur a révisé son texte et, lorsque cela sera possible, nous essaierons d’expliquer les possibles raisons expliquant ces changements :

- § 3 – γελοῖοι] γελοῖοι δόξαντες εἶναι καὶ φαύλοι τινες τὸν τρόπον G¹ : del. G². La version originale prévoyait peut-être une symétrie dans le nombre des adjectifs attribués aux dirigeants entre la première partie, concernant les ennemis (« υβριστάι » et « μεγάλαυχοι »), et la seconde, concernant les sujets ; l’auteur aurait donc révisé le texte pour pouvvoir mettre l’accent sur l’adjectif « γελοῖοι », qui a un spectre plus large en tant que terme négatif.


- § 4 – τοὺς τοιούτους ἀν εἶν μόνον δίκαιον καλεῖν αὐτοκράτορας] οἱ τοι oὐτοι ἀν εἶν μόνοι δίκαιοι αὐτοκράτορεσ λέγεσθαι G¹ : del. et corr. G². La préférence pour une proposition complétive au lieu d’une proposition indépendante avec la même signification réside dans le goût personnel de l’auteur, qui se retrouve par la suite (voir § 34).
§ 4 – καὶ ἡττῶντα θυμοῦ καὶ δουλεύουσιν ἀνηκέστοις ἔργοις καὶ τρόποις καὶ μανικῶν εἰσιν ἐπιθυμιῶν ἀκρατεῖς| G¹ : del. et ἄγριων ἐρώτων ἡττωμένοις (accordé avec « oïc » de la proposition précédente) καὶ θυμοῦ θηριώδους corr. in mg. G².

§ 4 – ὑμνήσαι μὲν οὖν (οὖν) supra lineam G³) ὡς δεὶ εὐκτὸν ἢν ἢν δήποι παντὶ καὶ ἔγγυ' ἢν τοῦ παντὸς ἐτίμησα τοῦτο πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων] ὑμνήσαι μὲν ὡς δεὶ καὶ σφόδρα ἐφίεμαι G¹ : del. et corr. supra lineam G².


§ 8 – οὔτε μὴν οὖν τε κατὰ μέρος] οὖν supra lineam G² : corr. in mg. G¹. Ici, comme dans le cas suivant, la modification de la séquence des mots pourrait répondre simplement à des raisons stylistiques.


§ 13 – δίκην ἐπιθήσειν ἀπειθοῦσιν] ἀδικοῦσι G¹ : ἀπιθοῦσι G². Vraisemblablement, la correction est ici due à la volonté d’éviter une répétition si près de la même racine verbale et du même concept de « justice ».

§ 14 – τόνῳ] τόνῳ G¹ : corr. G². L’auteur pourrait avoir choisi le datif pluriel pour s’adapter au cas utilisé auparavant dans le polysyndéton.


§ 17 – τόνῳ] τόνῳ G¹ : corr. G². L’auteur pourrait avoir choisi le datif pluriel pour s’adapter au cas utilisé auparavant dans le polysyndéton.


- § 28 – βαρβάρων] πραγμάτων G¹ : corr. G². En considérant le lien de ce génitif avec le terme « ὑβρις », on doit penser que la première version était le résultat d’une banale erreur, dont l’origine est sans doute trahie par la présence du même mot un peu plus loin.

- § 30 – τὴν χώραν τὴν ἡμετέραν] βασιλέως G¹ : corr. G². La seconde version semble vouloir souligner encore le sens de « communauté », en particulier pour ce qui concerne les valeurs utiles à fonder une identité sociale précise (en ce cas le territoire, sous la pression des ennemis au moment de la composition de l’ouvrage).


Parmi tous les passages dans lesquels Georges pense et repense ses corrections et essais, en recherchant la forme la meilleure pour son ouvrage, il y a un cas très particulier et complexe : aux ff. 246rv, en fait, Georges remplace toute une partie du texte de base (G¹) par une version marginale (G³), élaborée à travers des moments successifs (G²), identique pour le contenu mais différente de la première en ce qui concerne le style :
En outre, et en particulier vers la fin de l'ouvrage, l'auteur force la mise en page habituelle, comme s'il voulait adapter le texte entier à la surface d'écriture qu'il avait prévu et préparé pour la copie qu'il s'apprêtait à réaliser : ce qui somme toute est une pratique très courante pour les scribes, de tout temps et dans tous les milieux, puisqu'ils ont un modèle sous leur yeux et essaient de le reproduire le même schéma, ou qu'ils tentent d'employer la quantité de matériaux...
conforme à leur calcul initial. Cela nous amène à imaginer que la version du Vat. gr. 579 représente une phase intermédiaire du Bioς, exactement entre les premières notes organisées et la copie au propre / l'édition finale du texte. Une confirmation nous est également donnée par les nombreux cas où Georges insère dans l'espace entre les lignes ou bien dans celui des marges des mots simples ou phrases courtes, qui avaient tout simplement été oubliés auparavant – et aucune autre explication ne semble ici possible – pendant la copie du texte (comme « τῆς ἀξίας » dans l'expression « ὡς τῆς ἀξίας παμπληθὲς ἀπολειπομένου », au § 4).

Malheureusement, si la première étape (le modèle sous les yeux de Georges) peut être détectée avec une bonne marge de probabilité derrière les ajouts du Vat. gr. 579, plus complexe est le discours sur la version finale du texte. En fait, nous ne pouvons pas savoir où et comment Manuel Gregoropoulos et la main anonyme du XVIIème siècle qui était responsable des ff. 126v-162v du manuscrit post-byzantin Sinait. gr. 2015 ont copié le texte de la Vie de Vatatzès. Notre seule certitude est que ces deux versions – par la similitude avec le contenu du manuscrit Vat. gr. 2129, le Sinaiticus semble dériver de ce dernier, directement ou par un intermédiaire – prennent en compte toutes les modifications apportées par Georges de Pélagonie, et représentent donc un stade plus avancé que celui de l'autographe en notre possession.

Pour conclure. Même si la rareté des témoignages littéraires sur et par Georges tiennent malheureusement hors de portée des réponses à la question cruciale concernant le processus créatif qui poussa et motiva un savant tardo-byzantin, nous avons simplement voulu offrir à cet débat sur « l'auteur byzantin » les premières données recueillies sur cet énigmatique texte. Ce faisant, nous désirons également souligner la nécessité pour les érudits modernes de revenir aux manuscrits et aux sources écrites – trop souvent négligés ! –, de prendre en considération leur caractéristiques matérielles et de déchiffrer toutes les notes et les signes qui pourraient être une des preuves de la façon matérielle de faire littérature à Byzance. Comme dans le cas de la Vie de Vatatzès, l'examen minutieux d'un texte à partir du point de vue de son(es) support(s) peut décidemment expliquer certaines de ces phases et ouvrir des horizons nouveaux.

Avec le Vat. gr. 579, nous pouvons suivre Georges de Pélagonie tout au long du processus qui a amené ce savant de son premier brouillon à la version finale de son ouvrage, ce qui est un privilège très rare dans le panorama de la littérature médiévale. Un privilège qui nous permet de nous assoir au bureau de Georges et suivre son calame défiler avec vitesse sur les feuillets alors qu'il écrit, efface et écrit à nouveau son chef-d'œuvre, le Bioς τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου βασιλέως τοῦ Ἑλεήμονος.
La création d’un auteur :
Grégoire de Nazianze et ses commentateurs byzantins

Il est bien connu que Grégoire de Nazianze s’est mis en scène lui-même dans ses œuvres. En cela il n’est pas exceptionnel parmi les rhéteurs anciens ou chrétiens : Aelius Aristides, Jean Chrysostome ou Augustin, et plus tard Psellos, peuvent être cités comme exemples comparables. Ce qui est plus rare pour l’antiquité tardive et même le moyen âge, c’est le fait que ses œuvres semblent avoir été conçues et diffusées, dès l’origine, comme un corpus bien défini et structuré. En partie, la postérité a préservé cette construction littéraire et elle a même amplifié son caractère autobiographique.

Le premier public d’un auteur qui est aussi un prêtre ou un évêque est normalement constitué par les membres de l’église dont il a la charge. On chercherait en vain dans les sermons conservés de Grégoire le Théologien des traces d’une prédication réelle, l’intrusion du contingent et du concret dans des textes qui se veulent éternels et désincarnés. En même temps, Grégoire se raconte dans ses œuvres : d’une manière souvent allusive et subtile, il se présente comme un fils dévoué, comme un ami fidèle, et surtout comme un humble prêtre dont la vocation monastique a été contrariée. Comme l’a bien montré N. McLynn, il est un « self-made holy man ».

Cette entreprise de construction d’un auteur à travers son œuvre peut réussir (et elle a réussi) que si le public « marche », or, au moins depuis la fin du 6e s. et jusqu’à aujourd’hui, les commentateurs et les historiens qui se sont occupé de Grégoire de Nazianze se sont efforcés de reconstruire la réalité de ce personnage à travers sa propre œuvre. La biographie – ou plus exactement l’autobiographie – de Grégoire a alimenté une production littéraire et artistique importante, faisant de lui le modèle du prêtre.

Le corpus des sermons est évidemment le lieu où cette activité s’est exercée le plus, suivant le postulat évoqué plus haut selon lequel les sermons sont le genre littéraire où se reflète le plus concrètement l’activité du prêtre. Pour faire correspondre la vie et la prédication de Grégoire, les commentateurs et les historiens, médiévaux et contemporains, ont dû se livrer à des contorsions interprétatives assez remarquables.

L’un de ces commentateurs est Elie, métropolite de Crète, dont V. Laurent situe l’épiscopat vers 1120, et qui nous a laissé un commentaire sur les discours dits « non lus à date fixe » de Grégoire de Nazianze. Ce commentaire n’est conservé dans son entier que dans un seul manuscrit, le Vaticanus gr. 1219, daté de la fin du xiie ou du début du xiiie s. Un autre manuscrit, qui ne contient que la seconde partie des discours et du commentaire, et qui est daté exactement de la même période que le Vaticanus, a davantage attiré l’attention en vertu de ses illustrations en pleine page, exceptionnelles à plus d’un titre : il s’agit du manuscrit Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, AN i 8.

Le manuscrit conservé maintenant à Bâle y a été apporté par Jean de Raguse vers 1435. On sait qu’il a été restauré et relié, aux frais de Jean de Raguse, au monastère de Saint Jean Prodrome à
Constantinople (Petra), mais on ne sait pas s’il y a été copié. A Bâle, il a été abondamment consulté et en 1571 Johann Löwenklau y a publié une traduction latine des discours de Grégoire et du commentaire d’Élias sur la base de ce manuscrit. Nous sommes en plein dans les guerres de religion en Europe, et Löwenklau est protestant. Jacques de Billy, qui avait publié en 1569 une traduction latine des discours de Grégoire, prend la publication de Löwenklau comme une injure personnelle. Comme l’a montré I. Backus, le parti catholique n’aura de cesse de surpasser la traduction de Löwenklau et, dans cette rivalité, le commentaire d’Élie de Crète joue un rôle important. Le cardinal Antonio de Carafa presse Billy de produire une nouvelle édition revue de sa traduction et lui fournit des transcriptions du commentaire d’Élie de Crète réalisées sur un manuscrit qu’il vient d’acquérir (en 1576), l’actel Vaticanus gr. 1219. La traduction revue de Billy paraîtra à titre posthume en 1583.

Qu’y avait-il de si exceptionnel dans le commentaire d’Élie de Crète qui le mette ainsi au centre d’une guerre littéraire entre catholiques et protestants dans la seconde moitié du xvi e s. ? Élie n’est ni le premier ni le dernier des commentateurs byzantins de Grégoire, mais, comme il le dit dans sa préface, il s’est intéressé à des discours qui avaient été quelque peu délaissés, parce qu’ils ne faisaient pas partie des célèbres 16 discours de la collection dite liturgique, abondamment copiés, commentés et illustrés. En outre, peut-être plus que ses prédécesseurs, Élie s’efforce, comme il le dit, d’expliquer tout ce que Grégoire a composé d’une manière très subtile et haute en couleurs (πολυτρόπως καταποικίλλων).

Un exemple, qui porte certes sur un détail relativement insignifiant, illustre le succès de cette méthode interprétative.


Hauser-Meury, dans sa prosopographie des écrits de Grégoire de Nazianze, identifie cet Eulalius avec le successeur de Grégoire sur le siège de Nazianze, suivant en cela l’interprétation de la Vita de Grégoire écrite par Grégoire le prêtre à la fin du vie s., dont la source d’informations est essentiellement l’œuvre du Théologien lui-même (Gregorius Presbyterus, Vita S. Gregorii theologi § 22, ed. Lequeux 2001, 197 and n. 6 p. 264). Un manuscrit a été signalé par Somers dans son répertoire des collections complètes comme l’un des rares à contenir une note explicative au titre; il s’agit du Vaticanus gr. 469 (X35), un manuscrit copié dans la 1ère moitié du xive s., qui n’appartient à aucune
des deux grandes families de manuscrits de collections complètes. La note, contenue au f. 196r a été éditée par Devreesse dans son catalogue : Αὐτὴ ἡ ὁμιλία ἐκδόθη Εὐλαλίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ Δοάρῳν νεωτὶ τῷ θρόν(ω) ἐνδιμένῳ. ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ ἑπιστολ(ῇ) φέρεται ὑποχωρῆ(σαντος?) Σασίμ(ῳ) Εὐλαλίῳ καταλείψθαι τὰ Σάσιμα (σώσμα cod.), οὐ καὶ ταῖς χερσὶν εὑρετὰ ἐναποψύξαί, ὑπὲρ(ει) τ(ι)ς οὗτο(ς) Εὐλαλίο(ς) ἔστιν, ποτένων ἔτερος ὁμολογεῖ(σας?) ἔκειν ὢν οὗτο(ς) ἔκεινο(ς) τῶν δύο ἡρῴων ἐκλησίων, ὃ γίνεται ἐν ταῖς μετατάξεσι πέρνων (« Cette homélie a été prononcée pour Eulalius, évêque de Doara, au moment de sa récente installation sur le siège épiscopal. Parce qu'une lettre a également été préservée dans laquelle il est dit que Sasimes, alors que Grégoire s'en était retiré, avait été confiée à Eulalius, entre les mains duquel il « prie de rendre son dernier souffle », on se demande qui est cet Eulalius, soit un autre avec le même nom, soit la même personne ayant dirigé les deux églises, ce qui peut arriver lors d'un transfert »).

Cette note fait allusion à la lettre 182 de Grégoire (adressée à Grégoire de Nysse et datée de 383) : τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπισκόπων Ἐυλαλίον λέγω, τὸν ἀγαθοπράθονταν ἐπίσκοπον, οὐ καὶ ταῖς χερσὶν ἐναποψύξαμι (§ 4, ed. Gallay). Dans cette lettre, on comprend, comme l'auteur de la Vita, qu'Eulalius est évêque de Nazianze (encore du vivant de Gégoire) et non de Sasimes ou de Doara.

Quoiqu'il en soit, pour Elie il ne fait aucun doute que le nouveau pasteur dont il est question pour Doara est bien Eulalius et le titre du discours dans le manuscrit de Bâle (et dans le Vat. Gr. 1219) est en effet : προσφώνησις ἐκδοθεῖσα ἐπὶ τῇ χειροτονίᾳ Ἐυλαλίου ἐπισκόπου Δοάρων. Pour Elie, comme il se doit de tout expliquer, il ne fait aucun doute non plus que le fils de « fils de Dathan et d'Abiron » qui lui faisait des misères n'était autre qu'Anthime, l'évêque de Tyane, avec lequel Basile de Césarée, aurait eu, d'après Grégoire de Nazianze maille à partir (Ep. 48 et 50).

Si peu fondée que soit cette interprétation, elle se retrouve dans l'illustration qui sert de frontispice au discours 13 dans le manuscrit de Bâle. Elle se retrouve aussi dans la 3e édition (posthume) de la traduction de Jacques de Billy (reproduite dans la PG 35, col. 832A) : qui a changé le titre de sa 1ère édition (« Greg. Nazianzeni in electionem Doarensium, Homilia Eulalio Episcopo edita ») en « Habita in consecration Eualii Doarensium episcopi ».

L'interprétation d'Elie, relayée par Billy est ensuite passée dans l'historiographie moderne, sans l'ombre d'une preuve : ainsi Métivier dans une thèse sur l'histoire de la Cappadoce du 4e au 6e s., publiée en 2005, écrit qu’”Eulalius de Doara est consacré par Grégoire de Nazianze avant d’être chassé”, en s'appuyant sur le témoignage du discours 13…

On ne saurait donc surestimer l’importance des commentaires byzantins (du pseudo-Nonnos à Elie de Crète) pour notre (mé-)compréhension de cette œuvre littéraire volontairement allusive. Les éditeurs et traducteurs de la Renaissance ont largement puisé dans ces commentaires pour interpréter le texte souvent cryptique de ce maître d’éloquence, et ont ainsi relayé jusque dans les ouvrages modernes la science ou les croyances accumulées par les Byzantins. Souvent, dans leur zèle à vouloir faire correspondre les écrits de Grégoire et sa vie, ces commentateurs sur-interprètent le texte. Il n’est pas rare que des chercheurs contemporains prennent ces interprétations du texte pour le texte lui-même. Ainsi, l’image que nous avons de Grégoire de Nazianze, comme auteur, est l’œuvre de ses commentateurs médiévaux presque autant que la sienne propre.
L’oralité et ses modalités à Byzance

Les perceptions byzantines de l’oral et de l’écrit

Dans une lettre adressée à Syméon de Bulgarie en 896, Léon Choirosphactès commence par la comparaison suivante : « L’homme est double, o le plus grand des princes, j’entends par là qu’il est composé d’un corps et d’une âme. Le discours (λόγος) aussi est double : l’un est oral et écrit (προφορικὸς καὶ ἐγγράμματος), l’autre pensé et intérieur (ἐνδιάθετος). Lorsque le discours parlé et écrit suit le discours intérieur et celui de l’âme, nous pouvons croire qu’il est vrai, et le croyant vrai, nous l’acceptons avec satisfaction ; quand il ne le suit pas, nous ne le croyons pas et nous le repoussons » (ed. Kolias, n° 10). Basile le Grand, qui pourrait être le modèle de l’auteur byzantin, ignore complètement l’écrit dans l’opposition qu’il dresse entre discours « qui est émis par la voix et qui s’évanouit le moment même qu’il est prononcé » et discours « intérieur » (PG 31 477A). Ces constatations reproduisent un schéma bipolaire, cher à la philosophie platonicienne et stoïcienne, selon lequel le logos présente toujours un double aspect, rationnel (ratio) et discursif (oratio), et que le rapport instauré entre ces deux aspects, pour ne citer que deux des épigones byzantins de cette idée, est absolument complémentaire : « le discours mental est une sorte de pensée, mais le discours oral est le véhicule de la pensée » (Jean Damascène, Dialectica 31.11), ou plus simplement : « le discours que nous partageons est double, l’intérieur avec lequel nous pensons et l’oral avec lequel nous parlons » (Jean Doxapatrès, Prolégomènes aux Progymnasmata d’Aphthonios, 14, 122).

Les théologiens chrétiens à Byzance adoptent cette division, la réajustent en fonction de leurs propres préoccupations, et l’utilisent même pour comprendre la nature du Christ, désigné dans l’Évangile de Jean comme Logos. Entre la possibilité que Christ soit une réalisation du discours intérieur, étant donné sa nature divine, ou une réalisation du discours « oral », en raison de son incarnation, la plupart des théologiens contournent la question et lancent même l’anathème à ceux qui s’y hasardent : « si quelqu’un appelle le Christ discours intérieur ou oral, qu’il soit anathématisé » (Athanase, De synodis Arimini, 27.3).

D’autre part, certains parmi eux remplacent la bipartition philosophique du discours par une tripartition tout en continuant à ignorer la division entre oral et écrit. Ainsi, selon Jean Damascène, au discours intérieur et oral il faut ajouter un discours qui « est une création naturelle de l’esprit » (Damascène, Expositio, ch. 13.95-98), alors que les deux types du discours de la philosophie ancienne continuent à être perçus de manière traditionnelle : « la fonction rationnelle de l’âme se divise en verbe intérieur et verbe proféré. Le verbe intérieur est un mouvement de l’âme qui se produit dans la partie rationnelle sans aucun son distinct ; de ce fait nous déroulons souvent en nous-mêmes silencieusement tout un discours et nous tenons des conversations dans nos rêves. C’est sous cet aspect surtout que nous sommes tous des êtres rationnels : en effet, les sourds de naissance ou ceux
qui ont perdu la parole par quelque maladie ou accident n'en sont pas moins raisonnables. Le verbe proféré révèle son activité dans la parole et les discussions ; il s'agit autrement dit du verbe émis par la langue et la bouche. Voilà pourquoi il est appelé ‘proféré’. Il est le messager de la pensée. Sous cet aspect, on nous appelle ‘êtres parlants’» (Ibid., ch. 35).

Dans le texte cité au début de notre présentation, Choirosphactès introduit en revanche l’écrit dans le schéma traditionnel, même si son idée fondamentale ne concerne pas l’opposition entre oral et écrit mais entre discours vrai et discours faux, indépendamment des conditions de son énonciation. Dans son argumentation, l’oral et l’écrit ne font qu’une unité face au discours mental.

Pour trouver une certaine autonomie de l’écrit par rapport à l’oral, il faut abandonner le contexte philosophique et se tourner vers les préoccupations rhétoriques. Tout en acceptant la division entre discours intérieur et discours proféré, certains théoriciens de l’art rhétorique envisagent l’existence autonome de l’écrit en tant que variété de l’oral. Ainsi, selon Jean le Sicilien (c. 1000), le discours oral est celui « qui est émis à travers la bouche et les lèvres, et on peut constater qu’il se divise en proféré et en écrit » (Commentaires in Hermogenes Peri Ideôn, Walz 6 : 419. 18-18). Dans cette définition est évidente la place secondaire et auxiliaire de l’écrit qui n’est que le produit d’un acte d’énonciation préalablement oral. Pour qu’un verbe soit écrit, il doit d’abord s’articuler oralement. L’écrit est une forme particulière pour capter une des multiples variantes de l’oral.

Une préoccupation majeure pour l’esthétisation du discours est présente chez les professionnels de l’art rhétorique, ces enseignants discrets qui assurent les cadres de la culture littéraire à Byzance. Dans leurs écrits théoriques, la dimension esthétique du discours acquiert une certaine indépendance, elle aboutit même à la mise en avant d’un sur-discours, qui s’appelle technikos et qui est identifiable à l’art de la rhétorique et domine les deux autres, celui intérieur et celui proféré : « Le discours, tant celui proféré que celui intérieur, est soumis à la rhétorique comme une matière et il est orné par le logos technikos » (Jean Doxapatrès, Prolégomènes aux Progymnasmata d’Aphonitios, Rabe 14 : 90 ; répétition littérale de Trophonius, Prolegomena in artem rhetoricam, in Rabe, Prolegomenon Sylloge, p. 7). Le logos technikos prend subitement le pas sur les deux autres, il les surpasse même et les conditionne ; il devient la condition sine qua non de leur émission réussie : « Nous disons que la rhétorique est considérée comme l’art du discours des deux côtés, du côté du discours proféré et du côté du discours intérieur. En ce qui concerne le discours intérieur, elle l’orne pendant la recherche des arguments et des idées, si cela est une affaire de discours intérieur ; en ce qui concerne le discours proféré, elle l’orne aussi en le gratifiant avec l’éloquence et le bon rythme, si certes le discours proféré est responsable pour l’arrangement des mots et du bon rythme » (Ibid., 123.24-124.6). Dans cette configuration, on passe de la simple énonciation à la transformation de la parole orale en art littéraire, grâce à l’intervention du logos technikos ; le discours écrit n’existe pas comme l’opposé du discours oral, mais comme une de ses versions ; pour cette raison il n’est pas cité comme une unité indépendante du discours.

Celui qui ose explorer cette direction est Michel Psellos, qui réalise une avancée théorique décisive : dans une lettre adressée à Léon Paraspondylos il propose, avec son jeu de signification complexe, imbu de références littéraires multiples, une distinction entre oral et écrit (γράφειν, λέγειν) sur la base, d’un côté, des circonstances de l’émission du discours (il parle de αἰτία et καιρός) et de l’autre côté, sur celle de la différenciation stylistique (style simple pour l’oral et soutenu pour l’écrit). L’écrit joue cependant pour Psellos d’une qualité supplémentaire : grâce sa forme fixe, il
aide à dévoiler le vrai caractère de l'auteur : « La parole simple est récitée comme cela arrive et ne dévoile pas celui qui parle ; la parole des lettres trace en revanche le caractère de l'auteur » (Sathas, n° 11). En cela, Psellus reste fidèle à un *topos* de l'épistolographie classique qui voit dans les mots écrits la marque de l'âme de l'écrivain. L'écrit, par son « authenticité », sa complexité, sa stabilité et sa profondeur, s'érige contre la frivolité, la superficialité et le caractère éphémère de l'oral. Il reste cependant l'opposition intéressante que Psellus souligne au sein de la catégorie « logos proféré » en attribuant la place d'honneur au discours écrit et en proposant une esthétique discursive fondée, cette fois, sur l'opposition entre *graphein* et *legein* : l'oral est le moyen de la communication quotidienne, mais lorsqu'on doit « officialiser » cette communication, on a nécessairement recourt à l'écrit qui aide en même temps à la transmission d'un 'soi d'auteur' presque hiératique, statutaire et monumental. Psellus présente clairement, sans l'exprimer formellement, l'opposition entre usage public, distancé et rituel de la parole et son usage privé, interactif et officieux.

Byzance insiste constamment sur la confusion entre oral et écrit et il n'est même pas osé de dire que la division entre oralité et littéralité ne s'y pose que sur une autre base conceptuelle, plus solide pour l'explication de sa propre littérature, celle entre le discours simple ou « quotidien » (oral plutôt qu'écrit) et le discours technique ou « exercé » (*Excerpta e prolegomenis in librum Peri Staseôn* Waltz : 14. 229.6-7 : ὅτι ὁ προφορικὸς λόγος διττός, ὅτε δημώδης καὶ ὁ κατ' ἄσκησιν), c'est-à-dire le discours esthétiquement élaboré (oral et écrit). En laissant de côté le discours « quotidien », qui est étranger aux préoccupations littéraires, notre attention sera retenue par le discours élaboré qui, à cause du fait qu'il est considéré comme version du discours « oral », pensé en termes d'interaction et de proximité, est conçu comme produit de représentation : le discours littéraire à Byzance ne peut être que performatif.

* * *

**Une autre catégorisation possible des produits littéraires à Byzance**

Étant donné que la seule définition minimale et pertinente de la littérature que nous pourrions proposer, si nous voulons rester fidèles aux concepts des théoriciens du discours à Byzance, est que serait littérature tout discours esthétiquement élaboré, oral et écrit, en vue d'être « performé », nous procéderons à une catégorisation conséquente des produits littéraires à Byzance. Certaines remarques préalables s'imposent cependant : a) lorsque nous parlons de *performance*, improvisée ou ritualisée, nous indiquons un acte littéraire où se réalise la rencontre entre un produit littéraire à élaboration variable et un public réel ou potentiel ; autrement dit, il s'agit du moment où l'énonciation orale (ou écrite) devient publique et acquiert le statut de produit culturel. C'est dans l'acte de la performance que prioritairement et de préférence se rencontrent compositeurs et consommateurs de la littérature et c'est ce même acte qui définit souvent la « publication » du texte littéraire. Pour être plus précis, on peut dire que le texte byzantin peut envisager deux sortes de « publications », l'une *orale*, performatrice dans la synchronie (avec ou sans support écrit), et l'autre *écrite*, en cahiers ou en livre, confectionné souvent par l'auteur lui-même et destiné à la postérité ; b) le discours élaboré de la littérature, soumis à la performance, s'adresse à un public dont les capacités de perception varient selon une échelle qui va de la consommation la plus élémentaire au rapport créatif avec le produit littéraire. La maîtrise réelle de la littérature est un terrain à géométrie variable, qu'il est très difficile de cerner dans les sociétés du passé ; c) lorsque le texte est consigné sur les pages d’un manuscrit (il faut faire la distinction entre écriture d’un texte en vue d’être performé et sa consignation dans
un support-archive), il perd son caractère performatif en créant une distance avec les conditions de sa création et de sa transmission originales ; il devient dès lors un produit de l’histoire littéraire ; d) même s’il n’y a pas de théorisation correspondante, plusieurs textes sont créés à Byzance pour faire partie d’archives (traités médicaux, collections légales, encyclopédies thématiques, historiographie annalistique etc.), mais ces textes pourront être considérés comme des textes semi-littéraires ou pas du tout littéraires. Ainsi, nous justifions une définition de la littérature en tant que production exclusive de textes réellement ou potentiellement performés. Nous proposons par la suite de diviser les performances littéraires en trois grandes catégories, pour des raisons purement méthodologiques:

A. Les performances des discours à élaboration basse ou moyenne (structure formaulique et paratactique, langage répétitif et d’un registre proche au langage parlé etc.). Ces performances correspondent à la définition que les savants modernes avancent pour la littérature orale, comme étant celle composée, représentée et transmise oralement. Souvent ces créations frayent un chemin vers une réalisation écrite, mais, dans ce cas, leur caractéristique la plus remarquable est une certaine fluidité du texte consigné, tant dans la forme que dans le contenu. À cette catégorie appartiennent aussi des productions écrites qui simulent les modalités de la composition orale pour mieux encadrer et communiquer une histoire aux allures « fictionnelles » (Digénis, roman paléologue, satires etc.). Le discours performatif à élaboration basse ou moyenne choisit, en ligne générale, deux formes littéraires pour s’exprimer, la diégésis, lorsqu’il s’agit d’un discours en prose, ainsi que certaines formes poétiques bien mémorisables, et surtout les chansons. La diégésis, une forme de narration simple à langage bas et dénué d’ornements rhétoriques, était la forme privilégiée des hagiographes de l’époque protobyzantine pour transmettre un « témoignage » sur un fait ou une personne, dignes de citation. La diégésis est plus qu’une forme littéraire, elle constitue une manière précise d’organiser et de construire une histoire qui renvoie, précisément à cause de sa forme directe, à la « vérité » et à l’« authenticité » de son contenu. En ce qui concerne les formes poétiques et les chansons, nous disposons de témoignages de l’existence d’une riche production depuis le IVe siècle et des mises en garde des Pères de l’Église, notamment Jean Chrysostome, jusqu’au XVe siècle. Les chansons accompagnent toute activité sociale, surtout les moments décisifs dans la vie d’une personne (naissance, mariage, mort) ou de la communauté (fêtes religieuses, célébrations étatiques etc). Un nombre considérable parmi elles est performé dans un cadre rituel, même si rien n’empêche la présence d’une certaine improvisation. Elles sont créées par des compositeurs, souvent professionnels, et elles sont très vite récupérées par un grand nombre d’adeptes. Les pères de l’Église fustigent les personnes qui fredonnent les succès musicaux du théâtre de mime, même si dans ce cas on ne peut pas parler de création orale mais de diffusion orale. Nous savons aussi que les dèmes avaient à leur disposition des poètes prompts à créer les vers capables d’inspirer et de diriger un groupe. Les poèmes satiriques que nous lisons dans les textes historiographiques, les acclamations rythmées, les éloges et les encouragements poétiques, ainsi que les synthèses qui accompagnent les processions infâmantes organisées par l’État ou la communauté, doivent être considérés plutôt comme des créations de versificateurs professionnels que comme des improvisations populaires. La chanson est une parole publique et son émission doit être régulée et contrôlée ; elle est aussi une arme et dispose de tout le potentiel pour devenir la parole de l’homme « moyen et honnête », qui signe inclusions et exclusions par rapport à son groupe. Les performances à élaboration basse ou moyenne, aussi omniprésentes soient-elles, ne préoccupent jamais les théoriciens du discours et sont traitées avec dédain par les auteurs qui cultivent les performances suivantes :
B. Les performances des discours à élaboration moyenne - haute (langage soutenu, structure complexe, résonnances et transformation du texte en composition quasi-musicale). Les occasions sont multiples pour un orateur de déployer ses talents : les homélies dans les églises, les sermons des théologiens, les harangues militaires, les discours officiels, livrés devant des empereurs et des patriarches en diverses occasions, ou, dans un cadre moins rituel, les pièces littéraires ou morceaux de textes historiques, prononcés devant un public constitué des collègues du compositeur, devant les élèves d’une école dans une ambiance de compétition, devant les membres d’une classe oisive qui cherche à s’amuser ou devant des auditeurs de toute sorte, avides d’écouter des récits. Ces performances font de la culture littéraire un spectacle et capitalisent ses effets. Dans ce cas, la représentation orale des pièces littéraires est complètement conditionnée par l’écrit ; on simule non plus la forme du texte oral, mais les conditions de son énonciation. La culture littéraire spectaculaire pérennise les valeurs culturelles du monde gréco-romain et la place centrale du rhéteur dans cette conception de la culture. Certes, le rhéteur a changé de rôle à Byzance, mais il a gardé un peu de son prestige ancien : il est devenu la figure par excellence du maître d’école et de l’intellectuel libre en quête de rendre service au pouvoir. Le choix de faire du rhéteur la figure emblématique de la culture avait des conséquences importantes sur la pratique littéraire à Byzance.

C. Les performances liturgiques des produits littéraires, répétés oralement ou chantés selon un calendrier annuel et insérés dans la vie de l’Église : morceaux évangéliques choisis, hymnes, ou vies de saints et synaxaires constituent une catégorie intermédiaire des textes qui acquièrent leur légitimité à cause de leur forme écrite, mais qui ne gagnent leur rôle et leur efficacité sociaux que performés ou « réincarnés ».

Conclusion

Nous avons essayé de voir la littérature, à la manière des Byzantins, comme synonyme de la performance, et de poser les bases d’une nouvelle catégorisation du produit littéraire selon les modalités de sa représentation. Cette perspective de recherche demande une investigation encore plus approfondie en vue d’une nouvelle histoire de la littérature à Byzance.
La position de Laonikos Chalkokondylès dans le paysage littéraire de son époque relève d'un profond paradoxe. D'un côté, il s'est employé à écrire ce qui est en réalité une histoire de l'Empire ottoman, structurée sur l'évolution dynastique des descendants d'Osman, dans laquelle il fait montre d'une excellente connaissance des institutions, des finances, de l'armée, de l'idéologie de l'Empire ottoman. Plus généralement, il a une attitude très positive envers l'Islam et son prophète. Selon les dernières recherches, il écrivait le plus probablement son ouvrage à Constantinople et non quelque part dans le domaine vénitien comme on le pensait auparavant. Cela constitue un argument important pour le considérer comme un historien ottoman de langue grecque. En même temps, il imite non sans un certain succès les modèles classiques d'Hérodote et de Thucydide et plus encore fait une apologie passionnée de l'hellénisme de sa nation, se posant comme visionnaire de la restauration de la gloire et du pouvoir de son peuple alors tombé sous domination ottomane (A. Kaldellis, A New Herodotos: Laonikos Chalkokondyles on the Ottoman Empire, the Fall of Byzantium, and the Emergence of the West, Washington DC, 2014). Rallié au régime ottoman ou résistant : quelle cohérence trouver derrière cette apparente contradiction ?

Pour essayer de démêler cette énigme, nous utiliserons la clé interprétative fournie par un passage essentiel de l'introduction de ses Démonstrations historiques (I, 1, ed. Kaldellis, p. 2-4):

« Je ne considérerais pas méprisable de raconter ces choses en langue hellénique, parce que la langue des Hellènes est la plus répandue de par le monde et s'est mélangée avec plusieurs autres langues. Et grande est sa gloire présentemment, mais plus grande sera-t-elle encore, quand un empereur, lui-même Hellène, et ceux de sa souche qui seront empereurs après lui, régneront sur un empire important. Alors les enfants des Hellènes réunis seront gouvernés selon leurs coutumes, pour leur plus grand bien et avec un pouvoir dominant sur les autres (peuples) ».

S'agit-il en l'occurrence d'une sorte de prophétie sécularisée concernant la résurrection du royaume grec, qui aura lieu, on le sait, au début du XIXe siècle ? Ou bien a-t-on plutôt affaire à un message immédiat, concernant l'époque et l'entourage proche de Laonikos Chalkokondylès, qui pourrait nous aider à mieux comprendre son cercle de lecteurs et la fonction idéologique primordiale de son ouvrage historique ?

En 1984, M. Cazacu, étudiant l'arbre généalogique du grand vizir Mahmud pacha, est arrivé à la conclusion que Chalkokondylès était un parent distant du grand vizir. Ce dernier était apparenté à tout le Gotha de l'aristocratie byzantine et qui plus est doté de racines impériales. En conséquence de quoi, M. Cazacu conclut que Laonikos se serait établi à Constantinople pour devenir le chroniqueur semi-officiel de Mahmud pacha. En discutant un projet de Mahmud pacha visant à renverser le sultan Mehmed II et à lui prendre le trône, avec l'aide de Venise, l'historien français est arrivé à la conclusion que le basileus des Hellènes de la « prophétie » de Laonikos était le grand vizir lui-même.
Cette reconstruction a été questionnée dans la monographie publiée en 2001 par Th. Stavrides, The Sultan of Vezirs: the Life and Times of the Ottoman Grand Vezir Mahmud Pasha Angelović (1453-1474). La critique de Stavrides se résumait cependant à la discussion de certains aspects des reconstructions généalogiques de Cazacu, considérant qu’il n’y avait pas suffisamment de preuves pour prendre en considération une parenté entre Mahmud pacha et Laonikos Chalkokondylès.

Nous reprenons la discussion à ce point. En effet, le progrès des recherches a mis en lumière d’autres aspects qui vont au-delà des liens généalogiques, autour desquels on peut beaucoup gloser, pour éclairer d’un jour nouveau les relations entre l’historien hellène et le grand vizir ottoman d’origine grecque.


En essayant de circonscrire la date de l’écriture de l’œuvre de Laonikos, A. Kaldellis avait raison de contester la datation tardive d’E. Darkó, qui la plaçait à la fin du XVe siècle, en la faisant plutôt remonter aux années ’60 du siècle. En même temps, il nous semble qu’il est impossible de la dater plus précisément en 1463-1464. En effet, Chalkokondylès évoque la conquête par Matthias Corvin de la Bohême, « de manière que les deux royaumes (hégémonias) lui furent assujettis » (VIII, 60, éd. Kaldellis, p. 248-249). Mais cette allusion ne saurait faire référence à la soumission des bandes de mercenaires tchèques par Matthias Corvin en 1464 car cette opération de police interne au royaume de Hongrie a été sans aucune conséquence sur le plan international. En l’occurrence, il ne peut s’agir que de la proclamation de Matthias comme roi de Bohême par l’opposition catholique de Moravie, Silésie et Lausitzen lors des états de Olmütz, le 3 mai 1469. À partir de ce moment, la chancellerie royale de Matthias commence à dater les documents selon les années du règne des deux couronnes. En même temps, Chalkokondylès parle de Néroponte comme étant encore vénitienne, ce qui signifie que l’ouvrage a été accompli – dans la forme qui nous est parvenue – avant la conquête de l’île d’Eubée par les Ottomans, donc avant août 1470. Il résulte donc que Chalkokondylès avait interrompu son travail dans la deuxième moitié de l’année 1469, mais avant août 1470.

E. Gamillscheg a apporté une contribution décisive dans la discussion en identifiant le plus ancien manuscrit de l’œuvre de Chalkokondylès, le Parisinus grecus 1780, datable de la fin des années 1460, confirmant ainsi par les données matérielles l’analyse du contenu historique. La main du copiste du Paris. gr. 1780 avait attiré l’attention vers une série de manuscrits produits par un cercle qui tournaient autour de Georges Amiroutzès, installé à Constantinople après la prise de Trébizonde en 1461. B. Mondrain a identifié le copiste, restituant la figure d’un important intellectuel grec qui s’était illustré dans les premières années de la période ottomane : Démétrios Angelos. Élève de Jean Argyropoulos, médecin lui-même, il est l’auteur d’une trentaine de manuscrits conservés et identifiés jusqu’à présent. Mis à part ses intérêts professionnels, il était aussi passionné d’histoire, et en particulier d’histoire contemporaine. Ainsi, il est entre autres l’auteur d’une importante notice sur l’exécution de l’empereur de Trébizonde David Comnène.
Il n'est donc pas surprenant que, sous la plume de Démétrios Angelos, on trouve non seulement l'œuvre de Chalkokondylès, mais aussi quelques œuvres mineures de Kritoboulos d'Imbros, l'auteur de la biographie de Mehmed II achevée, selon les données de son Proémion, vers 1468. Cette identification donne encore plus de consistance aux observations de D. Reinsch, qui a pu mettre en lumière plusieurs éléments communs animant les deux œuvres historiques. Outre leur tendance générale philo-ottomane, les deux auteurs partagent la même vision de la disparition de l'Empire byzantin comme d'un phénomène historique, celui de la succession naturelle des empires, et non eschatologique. Tous deux interprètent ainsi la prise de Constantinople comme une vengeance du pillage de Troie par les Achéens, vengeance opérée par les descendants des Troyens, les Turcs. Tous deux se laissent guider dans leur travail par les mêmes classiques, Hérodote et Thucydide, bien que Kritoboulos maîtrise mieux ses modèles que Chalkokondylès, qui s'en émancipe très peu. Cela avait mené D. Reinsch à la conclusion que tous deux devaient non seulement se côtoyer mais aussi se lire l'un l'autre, et plus exactement que Chalkokondylès avait visiblement eu accès à l'ouvrage de Kritoboulos. Il se pourrait cependant que la réciproque soit également vraie. Dans son Proémion, Kritoboulos propose à Mehmed II d'écrire à la suite de sa biographie une histoire des Turcs en général, qu'il devrait être rédigée avec exactitude et en suivant l'ordre chronologique. Il renforce son propos par une critique d'autres œuvres de même nature, qui, selon ses dires, ne respectaient pas cet ordre, n'étaient pas objectives et tenaient des propos souvent inexacts. On pourrait y reconnaître les Démonstrations historiques, auxquelles les chercheurs reprochent souvent les mêmes failles.

Outre Kritoboulos d'Imbros et Laonikos Chalkokondylès, les manuscrits de Démétrios Angelos aident à mettre en réseau plusieurs autres auteurs de l'époque : Georges Amiroutzès, Théodore Agallianos, Gennadios Scholarios (alors retiré, après sa démission du trône patriarcal en 1456, dans son monastère de Saint Jean de Serres) : il s'agissait d'un groupe, trié sur le volet, d'archontes gravitant autour du Patriarcat œcuménique. Quel lien existait cependant entre eux et le grand vizir ? En 1463, Mehmed II avait fait donation à la mère de ce dernier – et sans doute à sa demande – du monastère de Saint Jean Prodromos Petras de Constantinople. Selon une notice du ms. Patmos 285 : « Tout en conservant la foi, sa mère Marie habitait le palais. Elle prenait soin des chrétiens. Elle a acheté au miri pour mille florins le siège du patriarcat (...) et aussi deux églises (...) pour que le patriarche et les chrétiens en jouissent comme d'un bien de pleine propriété ». Le grand vizir, qui n'avait pas oublié ses origines, jouait le rôle d'un véritable patron de la communauté grecque qui gravitait autour du patriarchat, comme le montre son intervention pour forcer le patriarche Joasaph Ier à accepter le mariage digamique de Georges Amiroutzès, son cousin germain. Ce qui donnait toutefois cohérence et cohésion à ce petit monde, miné de rivalités, était la présence, au sommet de l'appareil étatique ottoman, du grand vizir Mahmud pacha, d'origine grecque et d'illustre ascendance aristocratique, voire impériale.

Mahmud pacha, né vers 1427 à Novo Brdo, fait prisonnier et converti de force à l'islam dans sa jeunesse, avait entamé à la cour du sultan une brillante carrière. Comes du beglerbeg d'Anatolie, qualité en laquelle il participa au siège de Constantinople, il fut nommé grand vizir et beglerbeg de Roumélie par Mehmed II après la défaite de Belgrade de 1456, étant censé réformer un appareil militaire qui avait alors montré ses limites. Tâche brillamment exécuté : bras droit du sultan, il dirigea les campagnes de Serbie (1458), du Péloponnèse (1459), de Sinope et de Trébizonde (1461), de Valachie (1462). De retour au Péloponnèse contre les Vénitiens (1463), il dirigea aussi les campagnes de Bosnie (1464), d'Albanie et de Karamanie (1468). Pour des raisons encore trop peu
élucidées, il fut démis honteusement de ses deux fonctions en 1468. Il obtint l'année suivante un poste moins élevé mais non moins important, celui de sancak bey de Gelibolu, amiral de la flotte ottomane, qualité en laquelle il dirigea en 1470 les opérations de la prise de Négreponde. En 1472-1473, le sultan fit à nouveau usage de ses compétences en qualité de grand vizir pour coordonner la campagne contre Uzun Hasan. Au terme de si nombreux et loyaux services, il est donc surprenant d’assister à sa nouvelle déposition et à son exécution à Constantinople le 18 juillet 1474.

Les raisons de cette mystérieuse débâcle ont été mieux éclairées par les recherches entreprises dans les archives de Venise par I. Božić, Th. Stavrides et M. Cazacu. Elles font état, à partir de 1469, donc après sa première déposition, de l’ouverture de négociations secrètes entre Mahmud pacha et les autorités vénitiennes, alors en pleine guerre contre Mehemed II (1462-1479). Si jusqu’en 1470 la Sérénissime limita son offre à l’octroi de la Morée et d’un revenu annuel en échange de l’acte de trahison, la donne changea après 1473. La mise aux enchères de l’Empire ottoman était arrivée à la proposition de Mahmud pacha de renverser le sultan et d’attaquer les Détroits avec l’aide de Venise. Si celle-ci se réservait la Morée, Négreponde (Eubée) et Mytilène, Mahmud pacha voulait pour lui Constantinople et la partie européenne de l’Empire ottoman. Après de longues négociations, le doge Nicolas Tron, lui promettait officiellement, avec l’accord du Conseil des Dix,

« che aspirando la Excellentia sua a piu alta et gloriosa impresa et stato et asaltando la cita et l'imperio di Constantinopoli et dominio del Turcho de qua dal streto (...) l'imperio dicto de Constantinopoli damo se per la tutto gli offerimo li favori et presidii nostri ».

Cette promise audacieuse, découverte par l’espionnage ottoman, fut sans doute à l’origine de l’envoi brutal aux gémonies du grand vizir, coupable de haute trahison.

La vie du cercle littéraire formé autour du patronage du grand vizir devait être étroitement liée à son sort. Les deux écrits historiques font état des deux périodes majeures de l’activité de ce grand vizir. L’ouvrage de Kritoboulos, achevé en 1468, avant la première déposition de Mahmoud pacha, est l’expression de l’époque où les intérêts du groupe s’harmonisaient avec ceux de l’État ottoman. L’ouvrage de Chalkokondylès, inachevé mais mené jusque autour de 1469 / 1470, exprime déjà les prémisses du divorce entre ce groupe d’archontes et de lettrés grecs et l’État ottoman, et fait la promotion du grand vizir tombé en disgrâce dans la posture d’un possible remplaçant du sultan et restaurateur de l’Empire byzantin. La disparition du véritable patron explique vraisemblablement non seulement pourquoi Laonikos a laissé son œuvre inachevée, mais aussi pourquoi Kritoboulos d’Imbros n’a plus jamais écrit l’histoire des Turcs qu’il avait proposée à Mehemed II.

Ce rapport étroit des deux historiens à l’équilibre fragile qui régnait au sommet de l’État ottoman entre le sultan et son grand vizir permet enfin de comprendre les deux aspects paradoxaux de la conception historique de Chalkokondylès : promotion programmatique de l’hellénisme et son intérêt et respect pour l’Islam. L’Empire qu’aurait virtuellement fondé Mahmoud pacha Angelos ne saurait être une simple restauration d’un passé révolu. Cet Empire aurait dû devenir, comme l’était le grand vizir lui-même, une synthèse turco-byzantine. Laonikos Chalkokondylès a été l’idéologue de cette virtualité politique qui aurait pu jaillir sur la scène historique si la conspiration du grand vizir avait réussi.

C’est probablement la raison principale pour laquelle il proposa une refondation de l’identité de son peuple d’origine, sur autres bases que la millénaire Romiosynè. Son œuvre se caractérise par un divorce avec le passé romain comme avec le passé chrétien orthodoxe, par la récusation
verbale du premier et la relégation au second plan du second, en faveur d’une résurrection d’une conscience hellénique fondée sur la langue et sur l’héritage culturel classique. Ce n’était que dans ce cadre identitaire sécularisé que les Turcs de religion musulmane qui vivaient en Roumélie depuis déjà un siècle auraient pu coexister pacifiquement avec le reste de la population du nouvel Empire. Grand bâtisseur d’édifices musulmans, fin connaisseur de la littérature arabe, patron estimé par les historiens turcs de son temps (Shükrullah, Enver ou Tursun beg) tout autant que par ses historiens grecs, Mahmoud pacha appartenait aux deux mondes de manière égale. Son projet politique devait être tout autant une synthèse correspondante à la stature d’un grand vizir tourné en basileus. Placée dans le contexte historique qui était le sien, l’œuvre de Chalkokondylès cesse d’être paradoxe et ses deux aspects qui apparaissaient comme contradictoires au début de notre démarche se présentent maintenant comme les prémisses nécessaires de cette nouvelle synthèse turco-byzantine.

Paradoxalement, on pourrait avancer que cette synthèse fut pourtant prolongée à sa manière par Mehmed le Conquérant lui-même à travers un autre mythe historiographique, celui de l’origine Comnène de la dynastie ottomane. Ce n’est qu’avec l’islamisation programmatique de l’État ottoman entamée sous le règne de Bayezid II que les sujets chrétiens de l’Empire seront soumis à un statut rigoureusement défini de zimmis – mettant fin à toute entreprise de synthèse.

Une autre conclusion, méthodologique, émerge de la présente démarche : la nécessité de voir les auteurs comme des acteurs. Nos historiens étaient loin d’être les secrétaires objectifs et omniscients d’une réalité historique qui se tramait sous leurs yeux objectifs et qu’ils ne faisaient que noter consciencieusement pour le souvenir des générations à venir. Tant s’en faut. Ils étaient au contraire des acteurs intimement impliqués dans les jeux politiques de leur époque. Leurs partis-pris culturels nous les montrent aux prises avec les défis historiques de leur temps. Si le message littéraire des auteurs byzantins est immédiat, on peut en dire autant des premiers historiens ottomans de langue grecque.
Τα νομικά βοηθήματα κατά την επίλυση ιδιωτικών διαφορών από τον Δημήτριο Χωματηνό και ο τρόπος αξιοποίησής τους

Οι δικαστικές αποφάσεις και γνωμοδοτήσεις δεν ανήκουν στα κείμενα που συνήθως χρησιμεύουν για εξαγωγή φιλολογικής φύσεως συμπερασμάτων σχετικά με τη γραμματεία μιας εποχής. Πράγματι είναι κείμενα τεχνικά, που έχουν ως κύριο σκοπό την ανάπτυξη νομικών συλλογισμών και για την επίλυση προβλημάτων και όχι την έρευνα της αναγνώστη. Η διαπίστωση αυτή θα έπρεπε να διεξαχθεί στο δικαστήριο και ο τρόπος αξιοποίησής τους θα έπρεπε να συμβιβαστεί με τον κόσμο το συμπερασμάτων που διαπράττεται στην εποχή μας. Η δικαιοσύνη θα έπρεπε να επιλύει προβλήματα και όχι την επίλυση της εποχής. Πράγματι είναι κείμενα τεχνικά, που έχουν ως κύριο σκοπό την ανάπτυξη νομικών συλλογισμών και για την επίλυση προβλημάτων και όχι την τέρψη του αναγνώστη. Παρόλα αυτά δεν παύουν να αποτελούν προϊόντα ανθρώπινης συγγραφικής δραστηριότητας και να αποδίδουν σε κάποιο βαθμό τη συνειδητοποίηση και τις αντιλήψεις των συντακτών τους. Η διαπίστωση αυτή θα αποδοθεί με ευθύνη του δικαστή ως συντάκτη του κειμένου, όχι ως τεχνικό κείμενο. Ακόμη γνωρίζουμε, ότι κάθε κανόνας έχει τις εξαιρέσεις του. Συγκεκριμένα σώζονται αποφάσεις του επιφανούς δικαστή του 11ου αιώνα Ευσταθίου Ρωμαίου, από τις οποίες συνάγεται όχι μόνον η νομική κατάρτισή του και η αξιοπρόσεκτη ικανότητά του για τη διαμόρφωση του δικανικού συλλογισμού, αλλά και τη δημιουργία της νομοδοτικής δικαιοδοσίας του Βυζαντίου, έπειτα από κάποιο ανώνυμο νεώτερο τού καθηγητή και καταγράφοντας κατά κύριο λόγο τις αποφάσεις του Ευσταθίου πάντως μας έχουν παραδοθεί σε επιτετμημένη ή αποσπασματική μορφή μέσω μιας συλλογής που ονομάζεται Πείρα και έχει συνταχθεί από κάποιον ανώνυμο νεώτερο και κατά κύριο λόγο, τη δικαιοσύνη, δικαστήριο και κατά κύριο λόγο τη μεγάλη κωδικοποίηση της μάζας περιόδου, δηλαδή τα Βασιλικά.

Στο πλαίσιο της βυζαντινής έννομης τάξης, δικαιοδοτική αρμοδιότητα για επίλυση ιδιωτικών διαφορών αναγνωρίζονταν, κυρίως μετά τα τέλη του 11ου αιώνα, και στην εκκλησιαστική δικαστήρια. Εκτός από μεμονωμένες αποφάσεις που χρονολογούνται κυρίως μετά τον 13ο αιώνα και σώζονται από τις περιοχές της Θεσσαλονίκης, των Σερρών και της Μικράς Ασίας, τα Βασιλικά, η εκκλησιαστική νομολογία μας έχει παραδοθεί σε συλλογές δικαιοδοτικών πράξεων, που σώζονται αυτούς και αποδίδονται στην πρακτική στο Δεσποτάτο της Ηπείρου κατά τον 13ο αιώνα και στην Κωνσταντινούπολη κατά τα έτη 1315-1402. Αρχίζοντας από τις νεώτερες αποφάσεις, παρατηρούμε ότι αυτές προέρχονται από τη δραστηριότητα της πατριαρχικής συνόδου και στο μεγαλύτερο μέρος τους χρονολογούνται κατά
τά έτη 1399-1400 επί πατριάρχη Ματθαίου Α΄. Η εκτεταμένη αυτή δικαιοδοτική δραστηριότητα
οφείλεται οπωσδήποτε στις εξαιρετικές συνθήκες της εποχής, με αποκορύφωμα τον μακρόχρονο
αποκλεισμό της Πόλης από τους Οθωμανούς, ενδεχομένως όμως και στην προσωπικότητα του
πατριάρχη. Η προσωπική σφραγίδα του Ματθαίου διαγιγνώσκεται αναμφιβόλως στην τάση για
προστασία των αδυνάτων και στην απόδοση της ουσιαστικής δικαιοσύνης, ἀκόμη και αν, κάποτε,
κρίνεται αναγκαίο να παρεκλείνουν από το γραπτό δίκαιο. Ως κείμενα δεν παρουσιάζουν πάντως
ιδιαίτερο ενδιαφέρον, γιατί μάλλον και εδώ ισχύει η αρχή της προφορικής απαγγελίας και της εκ
των υστέρων καταγραφής, ενώ σπανίζουν οι παραπομπές σε νομικές πηγές.
Διαφορετική εικόνα αποκομίζει κανείς από τή μελέτη των αποφάσεων του μητροπολίτη
Ναυπάκτου Ιωάννη Αποκαύκου και του αρχιεπισκόπου Αχρίδας Δημητρίου Χωματηνού. Και οι δύο
υπήρξαν σημαντικές εκκλησιαστικές αλλά και πολιτικές προσωπικότητες στο κράτος της Ηπείρου,
κατά την περίοδο της διάσπασης της αυτοκρατορίας λόγω της «λατινικής» κατάκτησης, ενώ
διακρίνονταν και για την εγκύκλια παιδεία τους. Τα δικαιοδοτικά τους κείμενα φέρουν μάλιστα έντονη
την προσωπική σφραγίδα του καθενός τόσο ως προς το ύφος όσο και ως προς τη μέθοδο εργασίας. Το
αρχείο του Αποκαύκου είναι μικρότερο από αυτό του Χωματηνού· συγκεκριμένα περιλαμβάνει λίγο
περισσότερες από 30 αποφάσεις, που στην πλειονότητά τους αφορούν δίκαιο του γάμου και κυρίως
διαζύγια. Ο Απόκαυκος αποδεικνύεται ικανός δικαστής που κρίνει με οξύνοια αλλά και επιείκεια,
χωρίς όμως να παραπέμπει συχνά σε διατάξεις νόμου. Έτσι το έργο του δεν μπορεί να χρησιμεύσει για
άντληση πληροφοριών ως προς τη διάδοση και χρήση νομικών κειμένων, παρά μόνον ως τεκμήριο
για το ότι αυτή δεν ήταν ιδιαίτερα εκτεταμένη, δεδομένου ότι η βιβλιοθήκη ενός μητροπολίτη που είχε
διακριθεί και ως δικαστής δεν πρέπει να περιείχε σημαντικό αριθμό νομικών χειρογράφων.
Διαφορετική εικόνα παρουσιάζει το αρχείο του Χωματηνού. Εκεί, υπό τον τίτλο «Πονήματα
διάφορα», περιέχονται περίπου 150 πράξεις, πολλές από τις οποίες έχουν τον χαρακτήρα
δικαστικής ἀπόφασης, αλλά και γνωμοδότησης. Οι γνωμοδοτήσεις αυτές δεν διακρίνονται
εύκολα από τις κατά κυριολεξία αποφάσεις του αρχιεπισκόπου. Μάλλον ασφαλές κριτήριο για
τη διάκριση τους αποτελεί η παρουσία και των δύο διαδίκων, την οποία ο Χωματηνός φαίνεται
πως θεωρούσε απαραίτητη για την έκδοση δικαστικής απόφασης. Γνωμοδοτήσεις και αποφάσεις
του αρχιεπισκόπου Αχρίδας για ιδιωτικές διαφορές θα αποτελέσουν αντικείμενο της παρουσίασης
μου, σε σχέση με τις παραπεμπόμενες νομικές πηγές και την αξίοποιησή τους από τον Χωματηνό.
Το έργο του επιλέχθηκε, άλλωστε, τόσο λόγω της συνοχής και του όγκου του όσο και επειδή —σε
αντίθεση με τον σύγχρονό του Ιωάννη Απόκαυκο αλλά και γενικότερα τους βυζαντινούς δικαστές,
ακόμη και τους κοσμικούς— ο αρχιεπίσκοπος Αχρίδας για τη θεμελίωση της κρίσης κάνει ευρύτατη
νομικών πηγών, στίς οποίες, κατά κανόνα, ευθέως παραπέμπει.
Οι περισσότερες παραπομπές του Χωματηνού σε διατάξεις του «νόμου», γίνονται στα
Βασιλικά, από τα οποία μάλιστα συνήθως παραθέτει ολόκληρα χωρία. Η σχετική έρευνα, πάντως,
έχει καταλήξει στο συμπέρασμα, ότι για την πλειονότητα των χωρίων ο αρχιεπίσκοπος δεν είχε
συμβουλευθεί το σώμα της κωδικοποίησης, αλλά το περιληπτικό συμπίλημα επιλεγμένων —και
αλφαβητικά καταταγμένων με βάση το αντικείμενο— διατάξεων τους, δηλαδή τη Μεγάλη Σύνοψη
του 10ου αιώνα. Η χρήση της Σύνοψης στη θέση του πρωτότυπου κειμένου της κωδικοποίησης
είναι συνηθισμένη πρακτική, που, εκτός από τον αρχιεπίσκοπο Αχρίδας, ακολουθούσαν και άλλοι
νομικοί, είτε για λόγους ευκολίας είτε γιατί δεν διέθεταν τα Βασιλικά. Όσο αφορά όμως τον
Χωματηνό, είναι βέβαιο, πως εκτός από τη Σύνοψη είχε στη διάθεσή του αν όχι ολόκληρο το σώμα
της κωδικοποίησης κάποια τμήματά της, καθώς κάποτε επιλέγει να παραπέμψει απευθείας σε αυτήν
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και όχι στό συμπίλημα. Υπάρχουν φυσικά περιπτώσεις που το γεγονός αυτό δεν αποτελεί επιλογή,
αλλά οφείλεται στο ότι το συγκεκριμένο χωρίο δεν περιλαμβάνεται στη Σύνοψη. Μαρτυρείται όμως
και προσφυγή στο αυθεντικό κείμενο των Βασιλικών, προφανώς επειδή η περιληπτική διατύπωση
της Σύνοψης δεν ήταν αρκετή για τη διατύπωση των συλλογισμών του Χωματηνού. Τα «Πονήματα»
παραθέτουν επίσης και σχόλια στα Βασιλικά, κάποια από τα οποία δεν παραδίδονται μάλιστα από
καμία άλλη πηγή. Από σχόλια στα Βασιλικά πρέπει να έχουν αντληθεί και τα αποσπάσματα από
την Επιτομή Νεαρών του Θεοδώρου Εμεσηνού, που παρατίθενται σε γνωμοδότηση («Πόνημα» ἀρ.
20). Στο συμπέρασμα αυτό καταλήγω, επειδή η επιτομή αυτή έχει σε αρκετό βαθμό χρησιμοποιηθεί
για σχολιασμό της κωδικοποίησης, άρα είναι εξαιρετικά πιθανό να υπήρχαν τα αποσπάσματα αυτά
σε κάποιο, χαμένο σήμερα, χειρόγραφο των Βασιλικών, το οποίο διέθετε ο Χωματηνός.
Όπως είναι γνωστό, τα Βασιλικά αποτελούν επανακωδικοποίηση του ιουστινιάνειου δικαίου
σε πλήρως εξελληνισμένη και αρκετά εκσυγχρονισμένη μορφή. Η νομική πραγματικότητα του 13ου
αιώνα είχε όμως αρκετά διαφοροποιηθεί από το ιουστινιάνειο πρότυπο και οι αλλαγές στο δίκαιο
προβλέπονταν κυρίως σε αυτοκρατορικές νεαρές της μέσης περιόδου. Τέτοιου είδους νόμους
επικαλείται βεβαίως και ο Χωματηνός, κύριως στις περιπτώσεις, που το κωδικοποιημένο δίκαιο
είχε υποστεί συμπλήρωση ή μεταβολή με νεότερο νόμο.
Χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα αποτελεί ο θεσμός της «προτίμησης», δηλαδή το δικαίωμα
ορισμένων κατηγορῶν προσώπων να έχουν προβάδισμα σε περίπτωση εκποίησης ακινήτων. Η
προτίμηση αποτελοῦσε παλαιό θεσμό —ενδεχομένως με ρίζες στο ελληνιστικό δίκαιο— που είχε
ρυθμισθεί νομοθετικά στα τέλη του 4ου αιώνα. Ο θεσμός μπήκε σε νέες βάσεις και κατά κάποιον
τρόπο «επανεισήχθη» στο δίκαιο το έτος 922 με νεαρά του Ρωμανού Λακαπηνού, την οποία ο
Χωματηνός βεβαίως χρησιμοποιεί για την επίλυση διαφορών, πού προέκυπταν από την εφαρμογή
του, παραθέτοντας μάλιστα σε γνωμοδοτήσεις του μεγάλα αποσπάσματά της. Σημαντική αλλαγή
επέρχεται κατά τη μέση περίοδο και όσο άφορά την τέλεση της μνηστείας. Το ιουστινιάνειο δίκαιο
προέβλεπε μόνον όριο ηλικίας για τη σύναψή της —τα επτά έτη— και όχι συγκεκριμένο τύπο. Ένας
τρόπος που συχνά επέλεγαν οι άνθρωποι για να μνηστευθούν ήταν η ευλογία της σχέσης τους
από την Εκκλησία, η οποία με τον κανόνα 28 της Πενθέκτης οικουμενικής συνόδου (έτ. 691/92)
εξομοίωσε από πλευράς εκκλησιαστικού δικαίου τη μνηστεία με τον γάμο. Η εξομοίωση αυτή είχε
ως πρακτικό αποτέλεσμα να απαιτείται για τη λύση της ιερολογημένης μνηστείας λόγος διαζυγίου.
Έτσι, ο Λέων ΣΤ΄ ο Σοφός με τις Νεαρές 74 και 109 προέβλεψε ως κατώτατο όριο ηλικίας για τη
σύναψη τέτοιου είδους μνηστείας εκείνο του γάμου, δηλαδή το 12ο ή 14ο έτος (για τις γυναίκες
και τους άνδρες αντίστοιχα). Τελικά, ο αυτοκράτορας Αλέξιος Α΄ Κομνηνός με δύο νεαρές των
ετών 1084 και 1092 κατέστησε υποχρεωτική την ιερολογία για την εγκυρότητα της μνηστείας. Οι
νόμοι αυτοί παραπέμπονται μεν από τον αρχιεπίσκοπο, ο οποίος όμως δεν καταγράφει παρά κάποιες
λίγες γραμμές και μόνον από τα νομοθετήματα του Αλεξίου Α΄. Ο αρχιεπίσκοπος πρέπει πάντως
να διέθετε και χειρόγραφο με νεαρές του Λέοντος, γιατί σε γνωμοδότησή του παραθέτει μεγάλο
απόσπασμα από τη νεαρά 108 —η οποία προβλέπει να καταδικάζεται ερήμην όποιος, μετά από τρεις
κλητεύσεις, δεν παρουσιαζόταν στο δικαστήριο, ανανεώνοντας μια ιουστινιάνεια διάταξη που είχε
περιπέσει σε αχρησία— ενώ ένα ακόμη, μικρό, αποσπασμα σώζεται στο «Πόνημα» αρ. 77, —το οποίο
δεν αφορά επίλυση ιδιωτικής διαφοράς, αλλά πραγματεύεται ζητήματα εκκλησιαστικού δικαίου.
Κατά πάσα πιθανότητα ο αρχιεπίσκοπος συμβουλευόταν και την Πείρα, ενώ η παρουσία
του Ευσταθίου Ρωμαίου πιστοποιείται και από τα αποσπάσματα της Πραγματείας περὶ Πεκουλίων
—δηλαδή σχετικά με τις περιουσιακές σχέσεις των υπεξουσίων— που χρησιμοποιείται ευρέως
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από τον Χωματηνό, στον οποίον οφείλεται και η απόδοση της πατρότητας του έργου στον παραπάνω επιφανή δικαστή του 11ον αιώνα. Μία φορά ο αρχιπεσικός παραπέμπει —με ρητή αναφορά και απόσπασμα— στις Ροτές. Πρόκειται για έργο με ιουστινάνειο υπόβαθρο, που υπέστη μεταγενέστερες επεξεργασίες και αφορά τη μέτρηση του χρόνου και τις διάφορες προσεβησίες. Το ότι το είχε στη διάθεσή του δεν προκαλεί πάντως εκπλήξη, γιατί παραδίδεται ευρύτατα στα χειρόγραφα της Μεγάλης Σύνοψης των Βασίλικων. Τέλος, πηγές εκκλησιαστικού δικαίου έχουν πολύ περισσότερη παρουσία στα «Πονήματα» που αφορούν την επίλυση ιδιωτικών διαφορών, τα οποία αποτελούν αντικείμενο της παρούσας παρουσίασης. Μαρτυρείται πάντως το σχόλιο του Θεοδώρου Βαλσαμώνα στον Νομικόνα σε ΙΑ’ Τίτλους, ενώ παραπέμπεται αυτούσιο απόδοσα από «σημειώμα» του πατριάρχη Νικολάου Γ’ Ιραματικού (έτ. 1092).

Ο Δημήτριος Χωματηνός διέθετε λοιπόν μια μάλλον πλούσια νομική βιβλιοθήκη, την οποία αξιοποιούσε πλήρως κατά την ενάσκηση των δικαιοδοτικών του καθηκόντων. Η μικρά μου ενασχόληση με τις γνωμοδοτήσεις και τις αποφάσεις του με έμει μάλιστα οδηγήσει στο συμπέρασμα, ότι όταν επιθυμούσα να δώσει μια, κατ’αυτόν, δίκαιη λύση, η οποία δεν μπορούσε πρόχειρα και εύκολα να βρει έκρηξη στον νόμο προσέτετε σε πλήθος νομικών κειμένων, ακόμη και άσχετων με το θέμα του, στοχεύοντας πιθανώς στον εντυπωσιαμό εκείνων, που δεν είχαν την νομική του κατάρτιση. Δεν μπορούσε άλλωστε να αγνοήσει το γεγονός, ότι μεγάλο μέρος των «Πονήματων» του καταλαμβάνουν γνωμοδοτήσεις, που είχαν συνταχθεί μετά από αίτημα κάποιου διάδικου, κάποτε με τον σκοπό να προσαχθούν ενώπιον άλλου, πολιτειακού μάλιστα, δικαστηρίου. Στις περιπτώσεις λοιπόν αυτές, ο αρχιπεσικός μάλλον δεν επηρεάζοντας ως δικαστής, που έπρεπε να είναι αδέκαστος, αλλά κατά κάποιο τρόπο ως δικηγόρος, επιφορτισμένος με την προάσπιση των συμφερόντων του εντολέα του.

Η αυθεντία του Χωματηνού δεν εξασφαλίζει όμως πάντοτε νίκη στον διάδικο, που θα την επικαλείτο. Χαρακτηριστικό είναι ότι δύο γνωμοδοτήσεις του («Πονήματα» αρ. 38, 61) απορρίφθηκαν από κοσμικά δικαστήρια. Δυστυχώς οι αποφάσεις τους δεν μας έχουν σωθεί. Ο λόγος πάντως ήταν, πως το δίκαιο που εφάρμοζε ο αρχιεπίσκοπος ήταν απαρχαιωμένο και οι σχετικές αποφάσεις δεν μας έχουν σωθεί. Ο λόγος άλλωστε να αναφέρονται στο γεγονός, ότι μεγάλο μέρος των «Πονήματων» του καταλαμβάνουν γνωμοδοτήσεις, που είχαν συνταχθεί μετά από αίτημα κάποιου διάδικου, κάποτε με τον σκοπό να προσαχθούν ενώπιον άλλου, πολιτειακού μάλιστα, δικαστηρίου. Στις περιπτώσεις διαφορών, όπως της σύναψης δεύτερου γάμου από χήρους που είχαν παιδιά, το συμπέρασμα αυτό ο αρχιεπίσκοπος τότε επέκτεινε με ρητή απόσπασμα από «σημειώμα» του πατριάρχη Νικολάου Γ’ Ιραματικού (έτ. 1092).

Ανεξάρτητα από την αντιδικία για το παραπάνω ζήτημα η προσκόλληση του Χωματηνού στο ιουστινάνειασ προελεύση δίκαιο δεν μπορεί να αμφισβητηθεί, όχι μόνον επειδή αυτό είναι εκείνο στο οποίο κατά κανόνα αναφέρεται, αλλά γιατί —πέραν του ζήτημα της δευτερογαμίας, η στάση του απέναντι στο οποίο δικαιολογείται και από την ιερατική του ιδιότητα— συχνά κάνει λόγο
για θεσμούς ρωμαϊκής προέλευσης, ενεργούς μεν ακόμη, έστω μέχρι ενός σημείου, τον 6ο αιώνα, αλλά που στην εποχή του ή είχαν εξαφανισθεί ή είχαν, τουλάχιστον, υποστεί ουσιώδεις μεταβολές. Έτσι αναφέρεται στην παλιά διάκριση επιτροπείας και κρηδονικών, που μετά τη μέση περίοδο είχε σταδιακά εκλείψει· χρησιμοποιεί συστηματικά για να δηλώσει τη σχέση του κληρονόμου προς την κληρονομία τον όρο διακατοχή, που αποτελούσε μετάφραση της bonorum possessio του πραιτωρικού δικαίου, η οποία είχε προ πολλού εξαφανισθεί· αναφέρεται ευρέως σε «γαμικά κέρδη» με τη μορφή συμβατικών «κάσων» στην περίπτωση λύσης των γάμων, που είχαν πλέον υποκατασταθεί από παροχές εκ του νόμου καθώς και στο κληρονομικό δικαίωμα του επιζώντος συζύγου, άλλωστε δεν υπήρχαν συγγένεις, πού είχε ουσιαστικά εκλείψει μετά την έκδοση της Ν. 118 του ίδιου του Ιουστινιανού (έτ. 543).

Οι παραπάνω διαπιστώσεις δεν πρέπει όμως να οδηγήσουν στο συμπέρασμα, πως το αρχείο του Δημητρίου Χωματηνού είναι ξένο προς τη νομική πραγματικότητα της εποχής του. Ήδη άλλωστε αναφερθήκαμε στις αυτοκρατορικές νεαρές της μέσης περιόδου που επικαλείται και εφαρμόζει. Πέρα από αυτό, υπάρχουν και περιπτώσεις, στις οποίες ο αρχιεπίσκοπος υιοθετεί αντιλήψεις και πρακτικές αντίθετες προς τις κειμένες διατάξεις, που είχαν όμως επιβληθεί εκ των κάτω με βάση τις λαϊκές αντιλήψεις για τη λειτουργία κάποιων θεσμών. Χαρακτηριστικά παραδείγματα αποτελούν η κατά περίπτωση αναγνώριση της συγγένειας ως του ισχυρότερου λόγου για το δικαίωμα προτίμησης στην αγορά ακινήτου, η έμμεση αποδοχή ότι η σχέση της υπερυπουρίας έληγε με τη συμπλήρωση του 25ου έτους της ηλικίας και η υιοθέτηση της κόρης αντιστοιχούσε, καταρχήν, στο κληρονομικό της μερίδιο από την πατρική περιουσία. Όπως όμως υπάρχουν και περιπτώσεις, στις οποίες ο αρχιεπίσκοπος υιοθετεί αντιλήψεις και πρακτικές αντίθετες προς τις κειμένες διατάξεις, που είχαν όμως επιβληθεί εκ των κάτω με βάση τις οικογενειακές αντιλήψεις για τη λειτουργία κάποιων θεσμών. Χαρακτηριστικά παραδείγματα αποτελούν η κατά περίπτωση αναγνώριση της συγγένειας ως του ισχυρότερου λόγου για το δικαίωμα προτίμησης στην αγορά ακινήτου, η έμμεση αποδοχή ότι η σχέση της υπερυπουρίας έληγε με τη συμπλήρωση του 25ου έτους της ηλικίας και η υιοθέτηση της κόρης αντιστοιχούσε, καταρχήν, στο κληρονομικό της μερίδιο από την πατρική περιουσία. Όπως όμως υπάρχουν και περιπτώσεις, στις οποίες ο αρχιεπίσκοπος υιοθετεί αντιλήψεις και πρακτικές αντίθετες προς τις κειμένες διατάξεις, που είχαν όμως επιβληθεί εκ των κάτω με βάση τις οικογενειακές αντιλήψεις για τη λειτουργία κάποιων θεσμών. Χαρακτηριστικά παραδείγματα αποτελούν η κατά περίπτωση αναγνώριση της συγγένειας ως του ισχυρότερου λόγου για το δικαίωμα προτίμησης στην αγορά ακινήτου, η έμμεση αποδοχή ότι η σχέση της υπερυπουρίας έληγε με τη συμπλήρωση του 25ου έτους της ηλικίας και η υιοθέτηση της κόρης αποτελούσε στο προσωπικό του περί δικαίου αισθήμα. Η «αρχαιοπρέπεια» του δεν αποτελούσε εμπόδιο, αντίθετα μάλιστα κάποτε και εργαλείο, για την εκπλήρωση του σκοπού αυτού και δεν σήμαινε ούτε άγνοια των νεώτερων εξελίξεων ούτε αδιαφορία για τά μηνύματα του καιρού του.
L’auteur byzantin, la vie et l’œuvre ? Par-delà l’intertextualité

« Donner à un Auteur un texte, c’est imposer à ce texte un cran d’arrêt, c’est le pourvoir d’un signifié dernier, c’est fermer l’écriture »
(Roland Barthes, « La mort de l’auteur »)

L’auteur qui retiendra notre attention ici, le Ptochoprodrome, a écrit quatre poèmes qui portent aujourd’hui son nom, les Ptochoproromika. Son cas tient une place assez particulière et originale dans le débat sur l’auteur byzantin, à cause d’une question qui est encore discutée aujourd’hui ; le Ptochoprodrome est-il bien Théodore Prodrome ? Pour commencer en présentant cette controverse qui dure depuis plus d’un siècle, je me contenterai de paraphraser le résumé somme toute assez complet qu’en fait René Bouchet pour en présenter sa traduction parue aux Belles Lettres (Satires et parodies du Moyen Age grec, Paris 2012).

Il faut tout d’abord remarquer que les différents manuscrits qui nous ont transmis les quatre pièces nous présentent eux-mêmes leur auteur comme Théodore Prodrome de façon explicite, ce qui peut très bien n’être qu’une précision ajoutée bien plus tard par les copistes, puisque le plus ancien manuscrit qui nous aient conservé l’un des textes date probablement du XIVème siècle, alors que l’on pense aujourd’hui que Prodrome aurait vécu dans la première moitié du XIIème, peut-être jusqu’en 1170. Mais les chercheurs modernes depuis le XIXème siècle, et jusqu’à aujourd’hui encore, se refusent à accepter que le grand rhéteur byzantin soit l’auteur d’œuvres jugées totalement indignes de lui : bien qu’elles présentent un intérêt principalement linguistique, il faut rappeler que ces textes sont bien connus depuis longtemps, et qu’on a d’abord cru, avant de découvrir les différentes versions du Digénis Akritas, qu’il s’agissait des premiers textes en grec moderne, ce qui explique d’ailleurs qu’Adamantios Korais ait été le premier à les étudier. Voici ce qu’en pensent leurs éditeurs, Hesseling et Pernot en 1910 : « En réalité ces poèmes sont intraduisibles ; les longueurs, les redites, les platitudes, les non-sens y abondent, et bien clairsemés sont les passages qui se lisent agréablement », disent-ils avant d’ajouter qu’il n’en va pas de même au point de vue linguistique. Non seulement ces textes sont écrits en grande partie en langue vulgaire, mais encore ils font état de la vie quotidienne de l’auteur, et nous en font un tableau des plus rocambolesques et pitoyables, quel qu’en soit le cadre, maison familiale, monastère ou rues de Constantinople, à tel point qu’ils sont une source très importante de realia pour les historiens. Ils présentent des incohérences et un décalage important avec la littérature légitimée à laquelle on peut s’attendre d’un écrivain du niveau de Prodrome, sans oublier leur subversion affichée qui nous fait les classer en tant que satires.

Et l’un des éléments les plus spécifiquement importants ici est qu’ils nous montrent un auteur byzantin qui ne correspond pas du tout à la figure traditionnelle de l’érudit, mais à celle d’un écrivain de métier qui peine à vivre de sa plume. Voici le début du quatrième poème dans la traduction en proses de Bouchet (vers 1-17, p. 39) :
Dans mon enfance, mon vieux père me disait : « Étudie les lettres de ton mieux, mon enfant. Vois cet homme, mon fils : jadis il allait à pied, mais à ce jour il possède un mulet bien gras avec un harnais à double épaisseur de cuir. Pendant ses études, cet autre allait nu-pieds, aujourd’hui, comme tu peux le voir, il porte des chaussures à bout pointu. Tel autre encore, du temps où il étudiait, n’était jamais peigné, le voilà maintenant bien coiffé, tout ondulé. Tel autre qui, lorsqu’il était étudiant, n’avait jamais vu la porte d’une salle de bain, se lave maintenant trois fois par semaine. Et tel autre dont la poitrine était couverte de poux gros comme des amendes, y arbore à présent des pièces d’or à l’effigie de l’empereur Manuel. Fais confiance à ce que te dit ton vieux père : étudie les lettres de ton mieux ». J’ai donc étudié les lettres en me donnant beaucoup de mal. Mais depuis que je suis devenu professeur de lettres, je ne rêve que de pain frais et de mie blanche…

On voit, dans cet extrait assez représentatif, la densité sémantique, la subversion évidente alliée à un humour corrosif, l’importance donnée à la quotidienneté et à la trivialité pour faire contrepoids à une littérature plus idéalisée et légitimée, sur fond d’autodérision. Est également très présente une certaine conception de l’homme de lettre, dont il décrit plus en détail l’activité un peu plus loin : « Mais moi, pauvre de moi, combien de vers faut-il que je trousse, que je peaufine, que je déclame, et des meilleurs, pour trouver de quoi apaiser ma faim ? ». Force est ici de constater que nous sommes à un niveau intermédiaire de l’auctorialité ; en effet, malgré son humilité apparente, le Ptochoprodromos ne se définit pas comme un assemblage d’idées ou de vers anciens. Mais, d’un autre côté, bien qu’il ne se définisse pas non plus en tant que génie romantique, il nous dit créer des vers, et sur commande de surcroît, ce que pourraient prouver les faits, étant donnée l’utilisation de la langue dite « vulgaire », accompagnée de thèmes non moins vulgaires, qui ont dû représenter une tentative de prendre à contre-pied la culture légitimée (au sens bourdieusien du terme) de son époque, ce qui est inévitable lorsque l’on évoque des thèmes sexuels ou scatologiques, ou que l’on parodie la liturgie dans une société chrétienne. L’auteur des Ptochoprodromika s’écarte manifestement des sentiers battus ; s’il s’inspire d’Aristophane par exemple (ce qui a plaidé en faveur de la paternité de Prodrome), il ne participe pas de la culture ou de la logique de la syllogè. Son topos d’humilité ne cherche pas à effacer son « je » d’auteur comme c’est le cas dans bien d’autres textes byzantins, mais il ne fait que révéler à quel point il est conscient de son individualité ; il ne s’efface pas derrière ses prédécesseurs, mais les malmène au contraire, ce en quoi il montre des points communs assez frappants avec son presque contemporain occidental, le poète français Rutebeuf, dont l’œuvre a magnifiquement été traduite et commentée par Michel Zink dans l’exceptionnelle collection des Lettres Gothiques.

Faisons à ce point une pause dans notre propos général pour en revenir à la phrase d’accroche, citation extraite du très fameux article de Roland Barthes, La mort de l’auteur, lui aussi très subversif en son temps. La thèse que le critique y concrétise est que l’auteur est une notion hautement historique, donc « historisicable » - ce que cette table ronde ne saurait désapprover – notion étroitement liée à celle d’individu, cette dernière fluctuant donc elle aussi dans la durée et selon les aires culturelles. Dans la conception de Barthes, l’auteur ou son intention ne sont pas les détenteurs exclusifs du sens de texte ou de son herméneutique. La vie n’explique pas l’œuvre, puisque pour Barthes, qui fait abstraction des croyances dans l’individualité ou du génie créateur romantique, l’auteur, ce « je » qui n’existe qu’au moment de l’énonciation, n’est qu’un catalyseur qui condense plusieurs voix qui lui préexistent, ce qui ouvre l’interprétation à ces voix, ne les restreint pas dans ce « dernier signifié » qu’est l’auteur. En ce qui concerne l’auteur, il faut considérer que la vie et l’œuvre sont deux éléments distincts. Il ne faut bien sûr pas oublier de noter que cette « mort de l’auteur » n’est qu’un pavé jeté
dans la marre de l’ancienne critique littéraire positiviste, et que Barthes lui-même reviendra sur
l’auteur, finalement pas si mort, trois ans plus tard avec son Sade, Fourier, Loyola. Mais il a permis
une avancée majeure.

Pour maintenant en revenir à notre Ptochoprodromos, les chercheurs pendant des décennies
se sont efforcés de percer le mystère de sa personnalité réelle, positive, mystère dont il y a toutes
les chances qu’il reste à jamais entier. Récemment, dans la suite de l’élan qui a inspiré à Barthes
son article, des byzantinistes ont regardé ces poèmes avec un regard nouveau, en particulier Hans
Eideneier, Roderick Beaton ou Margaret Alexiou – mais pas seulement. Cette dernière les a lus avec
l’apport des théories bakhtinienes avec plus ou moins de succès, théories assez proches de l’idée de
Barthes, à savoir le carnavalesque et la polyphonie culturelle, mais tout en restant étroitement reliée
aux idées d’individu, d’intention…

Tout le sujet de cette présentation sera, à travers le questionnement du concept de « message
immédiat », de tenter de pousser plus loin l’herméneutique de ces textes par l’utilisation d’une
méthode récente, celle de l’ethnocritique littéraire théorisée principalement par Jean-Marie Privat
et Marie Scarpa, sans oublier de relier ces résultats à la méthode et aux connaissances historiques.
The Circulation of Literature in the “Circle” of the Sebastokratorissa Eirene

A lot has been discussed about literary circles in Byzantium, the so-called theatra (occasionally also called syllogoi), which were in function from late Antiquity until the end of the Byzantine Empire. A very vivid description about the performance of such venues is preserved in a letter of the emperor Manuel II Palaiologos (Dennis 1977, no. 27) who himself participated in a theatron. As Manuel tells us, the members of the theatron were well versed in the art of speaking to the point. They applauded to what they heard; they stamped their feet and shouted with joy, while the emperor sat in silence. Theatra and syllogoi are mentioned here and there; they are not only gatherings of a learned peer elite but also meetings of a teacher (e.g. John Tzetzes) with his students (Comm. in Ran. 897; cf. Marciniak 2007). As is the case in the description of a theatron by Manuel II Palaiologos, letters seem to have been very popular—from late Antiquity onwards—to be read aloud in these gatherings. This is for example testified by Michael Italikos who states about a letter of the historian Nikephoros Bryennios: “When your letter was brought into the logikon theatron it gave forth your voice and your song, with such literary grace, such a gift of the Muse …” (p. 154 Gautier, transl. by Mullett 1984, 175). Michael Psellos even labels the presentation of the letters of his addressee a panellenion theatron (ep. 223 Kurtz-Drexl).

While we are primarily informed about the existence of theatra and syllogoi in the Palaeologan period, the first climax of these kinds of literary circles was certainly the twelfth century, in particular the ‘long’ mid-twelfth century, encompassing the period of John II and Manuel I Komnenos (1118–1180). This time span is also the age of intensive patronage which flourished both at the Comnenian court and in aristocratic circles. The patrons were, interestingly enough, primarily women, namely Irene Dukaina, Anna Komnene, Bertha-Eirene of Sulzbach, the first wife of Manuel I, and, of course, the sebastokratorissa Eirene, Manuel’s sister-in-law. Patronage in mid-twelfth century did not only flourish in Constantinople but also in Southern Italy at the Norman court of Palermo where Byzantium was seen as the leading cultural prototype: the production of several poems and, primarily, the creation of the famous Scylitzes Matritensis testify to this assumption. In the late twelfth century learned circles are also to be found in rural Byzantium: Michael Choniates archbishop of Athens and later, after the Fourth Crusade, in exile on the island of Keos, seems to have organized gatherings with his students and friends similar to those described by the aforementioned Tzetzes.

Eirene, the sebastokratorissa, holding this title because of her husband Andronikos, the sebastokrator, emperor Manuel’s brother, who died in 1142, is perhaps the most renowned patroness of the Byzantine millennium. Although hardly anything is known about her background, one can conclude that she most likely stems from a Norman family. During Manuel’s reign she fell into disgrace; the reasons for that are unclear. Before she died (probably in 1152 or 1153) she is supposed to have operated a learned circle, a theatron, as one reads in secondary literature. It is also communis opinio that the mid-twelfth century literary elite participated in this learned circle: Theodore
Prodromos, the anonymous “Manganeios” Prodromos, John Tzetzes, Constantine Manasses and perhaps also her spiritual father, Jacob the Monk. In parenthesis it may be stated that Anna Komnene, the famous author of the *Alexias*, was in semi-disgrace at the end of her days too before she died at about the same time (1153/54) as Eirene. However, this might not have hindered her to have a learned circle as well, apparently one dedicated to philosophy, although distinct evidence is lacking here as well.

The questions to be treated in this paper are as follows: were the mentioned famous authors, who all worked on commission for the sebastokratorissa, indeed members of her circle? And if yes, was there a circulation of literature among them and an oral performance of their writings? Or was there hardly any contact between them? These questions, of course, cannot be answered satisfyingly or concisely. However, some tiny pieces of preserved written evidence will be presented in order to shed some light on mid-twelfth century literary production and its performance.

The anonymous Manganeios Prodromos, whose name was perhaps Aspidopolos, as recently argued by Elizabeth Jeffreys (Jeffreys 2014, 181), addressed no less than forty-eight poems to the sebastokratorissa Eirene. Around the year 1150 he claims he had been in her service for twelve years. In three (perhaps four) of his poems, supposedly dated in the middle or at the end of the 1140ies, the titles tell us that the verses were read in the chapel of the sebastokratorissa’s house (Magdalino 1993, nos. 72–74, [103]), further five (still unedited) poems (nos. 67–71) were delivered in the church of the holy Theotokos of *ta tou Kyrou*, as the titles indicate. If the titles are not a romantic note added by the thirteenth-century scribe of the cod. Marc. gr. XI 22, in which the poems are preserved, one has to question: who read the verses, and who was present at this reading performance encompassing sender and receiver (Marciniak 2007)? All of these poems are quite long, consisting of at least 60 verses; one (no. 67) is even 280 verses long. The context of these poems is also striking: the title of poem no. 72 states that the verses were read “when the feast of the holy Theotokos the Hodegetria was also being celebrated in the same church [i.e. in the church in the sebastokratorissa’s house].” The verses were rather read before than after liturgy and *akolouthia* respectively. The practice of performing texts in churches is also attested elsewhere: the title of an encomium of Psellos for a certain monk John Kroustalas tells us that the oration (covering 460 lines in the Teubner edition) was read in the church Hagia Soros (Littlewood 1985, or. 37). The prime receiver of the Manganeios poems, of which many deal with her miserable condition after her husband’s death and her apparent difficulties at court, is of course the sebastokratorissa. The audience, addressed as παρόντες in poem no. 68, may have consisted of her entourage, to which belonged her secretaries (grammatikoi) who are mentioned in Tzetzes’ epistles. There is some speculation if even Manganeios Prodromos himself was one of these *grammatikoi* (Jeffreys 2014, 181). Were Manasses, Theodore Prodromos, Tzetzes and the sebastokratorissa’s spiritual father Jacob also present? And if yes, did they pick up words, phrases and whole passages and reuse them in their own work? Nicholas Kataphloron, rhetorician in the second half of the twelfth century, criticized his fellow rhetoricians for snatching the work of others (Kataphloron referred to ancient authors) and presenting them (in *theatra*) as their own (Lukake 2001, 154; cf. Grünbart 2015, 187). As to the mid-twelfth century this is especially true for Jacob the Monk whose letters to the sebastokratorissa are a huge compilation of mainly patristic passages (Jeffreys 2009).

The re-use of passages within the mid-twelfth-century author’s elite is also clearly documented in the œuvre of Manganeios himself: his prototype is Theodore Prodromos who was mainly active as court poet during the reign of John II while Manganeios was Manuel II’s favorite author. (I will not
deal here with the question why Theodore Prodromos did not really find access to Manuel’s inner circle). Manganeios’ *imitatio* is clearly seen in the wedding poem for Theodora, the sebastokratorissa’s daughter, and Henry II Jasomirgott, duke of Bavaria and margrave of Austria (Neumann 1888, Heilig 1944, cf. Rhoby 2009) which is based on Theodore Prodromos’ verses for the wedding of one of John II’s daughters (Hörandner 1974, no. 13). Both the proem and many other passages of Manganeios’ poem testify to the adapted re-use. While Manganeios’ poem is to be dated to 1148/49, Theodore Prodromos’ verses were created before 1142 (Hörandner 1974, 267). How did Prodromos’ poem reach Manganeios? 1) Manganeios was present at the recitation of Prodromos’ verses and memorized the crucial passages. 2) Prodromos’ verses were also read and discussed at the sebastokratorissa’s circle. 3) As was recently shown (Zagklas 2014), Prodromos apparently reused some of his poetry for didactic purposes: this might also have been a way Prodromos’s poem reached Manganeios.

Manganeios, however, is not a mere imitator of Prodromos, on the contrary: he was capable of creating his own style: his enormous poetical output is full of beautiful (often newly coined) *epitheta ornantia*, which served as a stylistic device in his poetry. As our lexicographical tools tell us, a considerable amount of them (ἐρυθαυγής, ἐρυθρόβαπτος, καλλιβότρυς, καταμάργωρας, λαμπρόστολος, πορφυρόρης, πορφυρόφυτος etc.) are only attested in Manganeios and in Constantine Manasses, primarily in his verse chronicle, created slightly after 1150 and dedicated to the sebastokratorissa Eirene. There is certainly the possibility that these words were generally used in high-style rhetoric but the fact that they are only attested in the works of the aforementioned two authors rather points to a direct connection between them. The questions posed before come up here again: did Manasses pick up these words when some of Manganeios’ poems were recited in the sebastokratorissa’s circle? Were Manganeios’ poems already in circulation and accessible to a broader public through poetry books when Manasses wrote his chronicle, as Nikolaos Zagklas argues in his contribution for the “Poetic Circles and Anthologies in Byzantium” round table at this very Congress.

Tzetzes too left his traces in Manasses’ work. (It was most likely not the other way around because Tzetzes’ work in question, the *Theogonia*, was most likely composed before 1147 while Manasses’ work is to be dated later). The prologue addresses to the sebastokratorissa Eirene in Manasses’ chronicle and astrological poem are very much alike: did Manasses pick them up when he heard them in the sebastokratorissa’s circle? Tzetzes’ poem in question, the *Theogonia*, a didactic account about the descent of the gods and present at the Trojan war (Bekker 1842, Matranga 1850, cf. Rhoby 2010), was most likely indeed not presented in public, as is the case with wedding poems or the like, but within a smaller circle with the patron and addressee, the sebastokratorissa, in the center.

Tzetzes was perhaps even someone with ἐὐγλωττία (“beautiful and cultivated voice”) (Grünbart 2011) which made his lectures and presentations very vivid and thrilling for the audience, both in public and in inner circles. Tzetzes calls himself ἐγγλωττογάστρω (“someone subsisting on his eloquence”) which might indeed be true despite his very well-known propensity to exaggerate.

If a performance of a text before an audience was vivid and thrilling and animated listeners to behave as told by Manuel II’s letter cited at the beginning, depended also on the nature of the text, then it can be assumed that the nice stories told by Manasses in his chronicle were as enjoyable as e.g. Prodromos’ *Amarantos* dialogue (Migliorini 2007).

Back to the central issue of this contribution, namely the circulation of literature in the circle of the sebastokratorissa Eirene, a few statements can be made: the sebastokratorissa Eirene was the most prominent sponsor of literature and art of her time. The mentioned authors depended
very much on her commissions, although all of them, of course, also had other patrons. Although no clear evidence exists, we can be very sure that Eirene operated a learned circle which met at her house, either in the church or in a salon. However, no sources testify to the participation of the mentioned authors, primarily not to their presence at the same time although this assumption would be very tempting. Literature, primarily poetry, produced for Eirene was circulating. How it circulated, cannot be answered precisely: it would a very romantic to imagine that the mentioned authors exchanged their writings and commented on each other’s literary output. Although this practice existed in Byzantium it is hardly imaginably for Eirene’s theatron: there was certainly too much rivalry among these authors who always had to seek to get the best commissions and promotions. (Their complaints about too few orders are legendary).

Byzantium was very much a reading, listening, memorizing and recycling culture: these are the features which can be applied to the question of the circulation of literature. An audience, among them other authors, was listening to what was orally presented—either in public or inner circles—and was capable of memorizing it. In addition, collections of literature, poetry books or the like circulated in Byzantium to a large extent, and it is to assume that they were produced sometimes already even in the lifetime of the author. Having this in mind and applying it to the sebastokratorissa Eirene’s circle, we can conclude that despite the fact that the authors around her were only in loose contact there were other possibilities how their literary output reached one another.

This paper, which offers more questions than answers, closes with a statement by Margaret Mullett: “Rather than rely on the flimsy evidence for theatre and clumsy groupings together of protégés, we should perhaps turn to the writers themselves and try to work out the links among them; only then can we see if they fall into any clear grouping” (Mullett 1984, 182). Nothing is left to be added, except for the appeal to apply close readings to all kinds of mid twelfth-century writings (including theological treatises, commentaries, schede etc.) in order to single out relationships between authors, texts and audiences.

Lukake 2001: M. Lukake, Τυμβωρύγιοι και σκυλευτές νεκρών. Οι απόψεις του Νικολάου Καταφλώρου για τη ρητορική και τους ρήτορες στην Κωνσταντινούπολη του 12ν αιώνα. Symmeikta 14, 143–166
Niceforo Gregora e la Theotokos.
Alcune osservazioni sull’In nativitatem et praesentionem Deiparae (BHG 1079)

Il presente contributo è dedicato ad alcuni fogli del Marcianus graecus Z 142 (coll. 474), nei quali si è potuta identificare la minuta di un testo di Niceforo Gregora.

Il codice di Venezia è una miscellanea fattizia proveniente dal fondo del cardinal Bessarione, finora ignorata dagli studiosi. Il suo blocco principale tramanda l’opera dello pseudo-Dionigi Aeropagita, secondo questa scansione: De coelesti hierarchia (ff. 1r-66v), De divinis nominibus (ff. 66v-165r), De mystica theologia (ff. 165v-170v), De ecclesiastica hierarchia (ff. 170v-228v) ed infine le Epistulae (ff. 228v-251r); si tratta di una edizione di lusso, dotata del commento marginale attribuito a Massimo Confessore, e che può essere ascritta alla prima metà del X secolo su basi paleografiche. Quando, in epoca moderna, si è proceduto alla rilegatura, al manoscritto originario sono state aggiunte altre unità; all’inizio si trovano due fogli che di certo fungevano come protezione, mentre alla fine si trova poco più di una decina di fogli, in cui si distinguono tre unità.

In questa sede ci occuperemo principalmente dei ff. 256-265, i quali contengono un’orazione di Niceforo Gregora, conosciuta con il titolo di In nativitatem et praesentionem Deiparae (BHG 1079). Il testimone è repertoriato nel catalogo di Elpidio Mioni, ma non ha ricevuto sinora la debita considerazione ed è sfuggito agli editori dell’opera. Di recente, il manoscritto veneziano è stato menzionato da Iliana Paraskevopoulou nell’ambito di una ricerca sull’opera omiletica di Niceforo Gregora. Ma dell’elemento testuale si parlerà tra breve.

Conviene qui dare conto delle caratteristiche paleografiche del blocco. Alla sua confezione hanno partecipato due copisti, che si sono suddivisi il lavoro in questo modo: il primo (da qui in poi A) trascrive i ff. 256r-259v, 262r, r. 24-265r, r. 25, mentre il secondo (indicato di seguito con B) è responsabile dei ff. 260r-262r, r. 23. Le loro grafie gravitano entrambe nell’alveo della minuscola τῶν Ὁδηγῶν, ma sono perfettamente distinguibili l’una dall’altra, se non altro per una certa tendenza alla formalità, peculiare della prima mano, che è invece del tutto assente nella seconda. Il primo copista esibisce una grafia minuta, dal ductus rapido e dall’asse lievemente inclinato a destra, ma assai calligrafica nell’impostazione. Come confronto si potrebbe addurre la mano di uno dei copisti del Vat. gr. 1095 (ff. 63r-v e 267r, l. 24-269v), che la Pérez Martín (I. Pérez Martín, El ’estilo Hodegos’ y su proyección en las escrituras constantinopolitanas, in «Segno e Testo», 6 (2008), pp. 390-458, tav. 8) identifica con la variante tardiva dell’anonimo G, il prolifico collaboratore di Niceforo Gregora. La seconda mano, invece, impiega una scrittura di modulo medio e dagli interlinei ampi, dal tratto sinuoso e poco disciplinato, più simile a quella del copista del Vat. gr. 1085, ff. 97r, 98r-118v, di cui si può vedere una riproduzione nell’articolo della Pérez Martín sopra citato (Pérez Martín, El ’estilo Hodegos’ cit., tav. 10).

Nei fogli del Marciano compare una terza mano, il cui intervento più corposo si colloca alla fine dell’opuscolo, a mo’ di correzione di un passo precedentemente vergato da A, alla quale
aggiunge poi altri due righi. Si tratta della grafia dello stesso Gregora. A riprova dell’identificazione intervengono la ricorrenza del gamma alto, dalla traversa ondulata, dello zeta minuscolo, che principia con un tratto concavo a destra, dell’eta minuscolo desinente con un piccolo ricciolo; tra le legature si segnalano quelle di epsilon minuscolo, dal tratto discendente pressoché verticale, con lambda, nonché quella di rho con omicron a squadra. Per queste poche righe, Gregora impiega il solito inchiostro nerastro che si riscontra anche in altri esempi della sua scrittura; la sua ricorrenza in altri punti del τετράδιον in oggetto indica come l’autore si sia anche preoccupato di emendare e implementare l’opuscolo con brevi aggiunte marginali.

La presenza della mano di Gregora nel codice di Venezia prova che l’allestimento di questo testimone dell’In nativitatem si deve al milieu stesso dell’erudito: l’analisi paleografica permette di constatare che l’attività di copia è stata portata a termine, come si è detto da un gruppo di copisti, e se ne possono, tra l’altro, distinguere più fasi, che si intersecano e si complicano tra loro. La prima corrisponde alla trascrizione del testo da parte dei due copisti, A e B; continuò sono gli interventi correttivi di entrambi, che si occupano di rivedere le sezioni di cui sono responsabili. Tra le modifiche più complesse basterà qui segnalare quella che si nota a f. 256r, in corrispondenza del titolo: vi compare, infatti, una breve striscia di carta incollata tra i rr. 1-2, sulla quale il copista A riscrive alcune parole del titolo. Un brandello della striscia è caduto e si possono distinguere alcune lettere della versione precedente (ἐν…ἐ βίον τῶν | γονέων [ἐ]κεί.νης καὶ Ἀννης), che lasciano intendere come il titolo fosse in origine dedicato ai genitori della Theotokos, sui quali, in effetti, si concentra la prima parte dell’orazione. Solo in seguito si colloca la lettura effettuata da parte di Gregora: quest’operazione di revisione del lavoro svolto dai due copisti ha di fatto contribuito all’evoluzione del testo stesso.

E in effetti, la lettura «con la penna in mano» di Gregora, permette di affrontare un’altra importante questione, vale a dire come e a che titolo il testimone marciano si collochi nella tradizione testuale dell’Oratio in nativitatem. L’opuscolo, che s’inserisce nel genere dei λόγοι retorici, è stato editato in due occasioni: la prima volta nel 1906, a opera di F. I. Schmitt (in «Isvestija Russkago Archeologiceskago Instituta v Konstantinopole», 11 [1906], pp. 280-294); quest’edizione, che si basava su due soli manoscritti, è stata sostituita da quella più recente di P. A. M. Leone (Nicephori Graegorae de sanctissimae Deiparae nativitatem praesentatione atque educatione oratio, in «Quaderni catanesi di cultura classica e medievale», III [1991], pp. 1-31). Come si diceva, il lavoro di Schmitt si basava su due soli codici, i numeri 1085 (ff. 98r-107v) e 1086 (ff. 179r-188r) del fondo dei Vaticani Graeci della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Nella sua edizione Schmitt metteva a testo la versione del Vat. gr. 1086, aggiungendo in nota le lezioni del 1085, considerato di minore valore. Una tale impostazione era suggerita dal fatto che nel primo dei due codici lo stesso Gregora era intervenuto ad apporre alcune integrazioni al testo. Il fatto è sottolineato anche nell’edizione di Pietro Leone, il quale, però, pone a confronto le due versioni, senza scegliere l’una o l’altra delle due, seguendo un che grande seguito ha avuto per l’edizione di testi moderni. Leone, infatti, ha individuato altri due codici dell’In nativitatem: al primo, conservato a Gerusalemme, non ha potuto avere accesso; della collazione del secondo, invece, l’odierno Wien, ÖNB, hist. gr. 104, ff. 1r-10v, si possono seguire i risultati nell’apparato critico. I tre testimoni, i due Vaticani e il codice di Vienna, presentano alcune differenze testuali che Leone riconduce alla volontà dell’autore stesso: secondo l’editore, alla base delle varianti vi sarebbero tre archetipi diversi (x, y, z), che si sono succeduti nel tempo e che hanno dato origine ai tre codici che ci sono pervenuti, nell’ordine, il Vat. gr. 1086, il Vindob. hist. gr. 104 e il Vat. gr. 1085.
L’analisi paleografica non contribuisce a semplificare la situazione. Tutti e tre i manoscritti risalgono al XIV secolo. Peraltro, come si è solo accennato, i due codici Vaticani recano tracce inequivocabili di una loro progettazione da parte di Gregora: si tratta anch’essi di libri dal contenuto variegato e trascritti a più mani, tutte, però, gravitanti nel *milieu* dell’erudito di Eraclea; per di più è proprio quest’ultimo a intervenire in determinate occasioni per vergare alcune righe o fogli. Se, come si è visto sopra, nel 1086 Gregora si premura di aggiungere una breve sezione all’orazione *In nativitatem*, la sua mano non compare nei fogli 98r-107v del Vat. gr. 1085, ma se ne possono trovare attestazioni in altri punti. Insomma questi due manoscritti si configurano come esempi dell’attività di quei sodalizi di scrittura, tanto frequenti nella temperie culturale d’età paleologa e che si fecero promotori dell’allestimento di un gran numero di libri, dal contenuto profano e non. Dal canto suo il *Vindobonensis* è opera di una mano sola, che però è anch’essa riconducibile all’ambiente di Gregora. In questo contesto s’ inserisce la testimonianza del Marc. gr. 142.

Da un punto di vista filologico, le varianti del codice di Venezia sono, di volta in volta, congruenti con quelle del Vat. gr. 1085 (nelle edizioni segnato B) e con il Wien, *hist. gr.* 104 (indicato con K da Leone). Si riportano qui solo alcune delle più significative. Ad esempio, tornando al titolo, Leone lo pubblica come segue: «τοῦ σωφότατου κυροῦ Νικηφόρου Γρηγωρᾶ» (Leone 1991, r. 1); sia il Marciano (da qui in poi M), sia K omettono l’apposizione κυροῦ. Nessuno degli altri manoscritti testimonia, invece, il lavoro critico sul titolo stesso. Le testimonianze più interessanti sono però quelle relative alle correzioni di prima mano di Gregora: ai rr. 190-191 dell’edizione di Leone si legge: «ἴσως εἰληφότων τοῦ πάθους τινά»; ebbene il codice di Vienna al posto di πάθους reca πένθους, così come M prima che Gregora decidesse di modificarlo. Allo stesso modo, a r. 216 dell’edizione, Leone ha preferito riportare a testo le due varianti: νῦν γὰρ καὶ e καὶ γὰρ: in apparato l’editore informa che la prima lezione è quella che si legge in B, mentre gli altri due codici, vale a dire K e il Vat. gr. 1086, hanno καὶ γὰρ; quest’ultima, nuovamente, è la sintassi di M prima della correzione dell’autore, che inserisce il νῦν e modifica l’ordine delle due particelle successive. Il passo più complesso e stratificato è, però, la conclusione del testo, anch’essa tramandata in due versioni distinte:
Nell’ultima colonna si riportano le parole del Marc. gr. 142, dove le parentesi in apice indicano le aggiunte e le correzioni attribuibili alla mano di Gregora stesso; in neretto sono invece le sezioni che divergono nei vari manoscritti. Alla luce dei dati raccolti sembra di poter affermare che la versione trascritta nel Vat. gr. 1086 è la più ricca, la più completa, e pertanto anche l’ultima in ordine di tempo. Ricostruire i rapporti stemmatici e cronologici tra gli altri tre testimoni appare più complesso. Rispetto al Marciano, il Vat. gr. 1085 è quello con maggiori congruenze, mentre il codice di Vienna sembra derivare da un altro manoscritto, in cui l’attività di revisione di Gregora che si riscontra nel Marc. gr. 142 non era ancora giunta a compimento, ma al contempo anticipa alcune delle soluzioni preferite nella copia di A. La collazione con un altro codice risalente al XIV secolo, oggi conservato a Gerusalemme, nella Biblioteca del Patriarcato, Mone Abraham, 51 (olim Anastaseos 12) potrebbe forse gettare qualche nuova luce sulla genesi del testo; anch’esso, infatti, è stato trascritto da uno dei collaboratori di Gregora, di recente identificato da Daniele Bianconi con il Cratero responsabile del Laur. Plut. 74.10 (D. Bianconi, «Duplici scribendi forma». Commentare Bernard de Montfaucon, in «Medioevo e Rinascimento», n. s. XXIII [2012], pp. 299-318).
In ogni modo, il testimone di Venezia sembra collocarsi tra i primi esperimenti di composizione dell’opuscolo da parte dell’erudito, trascritto, riletto e rivisto in più momenti. Non solo l’analisi filologica, ma anche la mise en texte di questo τετράδιον rendono assai probabile che si trattasse di una copia di lavoro, destinata a ulteriore rielaborazione.

È opportuno, a questo punto, dare qualche ragguaglio sulle caratteristiche materiali dell’unità in oggetto. Si tratta di un unico fascicolo fattizio, risultato dell’accorpamento di bifogli o fogli sciolti: le due carte esterne (ff. 256, 265) sono rese solidali da una brachetta esterna, la quale percorre il foglio in tutta la sua altezza; il f. 257 è incollato a un tallone, corrispondente a f. 264, sul cui verso è stata a sua volta incollata un’altra carta; il f. 258 è accorpato al f. 263 da un rinforzo alla piega, così il f. 259 è provvisto di un talloncino incollato al f. 260, a sua volta solidale a f. 261; i ff. 262-263 costituiscono un ulteriore bifoglio. La cucitura si trova al centro del bifoglio 262|263. Attualmente il f. 258 risulta pressoché staccato dal corpo del manoscritto, mentre volante è il gruppo costituito dai ff. 259 + 260|261: a giudicare dal tipo di interventi, questa scansione, con gli inserti cartacei che legavano il corpo del fascicolo, devono essere originari. Tornando al f. 264, come si diceva, era in origine composto di due carte; il foglio aggiunto serviva a coprire una porzione di testo che evidentemente doveva essere corretta. La colla posta sul margine inferiore del foglio ha perso il suo potere adesivo, cosicché è ancora possibile leggere alcune righe sui due lati nascosti. Mentre quanto si legge dell’originario f. 264v è perfettamente identico alla nuova versione, il retro della carta instititia è frutto di un riuso: si tratta, infatti, di un altro frammento dell’orazione In nativitatem, corrispondente a Leone 1991, rr. 379-381.

La trascrizione dei fogli del Marciano, dunque, si presenta agli occhi dello studioso come un fenomeno complesso, non un mero fattore meccanico, ma un’operazione in cui le dinamiche materiali della scrittura si sono intersecate con l’atto mentale della creazione; il dialogo e il confronto dell’autore con il suo opuscolo, che si è esplicato tanto nell’appropriazione degli strumenti grafici, quanto nella supervisione del lavoro dei copisti che hanno partecipato alla copia, ha portato a una serie di ambiguità. In questo modo la fase redazionale si è ramificata e dilatata, fornendo quelle varianti che hanno creato e creano problemi agli editori.
Positionnement social dans le discours de Démétrios Chomatenos

La méthode traditionnelle de la recherche historique aussi que l’art habituel de la construction des récits historiographiques, conçus surtout en dix-neuvième siècle, laissent les historiens de Byzance qui voudraient s’occuper de la première moitié du treizième siècle d’un côté infiniment triste malgré leur objectivité et d’autre côté largement confus et perdus quant à leur approche aux sources. Notamment, on est habitué de placer les événements décrits dans les sources historiographiques de l’époque, principalement concernées par Constantinople, sur un axe temporel, en les comparant avec d’autres témoignages, voire les évidences plus dures provenant de la culture matérielle. Dans ce type de construction narrative, la chute de Constantinople dans les mains des croisés en 1204 ne peut être interprétée que comme une fin du monde tragique, pendant que tous les efforts soucieux et politique ultérieurs sont vus comme dirigés vers la reconstitution ou la reprise de l’ancienne ville impériale. Ce point de vue est dérivé surtout des récits de deux historiens : Niketas Choniates, qui a décrit que trois ans après la conquête de Constantinople et Georgios Akropolitès, qui a écrit son Histoire bien après la reprise de la ville. Le métarécit de la continuité absolue de l’État byzantin trouvé derrière la plupart des études modernes nous dirige vers la conclusion généralisatrice que le rôle unique de l’État de Nicée a été de conserver l’essence de l’Empire byzantin pendant son exile de Constantinople, alors que tous les autres États romains de l’époque, à savoir ceux d’Épire et de Trébizonde, ont échoué dans la réalisation de cette entreprise providentielle. Cette image peinte par Acropolitès et reprise par les byzantinistes, en mal d’autres histoires narratives grecques, ne rend pas justice à l’individualité et l’autonomie des expériences sociopolitiques de toutes les entités concernées.

Par ailleurs, les simplifications pareilles s’extravasent dans les recherches sur l’idéologie de Nicée et d’Épire. Les compositions rhétoriques nicéennes et le corpus épistolaire épirote qui contient la correspondance des principaux acteurs politiques et religieux nous présentent avec une riche base de données sur le sujet. Néanmoins, les études sur l’idéologie sont problématiques dans plusieurs aspects. D’abord, les représentations et les unités idéologiques sont souvent seulement ramassées à travers des sources différentes et cataloguées. Même quand une certaine causalité est reconnue entre les processus sociaux et l’idéologie, elle semble détachée de la réalité politique. Elle est traitée comme une fiction bien développée et consensuelle. Finalement, dans les études comparatives du treizième siècle le catalogue idéologique de Nicée avec la date limite de 1261 et celui de l’État d’Épire, officiellement aboli en 1230, sont mis en contraste sans beaucoup d’égard aux changements et contextes différents.

Un des idéologues principaux de l’État de Nicée a été l’archevêque de toute la Bulgarie siégeant dans la ville d’Ohrid, Démétrios Chomatenos. Grâce à son rôle extrêmement important du dirigeant religieux de l’église épirote, aussi que celui de l’allié politique de Théodore Comnène Doukas, il est considéré comme une figure quasi patriarcale. Or, son influence est principalement déduite d’une dizaine de lettres échangées avec Théodore Comnène, d’autres évêques et le patriarche de

D’abord, on doit poser la question du type des documents recueillis dans la collection de Chomatenos, de même que de la place de ce texte dans l’enquête sur la littérature byzantine. Il ne s’agit pas d’une collection pure et propre des décisions juridiques. Prinzing a reconnu entre 19 et 33 lettres selon différents critères formels. Pourtant, presque tous les 150 documents sauvés, dont ceux intitulés *synodike graphe*, *apokrisis*, *diagnosis*, *semioma/semiosis*, *praxis*, *apologia*, remplissent la plupart de six critères de Michael Trapp pour considérer un document comme une lettre, à savoir la présence de deux parties physiquement séparées qui communiquent par un message relativement court, adressé et écrit sur un support tangible. L’organisation et la distribution des documents dans les DCPD, ou leur absence présumée, rappellent plutôt à la méthode appliquée dans les collections de lettres inscrites dans le cadre plus vaste des *syllogai* byzantines. Mais, est-ce qu’on peut traiter cette collection des documents évidemment techniques comme un ouvrage littéraire ? Peut-on dire que la personne qui l’a écrite est un Auteur ? Et peut-on s’interroger sur la question de son public et ses lecteurs ? Même si je ne nie pas l’existence de lecture pour plaisir à Byzance, comme une notion principale de la littérature moderne, c’est bien clair que les conceptions byzantines de la littérature ne correspondent pas aux celles de notre époque. Les limites entre les textes littéraires et techniques ou appliqués sont beaucoup plus vagues dans la culture byzantine, les lettres et les collections de lettres étant le meilleur exemple. Alors, il n’y a pas de raison d’éviter l’usage d’utiles empruntés de la narratologie ou théorie littéraire qui pourraient approfondir et clarifier notre compréhension de ces textes et de la société qui les a produits. Par ailleurs, les écrits de Chomatenos s’inscrivent clairement dans le cadre du discours à la fois juridique, épistolaire, administratif et politique. L’analyse du discours prend en considération la production littéraire, mais aussi les énoncés dispersées dans d’autres types de la production discursive d’une société.

La ressource méthodologique qui, je crois, pourrait mettre en lumière le personnage de Démétrios Chomatenos comme auteur et acteur social est la théorie de *positionnement social*. Développée dans les années 1980 par les psychologues Rom Harré et Bronwyn Davies et le sociologue Luk Van Langenhove, la théorie de positionnement est fondée sur l’idée du constructivisme social et représente l’évolution plus dynamique et recherchée de la théorie des rôles. Selon Harré, les droits, les obligations et les responsabilités contestables et regroupées à court terme sont appelés « position ». Le positionnement est la manière dans laquelle nous assignons ces droits et obligations aux autres et les demandons pour nous-mêmes dans le cadre des interactions sociales par les énoncées de nos discours. Cette interaction est dynamique et dépendante des règles linguistique et discursive, aussi que du contexte spatio-temporel. Autopositionnement ou le positionnement des autres (les interlocuteurs de la personne qui positionne ou les tiers) peut être intentionnel ou forcé. Le positionnement n’est pas fixe ; il peut être contesté et alterné dans l’échange discursif,
La conversation est délimitée par la position de locuteurs, l'histoire en sens narratologique et les actes de langage relativement déterminés. Cette théorie peut aisément être mariée à l'idée foucaldienne de l'énoncée, parce que le positionnement est juste une énoncée de l'ordre quotidien.

Le positionnement est caractéristique pour tous les documents dans la collection de Chomatenos. Dans chaque document il positionne lui-même. Dans les lettres administratives et diplomatiques, il positionne ses correspondants, alors que dans les réponses il change les positionnements attribués à lui par les autres. Et dans les documents légaux, il pratique la « forme plus dramatique du positionnement forcé des autres », analogue à celle des procès juridiques d'aujourd'hui, sauf que sa propre position reste plus visible et moins cachée par l'institution qu'il représente. Le sondage de ces positionnements pourrait nous aider à comprendre les relations de pouvoir dans l'État d'Épire, aussi que l'idéologie immanente à ses acteurs sociaux et politiques.

Dans les *Ponemata diafora*, on trouve trois lettres adressées à Théodore Comnène en 1224 et 1225, après son intérressement comme l'empereur romain à Thessalonique. « Je te vois comme l'épée du Dieu, très puissant Comnène, dirigé par Dieu. » C'est par ces mots directs que Chomatenos commence la première lettre à Théodore (DCPD 11). Même si la lettre est écrite comme réponse à une question spécifique dans le domaine de consanguinité, l'auteur a consacré environ une moitié à l'éloge de Théodore, tout en le positionnant comme un guerrier brave et juste. Il lui associe la qualité juvénile et rénovatrice. Avant de venir au sujet propre de la lettre, il écrit : « Ta souveraineté divine a voulu savoir mon opinion... ». La deuxième lettre à Théodore (DCPD 26) est une confirmation d'une opinion antérieure de Chomatenos sur la question d'héritage, contre laquelle l'évêque de Berroias a levé sa voix. Théodore est positionné comme l'empereur saint du saint empire, l'évêque de Berroias comme barbare et Chomatenos comme le gardien des lois romaines et de la sagesse grecque. L'auteur souligne de nouveau que son opinion fut demandée par l'empereur. La dernière lettre (DCPD 110) est une consolation et indulgence pour l'empereur inquiet à cause de la peine de mort infligée à un pirate. Le positionnement guerrier de l'empereur est répété, aussi que sa position de suppliant devant Chomatenos. L'archevêque se positionne ouvertement et tacitement comme ayant le droit, et même l'obligation, de prendre la position de philosophe, juge et confesseur. Selon lui, l'empereur a sa place de protecteur du bien supérieur et il ne devrait pas appropier la logique apostolique, monastique, philosophique ou civile. C'est le fil rouge de cette conversation dont on voit qu'un seul côté : l'empereur ouvre l'accès au discours à Chomatenos, en permettant ainsi à l'archevêque de les positionner les deux.

Le positionnement de Chomatenos est assez clair dans les lettres destinées à Stefan Nemanjić, grand zupan et roi de Serbie, comme réponses aux questions sur les mariages interdits. La première lettre vient comme contestation d'un jugement de Chomatenos sur les degrés de consanguinité entre Stefan et une fille de Michel I d'Épire (DCPD 10). La tonne de la lettre est fortement condescendante. Même si l'auteur utilise le titre de Stefan dans l'adresse, il insiste sur leur position de *père et enfant*, dans le sens spirituel et intellectuel. Dans la seconde (DCPD 13) il garde cette relation, mais avec plus de respect semblable à celui qu'il montrera à Théodore Comnène. Il reconnaît son titre de roi de Serbie et l'adresse avec la formule *basileia sou*. À part le changement politique, on peut supposer que la première lettre, écrite en premier an d'archevêché de Chomatenos, a servi pour établir son influence ferme au niveau spirituel en Serbie. Quand Stefan accepte la position de Chomatenos et s'adresse à lui avec une autre question, la relation est déjà claire. Il est peu probable que « l'indépendance »
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de l’État serbe est en question ici. Certes, Épire en aurait pu avoir d’avantages politiques, mais il s’agit plutôt des relations entre deux figures puissantes, comme dans le cas de les *erotapokriseis* que Chomatenos aura adressées au fils de Stefan Nemanjić, Stefan Radoslav, une décennie plus tard.

L’épître envoyée par Chomatenos à Sava, le frère de Stefan Nemanjić et le premier archevêque serbe (DCPD 86), représente une curiosité. Chomatenos conteste la chirotonie de Sava résidant en Nicée. C’est un des rares exemples dans la collection, qui n’est pas écrit comme réponse, mais sur l’initiative de Chomatenos. C’est aussi un essai de repositionnement. Il réprimande Sava pour avoir sorti de sa position de moine et pris les droits et les obligations de l’archevêché d’Ohrid. Si Sava voulait changer sa position, il a fallu qu’il vint chez Chomatenos, qui avait le droit de le faire. Il envoie la lettre par Jean, l’évêque de Skopia, qu’il positionne comme son interprète et représentant du pouvoir légitime.

Les lettres échangées entre Chomatenos et patriarche Germain II de Constantinople sont probablement les documents les plus étudiés de la collection. Alors, je veux juste les adresser brièvement, comme l’indice du dynamisme de la mécanique de positionnement. Dans la première de ces lettres qui est la réponse au premier rapproche de Germain suivant le couronnement de Théodore Comnène (DCPD 112), Chomatenos est toujours prêt d’admettre la position de patriarche à Germain et de négocier les droits propres à sa position de l’archevêché de Bulgarie. Après que Germain a refusé de nouveau ces propos, Chomatenos ne l’adresse plus comme patriarche et insiste sur la légitimité de sa propre position, aussi que de celle de Théodore Comnène, à la fois dans la lettre écrite en 1227 (DCPD 114) et dans l’apologie écrite en 1233 (DCPD 1150), bien après la défaite de Théodore. Cela montre que l’image de Chomatenos comme le défenseur intransigeant de la dynastie épirote, pendant toute la durée de leur État, est loin d’être précise et correcte.

Finalement, il faut examiner comment le positionnement fonctionne dans les opinions et décisions juridiques qui ne concernent pas directement les dirigeants de l’État ou l’église, ce qui est la majorité des documents dans le corpus. Chomatenos montre son autorité complète, en écrivant sa pleine titulature d’archevêque que dans environ 20% de documents. Dans la plupart de documents, il réfère à soi même par *je/nous* ou par *ma/notre modération ou humilité* (*metriotès*), sans ou avec la mention de synode. Son autorité ne se suit pas dans l’emphasis de sa propre position, mais dans le pouvoir de positionner les autres. « …aucun droit de propriété ne lie pas Kalè aux biens de Geórgitzès. » (DCPD 40) « … cela n’est pas l’enfant légitime de Tzimpinos… » (DCPD 39) « Andronic et Irène sont les cousins germains, pour lesquels la loi considère qu’ils se trouvent dans le 4° degré de consanguinité. » (DCPD 11) Il faut noter que tous ces positionnements viennent sur demande, comme positionnements de second degré. Le plaideur est celui qui se place aux mains de Chomatenos ou le juge, souvent l’évêque, local. Il les positionne comme capables et autorisés de juger. Comme l’empereur, il ouvre l’accès au discours à Chomatenos, qui en retour donne la voix aux plaideurs, en citant souvent leur discours dans ses documents. C’est une relation de pouvoir non pas hiérarchique, mais réciproque. Les acteurs discursifs s’entre-légitiment. Cependant, ils ne sont pas les seuls acteurs concernés et positionnés.

Irène, la femme de Jean, courtisant de Basile à Kastron, a quitté son mari sans explication et passé six mois à Prilapos. Deux habitants de Prilapos, pieux et saints *ierologos* Romain et notaire Théodore, ont témoigné ce fait en écrit. Quand Jean a trouvé sa femme dans le village de Bodanes, elle a sauté dans la rivière pour fuir. Elle a été sauvée par le chef du village Grégoire Gabras, mais
comme elle ne voulait pas aller devant la cour, Jean a réussi de la divorcer avec l’aide des témoins, le pieu archonte de l'église Adrian Autérianos, le primicerius des lecteurs Michel Sbérilbos et pieu ecclésiastique Léon. Les Ponemata diafora abondent des exemples pareils. Alors, à côté du positionnement du plaideur et du juge, on voit la création d'un réseau de personnes marquées comme fiables dans les communautés locales, à la position de témoins et archontes.

Même si les écrits de Chomatenos sont souvent unilatéraux, ils nous aident à comprendre le mécanisme de production du discours, aussi que de l'accès au discours. Ils clarifient aussi la relation entre la société et le discours. On peut être sûr que le premier « public » de ces récits a été composé de mêmes personnes qui avaient participé dans leur création et qui avaient été positionnées par eux. La collection ultérieure de ces documents dans une œuvre intégrale pourrait avoir pour but la transmission de ce modèle du niveau personnel au niveau institutionnel. Certes, son importance comme l'ensemble de jurisprudence est incontestable. Mais, même après la disparaissons de toutes personnes mentionnées, le paradigme reste visible. Le paradigme selon lequel l’archevêque se trouve dans une position importante d’intermédiaire dans la négociation discursive du pouvoir. Les habitants d’Ohrid ou des provinces, l’empereur ou les personnages notables des pays voisins ont tous tourné vers lui, ont été introduits dans le discours et positionnés dans la société par lui. Son œuvre nous montre une société hétéarchique dans laquelle l'importance de la parole écrite avait une importance beaucoup plus vaste de celle qu'on est d'habitude prêts de lui accorder.
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Introduction: The Crucial Eastern Step of Byzantine Logic

There is general agreement among scholars that the Aristotelian logic used in Byzantium from the ninth century onwards was deeply influenced and determined by the exegetical work of the masters of the Neoplatonic school of Alexandria. Nevertheless, the exact circumstances of this transmission of ideas and books – a vast example of *translatio studiorum* – are still uncertain. The fundamental question remains: by which channels did Alexandrian scholarship reach Constantinople?

Two explanations, one direct and one indirect, have been proposed to account for this transmission. Both have been challenged by recent studies.

The direct explanation relies heavily on the appointment of Stephanus of Alexandria by Heraclius to a chair of philosophy in Constantinople. Stephanus would have brought with him manuscripts – some of which would become the archetypes for the manuscripts of the so-called *Philosophical Collection* (See M. Rashed, “Nicolas d’Otrante, Guillaume de Moerbeke et la ‘Collection philosophique’”, *Studi Medievali* 43 [2002], pp. 693-717) – and given lectures in Constantinople (it has been suggested that Maximus the Confessor attended these lectures). Mossman Rouéché has recently questioned, with good arguments, whether the appointment of Stephanus actually took place (see “Stephanus the Philosopher and Ps. Elias: a case of mistaken identity”, BMGS 36 [2012]). Nevertheless, there is still evidence that suggests the presence of a foreign philosopher in Constantinople in the seventh century. To begin with, in Ananias of Shirak’s account of his period of study in Trebizond in the 620s with the famous philosopher Tychikos, Ananias explains that Tychikos in turn had, at an earlier period, studied in Constantinople with “a scholar from Athens”, who could be Stephanus. Then there is Theodore of Tarsus, future Archbishop of Canterbury and allegedly trained in Constantinople, who boasts a surprising knowledge of Alexandrian philosophical exegesis, which is difficult to explain without intensive contact with an Alexandrian master. Finally, we still need an explanation for the Alexandrian provenance of the models of – at least some of – the manuscripts of the philosophical collection. Could pseudo-Elias have played a role in this process?

The indirect explanation is related to the region comprising Sinai, Palestine and Syria. Logic was frequently used among Christian thinkers. This use became more intense among theologians debating Christology in the aftermath of Chalcedon from the middle of the sixth century onwards. A group of thinkers particularly invested in logic, and whose activity ranged from compiling collections of definitions to composing proper logical treatises, includes Theodore of Raithu and Anastasius Sinaiticus, both of Sinai, John of Damascus in Syria and Theodore Abu Qurrah in Palestine. Leontius of Byzantium had strong links to Palestine and Jerusalem. If we accept, instead of the Greek life *Vita Maximi* (BHG 1234), the narrative proposed by the seventh-century Syriac life of Maximus (ed. by S. Brock, “An early Syriac Life of Maximus the Confessor”, *Analecta Bollandiana* 91 [1973], 299-346) written by George of Resh‘aina, even the famous Confessor is to be situated within this geographical and cultural milieu, which would associate him not with the monastery...
of Chrysopolis opposite Constantinople but rather with the monastery of Chariton in Palestine. According to Cyril Mango, “the chain of dialectical compendia extending from the 6th century to the early 9th turns out to be exclusively Oriental in origin, consisting as it does of Theodore of Raithu, Maximus Confessor, the Doctrina Patrum, Anastasius Sinaita, John of Damascus and Theodore Abû Qurra, bishop of Harran” (“Greek Culture in Palestine after the Arab Conquest”, in G. Cavallo, G. de Gregorio, M. Maniaci [eds] Scritture, Libri e Testi nelle Aree Provinciali di Bisanzio, Spoleto, 1991, [149-160], p. 158-9). This puts the particular case of the study of logical in perfect conformity with the broader observation of Guglielmo Cavallo about “the recognizable asymmetry in the eastern Byzantine world, between Constantinople and the outlying provinces during the period between the sixth century and the late eighth in the domain of literary culture, authors and texts. That is to say, in Constantinople itself we can see the slow triumph of agroikia (‘rusticity’), whereas in the outlying provinces the evidence points to cultural continuity. […] even after they had been lost to the (Roman/Byzantine) empire; […] it is in these centres and provinces where certain roots of the ninth century Byzantine renascence must be sought’ (“Theodore of Tarsus and the Greek culture of his time”, p. 55 and 57).

In the case of John of Damascus and Abu Qurrah, their writings would have been received in Constantinople during the ninth century. A copy of the latter’s logical treatise, a text against the Jacobites, was personally owned and annotated by Arethas of Caesarea. As these authors used Alexandrian material, they could indeed have served as vehicles of transmission. This highlights the need to improve our understanding of the place of logic and logical teaching in monastic culture, as well as the specific role of the Syro-palestinian cultural space and the Melkite Church in the transmission of logical learning. Finally, it raises the question of the possible influence of Syriac logical scholarship on Greek-speaking religious communities.

The round table has as its objective the discussion of the transmission of the Alexandrian tradition of Aristotelian logic. It will tackle the issue both by considering the available historical data and by discussing precise examples of contact or influence, in particular by showing doctrinal proximities between texts in the form of explicit quotations or conceptual borrowings.

The round table will start with considerations by M. Roueché about the transfer of manuscripts from Alexandria to Constantinople and the modalities of a possible direct transmission. We will then move to some aspects of the indirect tradition of logic, by considering two case studies related to Porphyry's Introduction to Aristotelian logic, one involving an author and another a concept: the author is Pamphilus, who composed a theological handbook and probably lived in the second half of the sixth century (D. Krausmüller); and the concept is the philosophical term “difference” which came to be central for christology (S. Mateiescu). This section will be completed by a discussion of another indirect tradition of Aristotelian logic, the introductions to rhetoric (B. MacDougall). Then, the last part of the round table will be dedicated to the reception of such material in ninth-century Byzantium by Theodore the Stoudite (T. Tollefsen) and in Photius and Arethas (K. Ierodiakonou). The Byzantine reception of the Alexandrian conception of substance as a self-subsisting entity will be discussed (G. Karamanolis). The last contribution will discuss, on the basis of a study of logical manuscripts, the knowledge of logic in Syriac during the ninth century.

[This round table is organised in the framework of and supported by the ERC project “Reassessing Ninth Century Philosophy. A Synchronic Approach to the Logical Traditions (9 SALT)”, based at the Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies at the University of Vienna]
Greek Philosophical Manuscripts in the Ninth-Century Byzantium

How the philosophical legacy of 7th century Alexandria made the journey to 9th century Constantinople remains an unsettled question. This is despite the fact that the journey taken by the same philosophical legacy “from Alexandria to Baghdad” in the Greek-to-Arabic translation movement has long been the object of considerable attention from students of the history of Islamic philosophy and medicine. It seems certain that there was a cessation of formal philosophical teaching in Alexandria during the 7th century as a consequence of the successive conquests of the city in 621 by the Persians and in 642 by the Arabs. And it is also evident that there was a renewal of interest in the works of Plato and Aristotle beginning in 9th century Constantinople. Finally, we can see from the extant palaeographic evidence, that is, manuscripts dateable to the 9th century, that there was at that time a reawakened interest in the collection, preservation and transmission of philosophical and mathematical manuscripts, utilising the newly developed minuscule script. Clearly, the philosophical legacy of 7th century Alexandria was delivered to 9th century Constantinople through the medium of Greek of manuscripts containing the philosophical texts and commentaries of that legacy.

This paper addresses the question, therefore, how did these manuscripts find their way to 9th century Constantinople where they became the exemplars of the copies that were studied by the Constantinopolitan philosophers? Three possible answers, not necessarily mutually exclusive, suggest themselves:

(i) During the century prior to the conquest of Alexandria, the manuscripts were brought piecemeal from Alexandria to Constantinople, e.g., by students returning home from their studies.

(ii) At the time of the conquest of Alexandria, a select group of manuscripts was removed from the philosophical school and taken en bloc to Constantinople where it became part of a richly stocked library or private collection.

(iii) In the 9th century the manuscripts were collected piecemeal from locations inside and outside Constantinople to satisfy the growing demands of the Constantinopolitan philosophers.

The first of these possibilities is nothing more than what might have been expected. As the largest city at that time, Constantinople would have had numerous educational structures, from private tutorials to well-organised schools, some of which will have taught philosophy in the Alexandrian manner. Their teachers will have been former students in Alexandria and their texts will have been the manuscripts that they and their fellow students acquired during the course of their studies in Alexandria.

The second possibility seems to contain echoes of a romantic narrative in which the flower of Late Antique Neoplatonism is snatched from the jaws of the advancing invaders and saved for posterity. This narrative has no historical basis and is flawed by its particularity. It may account for
the presence in 9th century Constantinople of some philosophical texts, but certainly not all. It also takes no account of the great cost and physical size of so many manuscripts and the difficulties in transporting them to Constantinople.

The third possibility is one that has been the least well considered although it is the one for which there is the most evidence. The most likely answer is that the manuscripts that were studied in 9th century Constantinople were collected in the 9th century and came from sources scattered within and outside the capital. This becomes clear when we consider that the Greek-to-Arabic translation movement that was also taking place at the same time must have had the same need for exemplars of Greek manuscripts as the 9th century Byzantines. Despite having little or no access to such bibliographic collections that may have existed in Constantinople and other major Byzantine cities still under Byzantine control, Arab philosophers had by the end of the 9th century procured Arabic translations of a large body of Greek philosophical and scientific texts. The exemplars that were used in these translations could only have been procured from the lands that were under Arab rule, i.e., territory that excluded Constantinople and the Byzantine lands. It follows that these exemplars must have been sufficiently available, both in numbers and accessibility, to make the resulting scale of translations into Syriac and Arabic possible. There is no reason to believe that philosophical manuscripts were any less available in Constantinople and the Byzantine lands than they were in Arab-controlled lands. An examination of the evidence of how and where the Arab translators acquired their Greek manuscripts shows that the Constantinopolitan philosophers will have done the same.

The Greek-to-Arabic translation movement has been closely studied by students of Arab and Moslem philosophy, but the evidence that they have uncovered and the fruits of their scholarship are less well known to Byzantinists. A highly informative account of manuscript collecting is provided by the 9th century Nestorian Christian physician who was responsible for making translations of many of the works of Hippocrates and Galen, Hunayn ibn Ishāq (808–873). He wrote an account of his translation work (his Risala) that provides valuable circumstantial information concerning his acquisition of the Greek medical manuscripts that provided the exemplars of the texts that he and his son, Ishāq ibn Hunayn (830–ca.910), translated into Syriac and Arabic. It goes without saying that the ultimate ancestor of every Syriac or Arabic translation must have been at least one Greek manuscript that served as its exemplar, so his comments on the Greek manuscripts he acquired and their condition tell us much about the availability and condition of Greek medical manuscripts in the 9th century. What he tells us of the availability and condition of the Greek medical manuscripts that he acquired will have been true of the contemporary availability and condition of Greek philosophical manuscripts as well. We can be certain of this because Hunayn and his son were also the translators of the majority of the Organon from Greek into Syriac and from Syriac into Arabic.

Another important source of evidence for the availability of Greek philosophical manuscripts is the book catalogue (the Kitâb al-Fihrist) of the 10th century Baghdad book dealer, Ibn al-Nadîm (ob. ca.998). In his entries for the books of the Organon, Ibn al-Nadîm tells us the names of those who translated the works into Syriac and/or Arabic, the Greek commentaries on each work, together with details of any Arabic translations of those Greek commentaries, and the names of Arab authors who have produced “abbreviations and epitomes” of the Greek original. The details he gives of the Greek commentaries and their translations are of particular importance. They show that it was not just the core works of the Organon that were available in Greek at the time of Ibn al-Nadîm, but also the commentaries of the Alexandrian commentators, some of which were said to be of considerable size.
From the evidence of Hunayn ibn Ishâq, Ibn al-Nadîm and others, it is clear that Greek manuscripts were sufficiently available in the Arab lands during the 9th and 10th centuries to support the entire Greek-to-Arabic translation movement without recourse to the bibliographic resources of Constantinople. The same must have been true of the availability of Greek philosophical manuscripts in the Byzantine lands.
Pamphilus and Aristotelian Logic

In the sixth century there emerges a new theological ontology, which differed considerably from an earlier model developed by the Cappadocian bishops Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa in the late fourth century. The Cappadocians had only recognised two components within each concrete being, the qualities that it shared with other members of the same species and the qualities that marked it out as an individual. By contrast, some theologians of the sixth century introduced a further component, pure being or existence, which precedes all qualification, despite the fact that the Cappadocians had explicitly rejected such a notion. In order to construct their arguments these theologians availed themselves of philosophical and more specifically of Aristotelian concepts. Of particular importance was the so-called *arbor Porphyriana*, the framework of genera and species, which the third-century philosopher Porphyry had systematised in his treatise called the *Isagoge*. The Cappadocians had radically simplified this framework by reducing it to the lowest species, which they then juxtaposed with the individuals. Our sixth-century authors were not content with this solution. They again turned to the *arbor Porphyriana* and adapted it to their needs. They focused on the highest genus, substance, which denotes pure existence, and some of them went so far as to cut out the intermediate genera and species so that the highest genus was directly juxtaposed with the lowest species. The result was an extended Cappadocian framework in which every concrete being has existence as its core, around which the natural and hypostatic properties are then layered. That philosophy could play such a role in theological arguments casts a revealing light on the nature of late Patristic discourse. Theologians not only regarded philosophical concepts as ready-made building blocks from which they could construct their arguments, but also seem to have accepted that such concepts were accurate reflections of reality.

An interesting example is Pamphilus, the author of a theological handbook who probably lived in the second half of the sixth century (Quaestiones, ed. P. Allen, in Diversorum Postchalcodonensium Auctorum Collectanea I: Pamphili Theologi opus, ed. J. H. Declerck, Eustathii Monachi opus, ed. P. Allen (CC, SG, 19; Turnhout, 1989), pp. 127-161). A good part of Pamphilus’ handbook is taken up by definitions of theological key terms. Given their importance both in Trinitarian and in Christological discourse, it comes as no surprise that the terms “substance” and “nature” are discussed at length. As one would expect, Pamphilus starts by reiterating the Cappadocian position that in theological discourse nature and substance mean the same thing (Pamphilus, Quaestiones, II, ed. Allen, p. 139, ll. 120-127). However, he then concedes that one can make distinctions between the two terms. One of these distinctions is relevant to our topic. It reads as follows:

Τινές τῶν πατέρων καὶ διδασκάλων σαφηνίζοντες τι σημαίνει τὸ τῆς φύσεως ὄνομα, ταύτην εἶπον εἶναι τὴν ποιὰν τῷ παντὶ ὑπαρξίν, ὑσχ ἀπλῶς ὑπαρξίν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ποιὰν ἀορίστως, καὶ οἶμαι ὡς ὀρθῶς καὶ ἀνελληπτῶς ὁ δρός ἐγκεῖται. σαφηνείας δὲ χάριν διὰ τούς ἑριστικοὺς, εὐγνωμόνας
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Some of the fathers and teachers who clarified what the term “nature” signifies, stated that it is the **qualified existence for everyone**, not pure existence, but the qualified one in an undefined way, and I think that the definition is correct and complete. But for the sake of clarity because of the disputatious who do not wish to hear the words of the fathers in a benevolent manner, one must add “as regards substance”, so that the definition is this: “nature is the qualified existence for everyone as regards the substance of each one.” For “as regards substance” is added, since the most specific difference, that is, the one in the true sense of the word or substantial (sc. difference) of “rationality” is predicated in “what kind of thing it is”, and it is in the human being as regards substance insofar as it is “rationality”. And it is in this respect separated from other species of the same genus and constitutive of the substance “human being”. (sc. We say), then, “according to substance” because of the inseparable accidents, which also distinguish the species and the individuals from each other, however, not according to substance but according to accident. Therefore the Fathers gave the meaning “pure existence” to substance and the meaning “qualified (sc. existence)” to nature, calling “nature” what is present and has grown in the substances in a specific manner, be it according to actuality or according to potentiality.

In the first and last sentence of this difficult passage Pamphilus summarises the position of an earlier theologian whose name he does not mention. The position of this theologian shows clear similarities with the arguments of Leontius of Byzantium, as we argue in this paper. The concept of pure existence has a counterpart in the highest genus of the Solutiones, whereas the distinction between substance as existent and nature as the set of qualities that are added to this existent is found in Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos. This shows clearly that Leontius of Byzantium participated in a broader discourse and furthermore increases the likelihood that there is a link between Leontius’ two arguments.

In order to grasp the full meaning of this passage we need to identify the source from which it is derived. The best starting-point is the strange and almost untranslatable phrase ἡ ποία τῷ παντὶ ὑπάρχει, which denotes the qualities that accede to pure existence. A TLG search reveals that there is only one close counterpart for this phrase, the sentence ποία παντὶ ζῷον ὑπάρχει in Aristotle's Posterior Analytics, which appears in the following context:

In order to grasp problems, one should excerpt both the anatomies and the divisions; and in this way, laying down the genus common to all the subject matter, one should excerpt (if e.g. animals are under consideration) whatever belongs to every animal; and having got this, again excerpt whatever follows every case of the first of the remaining terms (e.g. if it is bird, whatever follows every bird), and always excerpt in this way whatever follows the nearest term. (The translation is quoted from J. Barnes, *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation* [Princeton, 1984], p. 162.)

In this passage Aristotle explains how one can determine the content of particular genera. One needs to identify ποία παντὶ ὑπάρχει, that is, what qualities are found in every member of a genus. This is evidently not the most obvious port of call for a Christian who wished to make an ontological statement. It is possible that the anonymous theologian was attracted to it because it contained the word ὑπάρχειν, which seemed to offer an appropriate counterpart for pure existence.

Comparison shows that the anonymous theologian modified Aristotle's statement in two ways. Firstly, he replaced Aristotle's intermediate genera “animal” and “bird” with the highest genus. Secondly, he identified the qualities present in substances with the qualities that characterise the lowest species. Accordingly, Pamphilus offers as an example a quality of one lowest species, the “human being”. The suppression of all intervening genera and species is not without conceptual problems. It requires that specific differences of a higher order are added to the qualities that mark out the lowest species. However, it would be wrong to think that our author was the first to take this step. Already the Cappadocians had reduced the arbor Porphyriana to the lowest species, which made it impossible to distinguish between genus and specific difference. The real innovation is the reintroduction of the highest genus as a separate category. A comparison with Leontius’ argument in the *Solutiones* casts further light on this development. There Leontius juxtaposed in the case of God pure existence directly with the *logos* of being, whereas in the case of created species he left the intervening genera and species in place. Thus one can argue that the unknown theologian took the specific case of God as a starting-point and applied it to created species as well, thus establishing a universally valid ontological framework.

However, can we be sure that this model was applied to God? Unfortunately Pamphilus only reproduces the definition itself and tells us nothing about the purpose that it originally served. Yet he does give us one precious piece of information when he informs us that the concept of qualified existence had incurred strong criticism. Other authors had pointed out that the qualities were not sufficiently distinguished from mere accidents. This complaint is probably based on a misunderstanding. However, it suggests that the model was specifically developed for the divinity. Only there the presence of accidents constituted a major theological problem because it endangered the simplicity of the divine nature. Interestingly, Pamphilus thinks that he can offer a solution to this problem. He declares that the qualities that make up “nature” must be identified with specific differences such as “rational” in the case of the human species. In his view specific differences pass muster because they are constitutive of substances and thus can themselves be regarded as substantial. This argument is most likely again based on the writings of Porphyry who had declared that parts of substances are themselves substances (Porphyry, *In Categorias Commentarium*, ed. Busse, p. 94, ll. 17-19).
Διαφορά and the Logic of Identifying Differences in Byzantine Theology

One central source for important theological debates in the aftermath of Chalcedon was the understanding of the (unconfused) union of the divine and human natures in Christ. The argument often revolved around interpretation of one important term of this formula, namely the word ἄλλο. This paper argues that the participants in the debate also used a corresponding formulation of that problem in terms of how it is possible to identify a (specific) difference (διαφορά) in order to preserve the union unconfused. To identify differences was certainly a common topic in ancient logic, where the procedure of defining something essentially involved adding the correct specific difference to the common genus. The theological interpretation of the union of the two natures in Christ had recourse to the definition of those natures and implicitly to the essential properties that differentiated one nature from the other. Hence, διαφορά appears as a tool for the logical reasoning involved in key theological arguments in Byzantium, and the aim of this talk is to document this with references to several approaches stemming both from Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian communities.

We shall start with analyzing a debate about the status of διαφορά that took place in the 6th century non-Chalcedonian community. This involved, among others, Probus, who initially constructed his arguments as a non-Chalcedonian but finally converted to the Chalcedonian position that difference is an essential quality. The implication of this formula for Christology eventually became apparent to him: since Christ manifests through his acts two different substantial properties, divine and human, then he must be acknowledged as having two corresponding natures for these substantial properties. It is exactly this link between essential properties and natures that Severus of Antioch later denied, and thus the ontological status of διαφορά came to the fore. Severus accepted at a certain point in the development of his theology the necessity to use the word ‘two’ when discussing Christ. However, he restricted his use of the word to properties, divine and human, linked to the same subject, and did not acknowledge a difference in the natures defined by those properties. For Severus, the union of natures in the single subject of Christ eludes the ontological status of the difference between the two substances of Christ. Implicit in this is that the divine and the human essential properties lose any ontological character and become merely conceptual.

Maximus the Confessor later reacted to this argument very critically. In Epistle 12 (PG. 91, 485C-D) the Confessor began his reply to this issue by defining the status of quality as an essential difference and as dependent on a substance, in the sense that it has no existence by itself. Maximus’ strategy will be to compel the anti-Chalcedonians into accepting a disjunction: either the properties are dependent on natures, because they do not exist in themselves as hypostases do, or they do not exist at all, tertium non datur. The terms used by Maximus can be traced to Porphyry’s ‘constitutive difference’ (διαφορά συστατική) and ‘specific difference’ (εἰδοποιώς διαφορά). For example, according to the Isagoge, rationality is a divisive or specific difference for the substance of animal, but at the same time it is constitutive for the species of man. The same terminology had been found
earlier than Maximus in the case of Probus, and we shall argue that it can also be found in a particular middle Byzantine handbook of logic that could well have been influenced by the Confessor. Hence, Maximus seems to be a recipient of this current of thought, but at the same time added something new to it. He offered metaphysical content to these logical tools: for Maximus, the specific and constitutive difference is motion. This comes straight from Maximus’ metaphysical reading of the story of creation, according to which God is the creator and the cause that puts in motion the created substance of the world. Once the fundamental aspect of motion as a consequence of the doctrine of creation is accepted, its essential character follows from its ontological role of being constitutive of the species. Therefore, if in Porphyry one can limit analysis to a logical evaluation of essential difference as a predicate or concept, in Maximus this essential ingredient enters the core of ousia itself and inheres in the essence as an accompanying motion of it. Hence, according to Maximus’ theory, there are some essential properties that differ from the rest of the properties that an entity can have; these are constitutive and specific differences. They are part of the essence and, stripped of them, each being disappears. This is why, even if one can observe them theoretically, as Severus does, one must go a step further in claiming their ontological status. The later positive reception of this logic of difference in John of Damascus proves that this came to be accepted as the standard understanding of διαφορά in the pro-Chalcedonian milieu. As a result, it would be tempting to conclude that one could identify the difference between the Chalcedonians and the anti-Chalcedonians according to their logic of identifying differences: more exactly, depending on the ontological interpretation of διαφορά as an essential quality that complements substance or, on the contrary, as a predicate or concept lacking concrete reality, one could forge his argument for the former or latter side respectively.
The Prolegomena to Rhetoric and Hermogenes and Byzantine Logical Culture

Huge Rabe’s 1931 edition of a Prolegomenon Sylloge offers a collection of 34 prolegomena to the rhetorical curriculum, which were originally composed and compiled during different periods from Late Antiquity to the last centuries of Byzantium. These prolegomena comprise both general introductions to the study of rhetoric itself, as well as specific introductions for four of the individual books of the corpus of Hermogenes, namely the Progymnasmata of Aphthonius, the De Inventione (not by Hermogenes), the De Statibus, and the De Ideis. The present paper will demonstrate how this corpus of texts, whose popularity is attested by a large manuscript tradition, offers a new perspective on the question of the transmission of philosophical and logical culture from Alexandria to Constantinople, as well as the resurgence of Aristotelian logic in the ninth century.

Rabe himself showed how these rhetorical prolegomena, beginning already with the Late Antique specimens among them, owe much to the philosophical prolegomena produced by the Alexandrian masters. George Kustas notes that “both the structure and the content of the prolegomena owe much to the techniques of instruction and commentary in use in Neoplatonic circles, particularly in Alexandria,” adding that they are “replete with terms, definitions and quotations having their sources or their parallel in our Neoplatonic philosophical commentaries,” (Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric, p. 26). From Aristotle’s own four questions that are to be asked before studying any subject (“if it is, what it is, what sort of thing it is, and why it is”), to the ten questions to be asked before beginning the study of Aristotelian philosophy which appear in Ammonius, Simplicius, Philoponus, Olymiodorus, David and Elias, and which the latter attests are owed ultimately to Proclus, to what are described as the “famous chapters”, the seven or eight questions (σκοπός, χρήσιμον, etc.) to be asked before reading a specific work - this organizational apparatus, so familiar from the Alexandrian commentators, appears again and again in the rhetorical prolegomena, either in an adapted form or carefully adhering to the Alexandrian scheme.

Moreover, these questions, including the sets of four, of ten, and of seven, all serve as vehicles for importing into the rhetorical commentaries a number of ideas and methods drawn from the logical tradition. In other words, these questions and chapters, which are often explicitly presented in the rhetorical prolegomena as being the sort one asks in the study of philosophical texts, do not lead simply to discussions, say, of the σκοπός of Aphthonios’ progymnasmata. They serve in addition as an opportunity to import large tracts of material from the Alexandrian philosophical commentaries themselves. One can consider for example the definition of definition, a subject which features especially frequently during treatment of the Aristotelian question, τί ἐστι. Just as we might see in the pages of David or Elias, we learn in Trophonios the Sophist, whom Rabe dates not later than the sixth century and whose close textual relationship with David Rabe also emphasizes, that a definition is formed from a genus and specific differences (Rabe I.11.12-12). One finds the same understanding of definition in several other prolegomena which Rabe associates with the 5th-6th
centuries, and which he characterizes as steeped in that “philosophia scholastica, quam accurate cognoscimus ex Davidis et Eliae scriptis, discipulorum Olympiodori.” Or take one of the sets of prolegomena to Hermogenes' De Statibus, whose author, according to Rabe, “non erat Christianus”: here one learns that there are five modes of division (διαίρεσις): from genus to species, from whole to parts, from species of essence to accidents, from accident to essence, or from a homonymous word into its various significations (Rabe XIII.196.24-7.14). One finds almost exactly the same scheme in Elias' prolegomena (67-68), except that he offers a sixth mode, from species to individual. The examples could be multiplied at length.

These rhetorical prolegomena thus share a common literary heritage with the tradition of Alexandrian Neoplatonism and the commentators on Aristotle and Porphyry. It is not surprising that Rabe suggests that one of the rhetorical commentators may even have been a student of Olympiodorus himself. The Late Antique rhetorical prolegomena constitute a major vehicle for the transmission and diffusion of the Alexandrian logical Gedankengut. In the eleventh century they are reworked into two of the ripest examples of Byzantine rhetorical theory, namely the commentaries on the corpus of Hermogenes by John Siceliotes and John Doxapatres. This paper concludes by looking at another, earlier period characterized by intellectual ferment in order to assess the role of the prolegomena and their rich supply of philosophical ideas in the renewed interest in Aristotelian logic during the 9th century. Can one measure the impact of the ninth-century reception of the prolegomena against that of possible direct contact with the Alexandrian commentators? Where in a ninth-century curriculum would these rhetorical prolegomena have featured relative to the commentaries on the Isagoge, for example? One of the commentators on Aphthonios' Progymnasmata, whom Rabe (xlvii) argues could not have lived much later than the fifth century, declares that Aphthonios belongs not to the practical nor the theoretical part of philosophy, but “to the middle of these”, to the “organikon, that is, the logikon” (Rabe VIII.79.19-24). If Late Antique and Byzantine teachers believed that the corpus of Hermogenes belonged to the philosophical organon, then we should take them seriously and investigate the prolegomena to rhetoric and Hermogenes as a possible vehicle for the indirect transmission of the Aristotelian logical tradition.
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Logic in Theodore the Studite – A Contribution to the Early 9th Century Byzantine Philosophy

It is well known that Nicephorus of Constantinople (ca. 750/58-828) and Theodore the Studite (759-826) made use of a particular kind of logic in their defence of the holy icons. Scholars have called this logic Aristotelian. If that is the case, it should be taken as Aristotelian in the sense of the logic of the Neoplatonist schools. However, there are features of this logic that seem to stem from other quarters, viz. from the Stoics.

Theodore’s modern biographers have not been able to identify what kind of philosophical material he studied during his education. The biographical sources, in accordance with the traditional, hagiographical genre, make rather general and edifying statements. There are, on the other hand, some interesting pages in Ignatius the Deacon’s vita of the patriarch Nicephorus that are a bit more promising. Ignatius offers a list of philosophical topics Nicephorus studied in his early retirement from secular activity. In a footnote to the English translation Talbot (Byzantine Defenders of Images, Eight Saint’s Lives in English Translation 54 [1998] n.109) suggests that Ignatius copied the list from headings in an elementary textbook of logic and physics that has not been identified. That may well of course be the case. However, the list is quite long, and if it is copied from a textbook that must have been rather comprehensive. Most of what is listed is obviously material of Aristotelian provenance, i.e. it comes from the tradition of the mainly Neoplatonist commentators. There are, though, some indications that the textbook — if it really was a textbook — also contained material from some Stoic source, such as one of the list’s headings on “what kind of syllogism has only one premise”. Whatever Nicephorus read, whether a textbook or books by commentators, it is not improbably that the same material would have been available to Theodore, since they were contemporaries and both came from Constantinople.

Theodore’s Antirrhetici tres adversus iconomachos attest to knowledge of several logical topics. We find a doctrine of universals, a list of categories, a theory of synonymy and homonymy, an application of the category of the relative, and the construction of arguments called syllogisms. The three treatises are internally related to one another, but they differ markedly. The arguments are in general put forward, as he says in the introduction to the first treatise, antithetically (κατὰ ἀντίθεσιν), so that it is possible to see by juxtaposition (διὰ τῆς παραθέσεως) Theodore’s own arguments and the arguments of his iconoclast opponent. All three treatises are characterized by argument and counter-argument, so that we have a kind of pro et contra argumentation. Each refutation has its own character. The first confronts systematically iconoclast and iconophile arguments throughout the whole exposition but ends, though, in a series of anathemata. The second refutation is constructed as a dialogue with no care for describing a setting or a scene. What counts is, like in the first refutation, the arguments that are played out against one another. The third is more of a systematic exposition of iconophile doctrine but with reference to several iconoclast opinions.
This description may give the impression that Theodore enters the struggle with his iconoclast opponent in a rather unbiased and scholarly way. As a matter of fact it seems to me that he does not consciously distort the iconoclast case nor make his own position easy to defend. Of course, he wins the contest since he is in complete control of the development of the discussion. But even so I would say he does not avoid the real issues and he even modifies his views in confrontation with iconoclast objections.

The logical topics will be further elaborated in the final paper. What I offer here is just a summary of what will be the substantial part of this article:

(1) Theodore has a doctrine of universals. He does not elaborate this topic much, but we can see features that he has in common with earlier thinkers: he does not hold that universals are dependent on the human mind alone. They somehow (it is not easy to say exactly how) exist in particulars and are gathered from them through experience into a concept in the human mind. Universals as existing in the particulars are somehow individualized and circumscribed by the addition of certain properties and accidents that may be classified in a list of categories. Universals existing in the mind are uncircumscribed since they extend to all particulars of a certain kind.

(2) The list of categories is a list of circumscriptions that a being may suffer. Theodore’s list contains genuine Aristotelian categories like quantity, quality, position, place, and time. It includes also some items that are not in Aristotle, like inclusion, shape, and body. It is remarkable that relative is missing, since this category plays an important role in Theodore’s defence of the icons. There are several things here that need to be highlighted.

(3) Synonymy and homonymy are applied in order to highlight and defend a certain way of speaking of the icons: ‘For whatever is said concerning the prototype, the same may be said concerning the derivation [i.e. the image], however, in the case of the prototype it is said in a synonymous way, because it is said properly, but in case of the derivation it is said in a homonymous way, since it is not said properly.’ (Antirrheticus 2. 16, PG 99: 360d). What is interesting here is the shift of focus from the universal to the particular: it is well known that both the universal name and its definition may be predicated synonymously of an item, but we find here that a singular name (term) and definite descriptions related to that name may be predicated synonymously of the prototype and homonymously of the image. We may say synonymously of Christ that this is Christ and this is He who was crucified and He who rose on the third day. We may say homonymously of the icon that this is Christ and this is He who was crucified etc.

(4) The category of the relative is applied by Theodore in order to support the above version of synonymous and homonymous predication and in order to emphasise the unity of veneration of Christ and the icon. The icon is shown to be related to Christ in such a way that the material entity as such is somehow absorbed into the reality of the paradigm.

(5) One of the most interesting aspects of Theodore’s logic is his application of argumentative forms that he believes to be Aristotelian. It is actually possible to identify some proper Aristotelian syllogisms in the texts (I have at least found one), but the argumentative forms are generally Stoic. They can mainly be reduced to the first two Stoic ‘indemonstrables’ (the modus ponens and modus tollens). It seems to me possible that Theodore may have found such logical
structures in a handbook, but I really doubt that he would be capable to apply them the way he does without some practical training. — Where did he get that?

It is one thing to identify the above concepts and figure out their ancestry theoretically, but it is quite difficult to know practically which sources were available in early ninth-century Constantinople.
The Sources of Photios’ and Arethas’ Comments on the Categories

The earliest surviving texts of post-iconoclast Byzantine philosophy are the comments on Aristotle’s *Categories* by the patriarch of Constantinople Photios (c.810–after 893) and by the archbishop of Caesarea Arethas (c.850–932/944). Photios’ comments are extant in the form of a few still unedited scholia as well as in the form of a continuous text under the title *Clear Summary of the Ten Categories*; this summary seems to be a later version of his more detailed commentary, and fills eleven chapters of his collection of essays *Amphilochia* (*Epistulae et Amphilochia*, vol. V, ed. L. G. Westerink [ed.], Leipzig 1986, 137-47). Arethas’ scholia are found in a single manuscript, *Vaticanus Urbinas graecus 35* ff. 21v-29r, most probably written in Arethas’ own hand, but break off for no obvious reason right after the beginning of the category of quantity; these scholia have recently been published in a critical edition (*Arethas of Caesarea’s Scholia on Porphyry’s Isagoge and Aristotle’s Categories*, ed. M. Share, Commentaria in Aristotelem Byzantina 1, Athens 1994). My aim is to contribute to the discussion about the transmission of the commentary tradition of Aristotelian logic, by attempting to detect the various philosophical influences on these central Byzantine works. The prevailing view in the secondary literature is that the main influence comes from the Neoplatonic commentators, and it is true that one often recognizes Porphyry’s, Ammonius’ and Simplicius’ voices in the background of Photios’ and Arethas’ logical texts. But these are certainly not the only authors from whom Photios and Arethas drew extensively. Arethas, for instance, made constant use of the commentaries of Philoponus, Olympiodorus and Elias without mentioning them, and it is not at all clear whether he himself excerpted them from the original commentaries, whether he found them in a single manuscript, or whether he assembled them from more than one. In addition, although John of Damascus’ influence is often evident, the Byzantine commentators do not explicitly refer to him nor, for that matter, to Theodore Abu Qurrah, whose logical treatise Arethas owned and annotated. Since the Byzantines did not mention in most cases the authors on whose writings they heavily relied, and since they seem to have drawn their material from different texts at different sections of their writings, the task of revealing their sources is not straightforward, and the results are not always conclusive. Nevertheless, I think it is worthwhile and important to examine the variety of sources used by the early Byzantine commentators of Aristotle’s *Categories* in order to trace the stages in the development of Aristotelian logic, but also in order to be in a position to assess the much debated originality of the Byzantine thinkers.
Substance as Self-Subsistent Entity

The understanding of substance as self-subsistent entity is an idea elaborated by the masters of the Neoplatonic School of Alexandria in the framework of the exegesis of Aristotle’s *Categories*. This idea has a considerable posterity in Byzantine philosophy. For our purpose two phases of this history are particularly interesting to comment upon: the contribution of Photius and Psellos. In the ninth century Photius mentions this concept explicitly (*Amphilochia*, 138.26-29): Παρὰ μέντοι τὰ εἰρημένα λέγεται οὐσία καὶ πᾶν ὅπερ ἐστὶν αὐτοσύστατον, οὐ καὶ τὸν λόγον εἰκότως ἃν τις ποιοῖ, πρᾶγμα εἶναι λέγων αὐθύπαρκτον, μὴ δεόμενον ἑτέρου πρὸς ὑπάρξειν, οἷον ἀνθρώπος, βοῦς, πῦρ, γῆ καὶ τὰ ὄμοια.

Then in the eleventh century, in a short treatise on whether substance is a self-subsistent entity (*Phil. Min. Opus 7*) Psellus addresses the question of the sense in which substance (*ousia*) can qualify as self-subsistent (*authyparktos*), as was claimed, he says, by philosophers of the past. But the question, asks Psellus, is, first, what do we mean by the term “self-subsistent” and, second, whether any of the senses of “self-subsistent” can reasonably apply to substance. Does an entity qualify as “self-subsistent” if it exists by itself, i.e. is ontologically independent, or, alternatively, when it exists without being caused by some antecedent cause, that is, causally independent, asks Psellus. Psellus argues for the former option; for, he argues, no being (*on*) is without cause; the only sense in which an entity deserves to be called “self-subsistent” is in an ontological sense, that is, when no other being is needed for it to exist.

There are at least three interesting things in this small piece of philosophical prose; first, that Psellus addresses a philosophical question that is not of exegetical nature and seeks to determine his personal position by working out what the concepts suggest; second, his method of doing so involves the division and subordination of all beings from top down, what he describes as “*hypovasis*”, namely “descent”, a Neoplatonic term, indicative of Psellus’ philosophical education and inclination. Finally, Psellus confines his inquiry to the sensible realm and opts for an Aristotelian solution inspired by the *Categories*. Substance in the *Categories* is ontologically but not causally self-subsistent; for individuals (like Socrates) are caused by antecedent causes (his parents), yet depend on no other being for their existence. Psellus seems to imply that the term “self-subsistent” is used in a different sense in the theological discourse (concerning God) and in the ontological discourse. In the latter there is no self-subsistent entity in the causal sense, including intelligible ones (e.g. substance).
A Collection of Logical Texts in Syriac (Ms. Vat. sir. 158)

The Syriac manuscript Vat. sir. 158, probably produced in the ninth (or tenth) century, contains several texts related to Aristotelian logic and may thus serve as an exemplary case-study of a self-contained logical collection in one manuscript produced in or around the ninth century. Its contents include primary texts (Aristotle's Categories, Peri hermeneias, and Prior Analytics), what we might call an intermediary text (Porphyry's Eisagoge), and further supplementary texts on these, such as commentaries, a diagrammatic outline several folios long, and a life of Aristotle and a short introduction to his works. This paper, intended for an audience not necessarily conversant with Syriac, will focus on this collection of texts by discussing several questions about its contents and their arrangement, both on its own and in comparison with manuscripts similar in type in Syriac (including some Tochterhandschriften that used Vat. sir. 158 as a Vorlage), Greek, Arabic, and Armenian.

Aristotelianism and Greek into Syriac

By far the majority of literature translated into Syriac comes from Greek. While this Greek-to-Syriac literature is made up of much that is patently and explicitly religious — such as the Bible in more than one version, commentaries on the Bible, liturgical texts, homilies, and hagiography — there is also no small amount of non-Christian Greek literature. This ranges from gnomological collections to well-known Greek philosophical texts. In the latter category we have especially works connected to the Corpus Aristotelicum, on both the physical and the logical sides. To mention only a few: the pseudo-Aristotelian De mundo, the Categories, Peri hermeneias, the Prior Analytics, and Porphyry's Eisagoge. To judge from surviving manuscripts, some of these philosophical texts, especially on logic, continued to be read and copied well into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

This translated Aristotelian material also occasioned and inspired several works written in Syriac by authors such as Proba, Sergius of Rēšʿainā, Severus Sebokht, Jacob of Edessa, Išoʾbokht of Rev Ardašir, Patriarch Timothy I, Dionysius bar Ślibi, Yaʾqub bar Šakko, and Gregory bar ʿEbrāyā. In addition, Paul the Persian, author of at least two works touching on logic, may have written in Middle Persian, but this is not certain and these works survive only in Syriac. Finally, as in Greek, in Syriac we have a number of texts that combine both theology and logic, such as surviving texts from John Philoponus (written in Greek but mostly surviving only in Syriac), an apologetic treatise of a certain Elia addressed to Leo of Ḥarrān, Theodore bar Koni's Book of Scholia (incorporating some work of Silvanus of Qardu), and an apologetic treatise of Nonnus of Nisibis.

The texts in the manuscript

Here follows a listing of the contents of Vat. sir. 158 with a few remarks.

f. 1v Story on Porphyry and the Eisagoge (incomplete)
This work is called a story (tašʾ ibā, the same word used in titles of Syriac hagiography) and presents a view of Porphyry's life and the writing of the Eisagoge for Chrysaorius. Unfortunately only this one page of the work survives, but later in this manuscript this story becomes the subject of a lemmatized commentary.

**ff. 2r-16r** Porphyry's *Eisagoge* (leaves missing at the beginning)

While Aristotle's own works may be considered primary for logic (in Greek as well as in Syriac), the *Eisagoge*, whether it is an introduction to the *Categories*, to logic, or even to philosophy considered more broadly, stands on another level. Nevertheless, commentators both Greek and Syriac found the *Eisagoge* to be well worth commenting on in its own right, just like the works of Aristotle. This work, then, might best be considered an intermediary text between the works of Aristotle and the commentaries on the works of Aristotle. The Syriac text of the *Eisagoge* in this manuscript is the second Syriac translation of the work, an earlier one having been made in the sixth century. The colophon to the text as it stands in this manuscript runs as follows:

Finished is the *Eisagoge* of Porphyry the philosopher, which was translated from Greek into Syriac as accurately as possible by the pious brother Mār Athanasius of the holy Monastery of Bēṭ Malkā in the year 956 [Anno Graecorum] in the month of January [= 645 CE].

This translator, Athanasius, studied with Severus Sebokʰt (mentioned above) at the Monastery of Qennešre and he also penned an introduction to logic.

**ff. 16r-26r** A diagrammatic outline for logical terms

Diagrams to illustrate the relationships of certain logical terms and categories are not uncommon in the manuscripts of logical works in various languages, but rarely do they span so many folios. Here, across ten folios we have several diagrams under the title *Divisions of the Eisagoge of Porphyry the Philosopher* covering, for example, what genus is predicated on, the divisions of *ousia*, the divisions of the propositions in syllogisms, and the division of difference and differences.

**ff. 26v-27r** An introduction to Aristotle's writings

The title of the work is *Something showing the causes for which Aristotle the philosopher composed all his work*. It deals exclusively with Aristotle's logical works.

**ff. 27r-27v** Life of Aristotle

The title of this short work is *The story of Aristotle in brief*. It covers the basics of Aristotle's life, well known from other sources in other languages, too, and mentions Aristotle's students.

**ff. 27v-63v** Aristotle, *Categories*

Here we have the Syriac translation of Jacob of Edessa. There are two other extant versions: an earlier, anonymous, translation, and another translation by Jacob's near contemporary, George, Bishop of the Arabs. But it is Jacob's version that, to judge from surviving manuscripts, had the widest circulation among Syriac readers.

**ff. 63v-95v** Aristotle, *Peri hermeneias*

**ff. 95v-107r** Aristotle, *Prior Analytics*
ff. 107r-131r Commentary on Porphyry’s *Eisogoge*

The rubric for this part of the manuscript runs: *Commentaries of the Eisagoge: Seven kephalaia necessary for us (to ask) before (we study) every book.* Included also in this section of the manuscript, on ff. 129r-131r and continuing on 134r — written, it seems, in another hand — is the commentary (*nuhhārā*) to the “story” on f. 1v mentioned above. This commentary has much in common with the prolegomena-commentaries well known from earlier commentators writing in Greek.

ff. 131r-135r Letters to Priests and Deacons

The last set of texts fits incongruously with the rest of the manuscript’s contents: these few letters have no explicitly logical content at all. They may, however, have served as rhetorical models for Syriac letter-writing.

*Comparanda manuscipta Syriaca &c.*

This manuscript was copied *in extenso* (or mostly so) at least a few times some centuries later. These “‘Tochterhandschriften” are Firenze BML Or. 209 [Assemani 196] (1585 CE), Firenze BML Or. 174 [Assemani 183-184] (1592 CE), and BnF syr. 248 (1637 CE). Other distinct Syriac logical manuscripts that will serve us as comparanda, aside from some fragments, include: BL Add. 14658 (7th cent.), BL Add. 14659 (8th/9th cent.), BL Add. 14660 (9th/10th cent.), BnF syr. 354 (the first part, from 1224 CE), Berlin 88 (1259/60), India Office 9 (16th-18th cent.), Camb. Add. 2011 (18th cent.), Camb. Add. 3284 (18th cent.), Camb. Add. 2812 (1806 CE), and Berlin 89 (≈1882). Naturally, a more immediate value lies with the manuscripts closest in probable age to Vat. sir. 158, but even the later copies deserve consideration, not least because they give us a possible glimpse of their *Vorlagen*. In addition, these later copies show us what later (sometimes much later!) students of logic in Syriac may have had at their disposal, and in what arrangements, just as Vat. sir. 158 shows us the same for the period around the ninth century.

We will also consider, although more briefly, a few manuscripts of related subject matter in Greek, Armenian, and Arabic. We have some such earlier manuscripts in Greek, but in Armenian and Arabic the copies are later (from around the thirteenth century and later).

Some questions

As we consider the textual material that this manuscript offered to the interested reader in the ninth or tenth century (and later), some questions come to mind. First, why these texts and not others? Can we say what made the scribe include exactly this collection of texts in the manuscript? And why are the texts in this order? Some of them have an obvious connection, as in the case of the *Eisagoge*, the *Categories*, *Peri hermeneias*, and the *Prior Analytics*. We thus have the first three parts of the *Organon* prefaced by the *Eisagoge*. But interspersed among these we also have a few commentaries, commentary-like material, and very brief orientations to the logical curriculum. The manuscript’s end is the ill-fitting group of a few letters, which, as mentioned above, may at least have made an accompanying rhetorical contribution. So, leaving aside this last text-group, we have a fairly comprehensive initial course in logic, a course offering both the foundational texts from Aristotle and the intermediary “introduction” of Porphyry, as well as supplementary, perhaps more gentle, guides which might have been especially suitable for beginners in a logical curriculum.
Concluding aim

This manuscript, at least in part, has been discussed to some degree by Anton Baumstark and, more recently, Henri Hugonnard-Roche. It has, however, never been studied in detail as a whole package of logical material as prepared in or around the ninth century. This investigation, then, following the outline, questions, and comparanda given above, has as its goal exactly that focused study of the transmission of a heavily Greek-based course into the hands of a Syriac reader. One advantage of this kind of study is that we are thus considering a real textual artifact, that is, an actual collection of several closely related texts side-by-side in a single codex that is relatively fixed in time (if not place) that would have been available all together to a prospective reader then and thereafter; we are thus not considering the history of Syriac literature or of philosophy on the basis of a more abstract collection of texts gathered from several manuscripts of different places and time periods, or worse, merely from printed editions. At the minimum, we can be sure that at least the texts compiled in this codex, which was itself copied more or less intact a few times in the following centuries, were available to some readers beginning sometime in the ninth century or soon thereafter.
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The Episcopal Palace in Early Byzantium: Introduction to the Round Table

Throughout late antiquity the most important reference model for the residences of the upper classes was the imperial palaces, for their typological variety, for the complexity of the functions and especially for the prestige of their role. A composite architectural language grew up, which mixed different elements: reception halls, peristyles, triclinia, private baths were present as well in the aristocratic houses as in the episcopia and the praeatoria, giving the architecture of power a broad appearance of uniformity.

It is important to examine the episcopia keeping in mind this overview. After a first phase of development of the ecclesiastical residential typology, from the late 4th century these complexes tend to assume monumental forms, adjoining the episcopal church. It is no coincidence that they gradually began to host administrative and representative functions as the role of the bishops increased.

In the 5th and in the 6th century many episcopia were decorated with prestigious furnishings (mosaics, wall paintings), frequently showing a selection in the repertoire of the subjects: for example, mosaics with figurative subjects were rare and the walls showed merely geometric, symbolic or religious scenes; statues were infrequent.

A distinguishing feature of these complexes was first of all the connection between the residential area and the buildings of worship (the cathedral, the baptistery, other churches and chapels, often better known than the residences through the archaeological practice), but also rooms for charitable or catechetical functions were present. Other common features can be identified in the presence of boundary walls and of an ornate façade, or in the development of internal paths, which followed the liturgical practices. Within the episcopia there were many reception halls and services areas (housing, kitchens, baths, workshops, warehouses, etc.), too. Also rare cases of episcopal offices can be probably recognized.

It is interesting to observe that within the episcopal architecture, in the course of time, recessive typological elements were sometimes present, as for example the triclinia with more than a apse, of palatial derivation. In those cases, such as in the Lateranus palace of Rome and the episcopal triclinium of Ravenna, the presence of this particular type of room depended on the prestige and also on the capacity issues: the bishops, in fact, could host a great number of diners and had the social need of exhibiting a luxurious triclinium, as the ones occasionally described by the written sources. Sigma tables and other significant elements of status could adorn the dining rooms, as some episcopal residence testify.

All these aspects are emerging more and more through the recent archaeological researches, opening the way to further perspectives in the study of episcopia and also shifting the focus on the economic phenomena related to the development of these new centers of the power.
The Episcopal Palaces: Worldly Splendor in the Style of the Ruling Class Versus Monastic Virtues

In this paper aspects of the Episcopal palace in early Byzantium will be examined focusing on the literary sources and combining them with archaeological evidence. Emphasis will be placed on the splendor attested for the Episcopal palaces.

The magnificence of the architecture and of the décor of the Episcopal palaces makes sense only if the class origin of the bishops in Late Antiquity is taken into consideration and the social, political and economic power of the office is appreciated. As the cities’ ruling class was declining, many of its members were attracted to a career in the Church to avoid the economic burdens of their office. Also members of the senatorial class were attracted to the Episcopal office. Competition of candidates for the Episcopal office was fierce. Ammianus Marcellinus referring to the contest between Damasus and Ursinus for the bishopric of Rome in 366, explains how the luxurious life in the city would attract to the bishopric men who wanted to enjoy this life; they would enjoy ostentatious gifts from members of the high class, especially women, ride in carriages, have splendid dresses, and enjoy dinners more lavish than those of kings. John Chrysostom in his *On the Priesthood*, establishing the ideal qualities of the priests and bishops, explains that the office was so attractive that led to payment of fees for ordination and consecration. The practice was forbidden by several Church Councils, and Justinianic Novel 123.

Famous cases of Episcopal corruption are that of Sophronius, bishop of Pompeiopolis, who enriched from the properties of the Church, and that of Antoninus, bishop of Ephesus. Antoninus was charged among others, for removing marble slabs from the entrance of the baptistery and used them to adorn his own baths, and for removing columns set up for years for the church and taking them into his own triclinium. In Byzantium Episcopal palaces continued for centuries to be constructed with a splendid display of marble, as that of John Apokaukos (12th-13th centuries) in the small provincial city of Naupaktos, a real small palace (συνεπτυγμένον παλάτιον).

John Chrysostom, patriarch of Constantinople from 398, reduced the extravagant expenses of his Episcopal palace and its ostentatious luxury, and transferred the funds to the hospital. The bishop’s triclinium was very large and could accommodate up to forty bishops. John Chrysostom ended the frequent banquets at the Episcopal palace and lived with modesty. Dining at the Episcopal Palace was an opportunity to establish or strengthen contacts with members of the upper class and of the imperial family (e.g. Pulcheria and her sisters used to dine at the Patriarchal palace on Sundays followings communion).

However, John Chrysostom increased the wealth of his Church. The complex of buildings which Olympias donated to the patriarchal Great Church of Constantinople included her house, a tribunal, private baths, various buildings in the neighborhood, butchery.
Edifying stories offer us glimpses into Episcopal palaces. Saint John the Almsgiver, patriarch of Alexandria, placed a bag with seven and half pounds of gold offered by a ship owner under the holy table in the oratory of his cubiculum and performed the liturgy. He had the money chest under his bed, and gold coins were carried into his palace in jars labeled “Finest honey” or “Unsmoked honey”. In ecclesiastical residences with syneisaktoi women’s cloths, baskets and spinning instruments were obvious around.

The magnificence of bishops’ palaces is revealed in the archaeological excavations in their size and location, as for example, at Ephesus with 25 rooms and a bath, and at Butrint with over 30 rooms (5th c.).

The view which apsidal halls enjoyed can be felt today at the sixth-century Episcopal Palace at Poreč, continuously used in the Middle Ages, next to Euphrasius Basilica. Built by the maritime city wall, it was raised over the wall and opened to the marvelous view of the sea. Similar view enjoyed other Episcopal Palaces, such as that at Nikopolis in Greece and at the Castra Porphyreon in Israel.

The location of some Episcopal palaces on the cities’ acropolis underlines the bishop’s authority. At Scythopolis the entire acropolis was an ecclesiastical domain with the Round Church and a monastery and the Bishop’s palace in the centre. Similar was the arrangement in Justiniana Prima (Caričin Grad). In this latter case the two apsidal halls (in the complex IV and in the Building III), both belonging to the episcopal complex, have been identified as the secretarium and the hall of the salutatio. Following the fashion of the triclinia of the domus in use during different seasons of the year, texts attest similar use of triclinia in Episcopal palaces (e.g. winter triclinium in the acta of the council of 536).

The House of the Ekdikos at Nikopolis in Greece has been identified with the Bishop’s palace on account of its location west of the Basilica A across the street, the two rooms with frescoes depicting saints with halos under a staircase, crosses in niches and movable objects with Christian symbols. The unusual oval form of the bathtub may reflect the taste of a bishop.

Architectural similarities with the domus are discerned everywhere. The sixth-century Patriarchate of Constantinople, south-west of the Great Church, included the Large Hall with three bays, dating to the 6th century, an atrium surrounded by rooms in 3 stories of which the 2 survive. It is usually identified as the Large Sekreton of the Patriarchate. The Large Hall had a flat (perhaps partly) roof serving as a terrace (as the late remodeling of the House of Ekdikos), accessible from the rooms above the south-west vestibule of the church. Among the alterations of Patriarch Thomas was the construction of a cross-vaulted substructure beneath the antechamber of the Large Hall, tentatively identified with the Patriarchal library, burnt in 791.

As the luxurious decoration and furniture of the Episcopal palaces is lost, texts offer us some glimpses of the interior and of the bishops’ customs in the domestic and administrative context.
Everyday Life and Production in Early Byzantine Episcopeia from the Aegean and the Mainland, Greece: The Material Culture Evidence.

Archaeological research of the last 30 years or so continues to offer new and vital material evidence in many sites in Greece, dated in the early Byzantine period. Due to this, there has been an increase in the number of publications concerning greater or smaller architectural complexes, workshops and agricultural production centres as well as objects of material culture of the same period. At the same time, researchers are re-examining the material from past excavations by applying new methodologies and are approaching this period knowing that after the first decades of the 7th century we enter the transitional period of Byzantium, an era which cannot be understood just by examining the surface of the evidence. It needs research and in depth analysis, comparison and most of all re-examination of the evidence in new ways.

The topic of the round table concerns the Episcopal palace in early Byzantium. But what do we call episcopeion? There are very few cases in which episcopeion has been identified with an inscription. In most cases, episcopeion is identified as a large complex of buildings including apart of the basilica and the baptistery, the episcopal palace with the auxiliary spaces. During the 6th century we notice that the residencies which are characterized as episcopal palaces are large and luxurious, and basically do not differ from the wealthy residencies of that era; moreover, the bishop at that time was part of the city’s élite.

It is known that since the late 6th and mainly during the 7th century significant changes in the early byzantine cities are observed. Similarly, during the same period we observe changes in the use of parts of the buildings that have been identified as episcopeia. A very important change is the transfer of production and packaging workshops of agricultural products inside the Episcopal complex, whereas in some cases ample storage places are created.

The episcopeia that have been identified in the Aegean and the mainland of Greece area are plenty, yet, many of them have been excavated according to old methods and very often there is not enough evidence about the late phases of these buildings. Additionally, in previous publications all the small findings and the objects of material culture are not being properly analysed. As a result, it is not easy for the researcher to detect the changes in the uses within an era, that is, of the transitional byzantine period, in which the administrative and the production activities seem to be housed in the same building.

In this presentation we will examine some cases of episcopeia which have been unearthed in the Aegean and the Greek mainland. There are, however, concerns regarding the dating of the main and late phase of these complexes, the change of the use of some areas and their transformation to production facilities, the examination of the products produced within them as well as the analysis and presentation of the material culture found during excavation.
The study and analysis of the data may allow us, to a certain extent, to get an idea about the standards of daily life in these particular building complexes. At the same time, with the aim of archaeological data, we could investigate the degree of intervention of the clergy officials in the production process. It is known, however, from written sources that the Church and its officials possess great property in certain areas, produce and trade goods, as well. Moreover, studies and findings of the few past years confirm the above hypothesis. We believe that the ongoing study of the material culture will be an effort to investigate the extent of this phenomenon during the early byzantine period.
The Episkopeion of Constantinople in the Early Byzantine Period

Since its very origin, the episcopal residence at Constantinople appears to be closely linked, due to either functional, practical or historical reasons, to the major ecclesiastic complex known as the Great Church (the Megale Ekklesia). This should be the fundamental premise one has to take into account when dealing with a group of buildings (the episkopeion) that had almost totally vanished, or with the rather confuse and puzzling picture offered by the available sources.

Early modern scholars, first of all Ducange, collected a file of related sources and records. Ducange's dossier was accurately revaluated and discussed only as late as the second half of the 20th century, when the topography of the area between Hagia Sophia and the open space of the Augusteion became the subject of several scientific works. Two among them were definitely aimed at defining the location and layout of the episkopeion/patriarchate: the first was published by Rodolphe Guilland in 1955. A second, by Raymond Janin, appeared in 1962. Furthermore, in 1959 Cyril Mango had made the episcopal headquarter the subject of some fundamental remarks, included in his monography devoted to the Chalke, the monumental entranceto the Great Palace looking out onto the Augusteion. Mango's suggestions on the episcopal building will be resumed only in the late 1970s, thanks to the renewed attention payed to the wall mosaic decoration of the rooms above the southwest ramp and vestibule of Hagia Sophia. On this occasion, Robin Cormack and Ernst Hawkins, on the base of the first ever detailed analysis on the masonry of the abovementioned rooms, were able to reassert the direct architectural intercommunication between the core of the episcopal residence and the south gallery of Hagia Sophia. They also proposed a 6th-century date for the structures involved. This proved to be a pivotal step for later researches. Since 2006, when a substantial contribution on the baptisteries of Hagia Sophia by Ken Dark and Jan Kosteneck saw the light, the relevant traces of the nowadays vanished buildings adjoining the southwest corner of the Justinianic Great Church were even more considered. Dark and Kosteneck continued their own researches, mostly based on archaeological surveys on the spot together with a new approach to primary sources. They gradually presented the results of their Hagia Sophia Project in a number of reports, followed, in 2014, by a final report. This latter indeed represents a newly conceived approach to a peculiar issue: i.e. that of the 7th-century additions the sources recorded for the episkopeion, which had constituted, by the way, the main topic of Guilland's early contribution.

Once taken into account the formative stages of the institution of the Great Church, lasting for about two centuries before the Justinianic interventions took place, the frame in which the episcopal residence is to be located is admittedly quite unclear. A first phase of the episkopeion should have preceded the construction of the church of (Hagia) Sophia in the 360s. Disorders during the early phase of the post-Nicene Christological controversy at Constantinople seems to have taken place around the church of (Hagia) Eirene. Before 360, Hagia Eirene undoubtedly played the role of the episcopal church of the New Rome, as an early and reliable source like Socrates, who wrote around 439, appears to stress.

The Christological controversy led to an extreme fragmentation of the religious pattern of Constantinople. There is strong evidence for the existence of more than one episcopal centre during the momentous decades 350-380. Homoean predominance under Constantius II and Valens did not prevent other factions – the Nicene, the Novatians, etc., from doing their best efforts to maintain their own episkopeia.

Thus far, the first mention of a collectively recognizable oikia for the bishop (Nectarius, 381-394) appears after the Nicene creed was established as the unique orthodoxy by Theodosius I. Sozomenos reports its destruction by fire during the late anti-Nicene mobs led in 388 by the not still extinguished homoean party. According to a long lasting tradition, this oikia was plausibly located in the nearby of the episcopal church, the Eirene, or, at least, between this latter and the newly constructed church of Sophia, which seemingly acquired, between 360 and 381, a new status at the expense of the Hagia Eirene.

The term episkopeion makes its appearance at the beginning of the 5th century as well. Palladius uses it in the biography of John Chrysostom. Only in the 9th century, with Theophanes, the word patriarcheion became to be standard. We do not know whether the episkopeion of Palladius was burnt down or not during the disorders that certainly damaged the Great Church complex in 404, but we can easily venture that it was fated to be reduced to ashes, together with the whole complex, during the Nika revolt of 532.

There is no evidence supporting the assumption that the Justinianic reconstruction of 532 has implied a relocation of the episcopal residence. After the 6th century, in any case, sources agree in assuming that it was a multi-storied building and that it lay in the area between Hagia Sophia and the Augusteion. The new episkopeion was probably to be accessed directly through Hagia Sophia’s north-western ramp, or, possibly, by means of secondary doors, as told in the Life of Theodore of Sykeon (between 596 and 602). Some of the adjoining rooms still extant in the area of the ramp were reasonably identified – already by Mango – as a part of the residence (Great Sekreton, Small Sekreton). We cannot be sure that this was the secretarium where we are told the council of 553 was held. Sekreton, nonetheless, is the word John of Ephesus uses to single out the rooms where archbishop John III Scholastikos (567-577) put several miaphysite bishops under trial in 574-577. Mango argued that this represented the core of the building, and he advanced the opinion that it was to be dated not before the reign of Justin II (565-578). John III is indeed credited with a lavish rebuilding of the residence, witnessed once again by John of Ephesus. This reconstruction, according to John's narration, was due to a further fire, occurred in December 563, which is known to have seriously damaged the narthex of Hagia Eirene and most of the surrounding area. Thus far, it could be suggested that, earlier than 563, the episkopeion still lay closer to Hagia Eirene while the destructions in 532 did not cause it to move from its primeval site.
Patriarch Thomas I (607-610) is responsible for an enlargement of the complex, to which new extensions were added, the most well-known being the so-called Thomaites, a large, elongated hall. This latter, on the base of Guillard, Janin, and later contributions, was located, by large consent, to the east of Hagia Sophia or along the eastern side of the Augusteion. Dark and Kostenec questioned this point, providing a new reading of the extant traces on the masonry of the southwest corner of Hagia Sophia. According to their conclusion, the later addition of patriarch Thomas I (607-610) pointed toward the west and the atrium of Hagia Sophia. The new topographical hypothesis would be supported, by the way, by the well-known passage of Theophanes related to the first dethronement of Justinian II (695). The text, in fact, tells how the patrikios Leontius, having summoned a large crowd hostile to the emperor in the atrium of Hagia Sophia, was able to come up to the episcopal residence directly from the atrium and to urge patriarch Callinicus I (693-705) to support overtly the revolt. As a result, the early 7th-century additions should have been enough limited as far as their extent is concerned.
The Bishop’s Palace of Miletus in Caria (Turkey)

The Bishop’s Palace in the centre of Miletus in Caria, on the west coast of Asia Minor, dates from the first half of the fifth century AD. It replaced a late Roman peristyle house from the third century AD that had undergone renovation in the fourth century. The fifth-century building was closely associated with the oratory of St Michael and can thus be identified as the episcopal palace. The oratory flanked the residence to the south, served as palace chapel, and was rebuilt in the seventh-century. The original oratory appears to date from the fifth century, when the palace was built; it had a single nave that consisted of a former temple cella and was too small for a parish church; it can only have served as palace chapel. In the early seventh century the temple cella was replaced by a three-aisled basilica with galleries and an inscription that identifies the edifice as an oratory (rather than as a parish church) and relates the rebuilding to the patriarch of Constantinople and the local clergy (rather than to a worldly donor). The oratory, a vestibule in the form of an elongated apsidal hall, a relatively large main hall, and the absence of a central peristyle court distinguish the palace from the peristyle houses of late antiquity and link it to the Byzantine Palace at Ephesus. The new features may reflect the establishment of a new elite of clerical office-bearers that replaced the leading families of old.
An Archiepiscopal City: Justiniana Prima as the Seat of the Primate of Dacia

The recent discovery of a series of seals of a certain ‘Archiepiscopus Ioannes’ in Caricin Grad have provided an almost conclusive answer to the long debated question as to whether this site was Justiniana Prima. These seals come as a reminder of the special character of this city and of the status of the ecclesiastical authority which was based at it: Justiniana Prima was built to serve the seat of an archiepiscopus.

Novel XI of Justinian defines the area of jurisdiction of the new archdiocese as being identical to the civil diocese of Dacia. This means the creation of an independent church for the Latin speaking northwest Balkans, comprising the provinces of Moesia Superior, Dacia Mediterranea, Dacia Ripensis, and Dardania. The bishop of Justiniana Prima would be the ecclesiastical primate of four metropolitans and about fifteen bishops. Although comparatively small, this jurisdiction was envisaged as a fully autocephalous (independent) unit of the imperial church, within the Patriarchate of Rome. That is to say, the position of Justiniana Prima would be the equivalent of Ephesus for Asia, Caesarea of Cappadocia for Pontus, and Thessalonica for Macedonia.

The written sources provide information about the role of diocesan primates (archbishops) and their duties. The letters of Basil of Caesarea, reveal that the bishop of the diocesan capital of Pontus held annual councils with the metropolitans and bishops under his jurisdiction. These meetings were normally organized during the festival of the local martyr Eupsychios, and were the opportunity for various kinds of ecclesiastical business to be carried out, such as the election of new bishops, and meetings of the clergy with the civil authorities. Regular episcopal meetings were probably instrumental in carrying out the government of the church, and they seem to have become closely related to the cult of local saints, to whose festivals the bishops were invited to participate, providing the occasion for their gatherings. Indeed, one of the archiepiscopal seals found in Caricin Grad bears the image of the martyr Saint Priscus, whose cult must have been central in the life of the new archbishopric.

The special role of archbishoprics in the administration of the church probably had implications for their building infrastructure, but our archaeological knowledge about archiepiscopal residences in Late Antiquity is very small: the residences of the bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Jerusalem, Ephesus, Caesarea, and Thessalonike are virtually unknown. By contrast, the excavations at Caricin Grad have revealed an entire city which was built in purpose, partly in order to serve as the base of a diocesan primate. An exceptional and unique site in every way, Caricin Grad can provide us with information about how the East Roman authorities understood a city associated with the specific functions of an archdiocese. This paper will discuss how our understanding of the site can be enhanced and informed by taking account of its special status in the administrative landscape of the East Roman Empire and its church.

The compound of the fortified acropolis of Caricin Grad has been reasonably identified as the archiepiscopal residence and cathedral. By its size, fortification, and inner organisation, this fortified
residence recalls other Justinianic structures of the Limes provinces, such as the Sinai Monastery, and the fortresses of North Africa. Its most distinctive element are two large reception halls, perhaps related with episcopal councils under the archbishop of Justiniana Prima. Their building type is repeated in the compound of the so-called praetorium in the Upper Town, which has been tentatively interpreted as the headquarters of the civil or military authority. This interpretation is currently difficult to prove, but, if true, the peripheral position and small size of the so-called praetorium would suggest that the role of the civil authority in Justiniana Prima was secondary. The city was dominated by ecclesiastical complexes, the number and density of which turned the urban space into a ritual landscape. Could these numerous churches represent the cults of martyrs and saints in the jurisdiction of Justiniana Prima, thus celebrating the bonds between the archbishop and his suffragans? For all purposes, it seems that the whole city of Justiniana Prima was designed as an extended archiepiscopal residence, a Byzantine ‘cathedral city’.
Les espaces domestiques et économies de la résidence épiscopale protobyzantine de Byllis (Albanie)

Dans son état du VIᵉ s., le groupe épiscopal de Byllis était bordé au sud par un passage ouest/est, qui desservait l'atrium, l'exonarthex et l'ensemble baptismal de la basilique cathédrale. Vers l'est, cet ancien decumanus envahi par l'Église, traversait une cour quadrangulaire autour de laquelle se concentraient les activités profanes, économiques, agricoles, du quartier épiscopal. Véritable secteur voué au service de l'évêque, cette insula episcopalis a pris forme au tout début du VIᵉ s. Elle constituait un ensemble urbain cohérent, dépendant de l'évêché mais distinct de l'espace liturgique, coupé de l'espace public mais possédant un accès direct au cardo longé par le rempart protobyzantin.

La cour médiane résultait de l'arasement vers la fin du Vᵉ s. des bâtiments qui bordaient le decumanus au sud, suivant la grille urbaine hellénistique. À leur place on édifia un grand bâtiment pourvu d'un étage, dont l'alignement différait nettement et qui fermait au sud la cour qu'il dominait par son volume. Les fenêtres des cinq pièces de l'étage ouvrant vers la cour portaient un décor crucifère répondant à celui du groupe épiscopal. Du côté nord, l'espace était longé par un entrepôt et par un chai dont la façade sur l'ancien decumanus prolongeait celle du groupe cathédral. Appartenant à l'ultime phase chronologique, un bâtiment irrégulier vint presque fermer la cour au sud-ouest. Ouvert sur le passage qui desservait les annexes de la cathédrale, ce petit édifice dont les murs étaient montés à la terre affichait pourtant aux fenêtres de son étage, pavé d'une mosaïque grossière, un décor proche de celui du bâtiment sud avec lequel il devait d'ailleurs communiquer – ce qui lui conférait une certaine dignité. La porte fermant le passage à son angle nord-est acheva de clore la cour et de la séparer du domaine proprement liturgique.

De plain-pied, le bâtiment du chai a quant à lui livré une belle installation vinicole de la seconde moitié du VIᵉ s., des fouloirs aux celliers. Dans l'angle sud-est de sa pièce orientale, un fouloir se déversait dans une baignoire remployée, d'où le moût décanté pouvait être transvasé dans quatre pithoi étanchés au bitume, alignés à l'est. Dans l'angle nord-est, un second fouloir muni d’un escalier extérieur, se déversait en cascade d'est en ouest dans un bassin de recueil puis, à travers un mur de refend, dans une profonde cuve de vinification carrée, que fermait un couvercle de bois. Les autres pièces du chai servaient au stockage du vin dans des rangées de pithoi bitumés.

Le grand bâtiment méridional combinait enfin, avec son voisin, fonctions domestiques (habitat à l'étage, avec des cheminées ; grande cuisine de plain pied avec batterie de foyers au sud, cave/cellier) et activités économiques en rez-de-chaussée, vers la cour (étable; boucherie; moulin à huile…). L'étage aux fenêtres ornées de ces bâtiments sud et sud-ouest constituait probablement la résidence même de l'évêque de Byllis.
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Introduction

Archaeology is transforming and increasingly defining our knowledge of the transition from Antiquity to the Middle Ages, not only in the urban centres and the frontier areas, but also in the internally marginal transit zones of the late Roman world. It has long been known that the Aegean islands possess an unparalleled wealth of material evidence in the form of the 200 or so Byzantine era churches still standing on the island of Naxos, many of which include an early medieval phase. In recent years, work by the local ephorate of antiquities as well as by other European teams from Norway and the U.K., has greatly clarified the context in which these monuments should be studied and the value of the documentation they provide. The construction and decoration phases have been more securely dated, and in some churches, earlier phases have been discovered beneath the middle Byzantine or later surfaces. Surveys have revealed the settlement and cultivation history of the land surrounding the monuments. An early Byzantine occupation phase, including churches, has been uncovered beside the ancient (4th c. BC) tower of Heimarros. Above all, surveys and excavations conducted at the site of Apalirou since 2010 have demonstrated the existence there of a major fortified town, planned and constructed in the 7th c., with an impressive infrastructure of food and water supply. Meanwhile, archaeological research in the ‘Small Cyclades’ has shown that the sea lanes around Naxos remained busy after the 6th c.; on the other hand, work on the neighbouring island of Paros has not contradicted the picture of abandonment presented by a 10th-c. written source.

In this session, field archaeologists currently working on this material interpret the significance of their findings for understanding the place of the central Aegean islands in the Byzantine Empire of the 7th and 8th centuries. The concluding general discussion will consider their results in the light of the broader historical trends of the period.
Naxos and Paros from Late Antiquity to the Byzantine World.
A Case Study of the Settlement Evolution

The uninterrupted human activity on Naxos since the Neolithic period has left many visual traces on the natural and cultural environment of the island. In particular, Naxos has become the focus of archaeological interest because of its important Byzantine monuments. In this presentation we will overview the evolution of the settlement pattern on Naxos from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages in comparison with neighboring Paros, examining the reasons why these two islands of the same importance during the early Byzantine period had a different evolution later.

Naxos is the largest island of Cyclades with a total surface measuring 429 Km² while Paros, which is third in rank, measures 196 Km². These two islands occupy a central position in the Cycladic complex and the Aegean Sea network surrounded by other large and small islands. During the late Roman Period the shift of the capital to the east raised the geographical and economic importance of Naxos and Paros at the heart of the Aegean Sea commercial routes, agrarian production and international transactions, which also included other insular cities, as Amorgos, Ios and Thera according to the Synekdimos of Hierocles. Archaeological research has also traced remnants of satellite late Roman settlements in Schinoussa, Ano Koufonissi, Keros, Pholegandros and Sikinos. Administratively, these islands became part of the Provincia Insularum, the capital of which was the city of Rhodes. Later, under the reign of Justinian, they were reorganized under the new administrative unit of Quaestura Exercitus to serve the supplying of the army. Naxos and Paros had already been episcopal seats of the metropolis of Rhodes by the 4th century.

The landscape of Naxos is mainly mountainous in the central and eastern part, while fertile valleys open up between the hills at Tragaia and Sagri. Zas is the highest peak of the Cyclades, with a height of 1004 m. The western part is occupied by large coastal plains. The landscape defined the agricultural and stock raising production of the island up to today. According to the evidence of excavations at Chora, Gyroulas and Iria and the locations of Early Christian monuments, it is rather certain that the ancient settlement pattern was continued during the late Roman Period. The main settlement of the island remained the Polis of Naxos in the western lowland surrounded by two natural ports and two hills suitable for defence. The areas of Grotta and Aplomata to the north of Kastro were densely populated from the 4th century onwards. The remnants of a luxurious house with mosaic pavement were discovered on the south side of Aplomata. The temple of Apollo at Palatia was converted to a Christian Basilica. The ancient aqueduct from Flerio, reconstructed twice during the Roman Period to a length of 11km, remained active until the 7th or 8th c. Numismatic evidence from the excavations at Chora covers the 6th and the first half of the 7th c.
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A series of Christian basilicas dated from the 5th to the middle of the 7th c. indicate sites of human activity. Four were located on the western coastal or lowland areas: Ag. Stephanos at Aggidia, Ag. Georgios at Iria, Ag. Matthaios at Plaka and Ag. Akepsimas at Polichni. In the hinterland a number of monuments indicates sites of human activity on the plateau of Tragea: Panaghia Protothronos at Chalki, Ag. Isidoros at Rachi, Panaghia Drosiani at Moni. The ancient temple of Gyroula at Sagri was converted to a Christian basilica. In the southeast the basilicas next to the ancient tower of Cheimarros and near Kaminos indicate that the ancient inland itinerary to the port of Panormos maintained its importance. Potsherds and architectural remnants at Panormos testify that the port continued to connect Naxos to the satellite settlements of Schinoussa, Koufonissi and Keros. Two basilicas on Naxos were related to ancient towers at Plaka and Cheimarros, while three ancient temples at Palatia, Iria and Gyroula were converted to Christian basilicas. Most of the other monuments were constructed near sites where ancient human activity is attested. It seems that the ancient settlement and activity pattern which corresponds to the natural resources of Naxos was continued. Inland and coastal activities along with economic growth and a calm transition to Christianity can be observed.

Paros, has a quite different geomorphology than Naxos. From north to south the mountainous central part (with the highest peak of Prophet Elias at 776 m altitude) is surrounded by fertile lowlands near the sea coves, where all the late Roman settlements flourished. Another factor for its financial wealth from ancient times, was its local white and transparent marble, the “paria lithos”. It was used at least until the first half of the 6th c. in the basilicas of the island and first of all in Panagia Ekatontapyliani at Paroikia. The three-aisled cross-shaped domed basilica of Ekatontapyliani, one of the most important early Byzantine monuments, alongside the chapel of Ag. Nikolaos and the later dated Baptistery, proves by itself the importance of the island during this period. The recent excavation work by the Ephorate of Antiquities of Cyclades (EFAKYK) brought to light pottery evidence dating from the Constantinian to the post-Justinian period (c. 650): Imports from Asia Minor, Cyprus, Palestine and North Africa show the commercial connections of Paros all over the empire. Also, the finds of Late Roman Parian amphoras shed light on the local economy and the agricultural production of the island during the 6th c. The «κατά την πόλιν» complex of Ekatontapyliani was obviously a point of reference of the religious and everyday life of late Roman Paroikia, the main settlement of the island in all periods. The extension of the settlement is proved by pottery finds from recent excavation work at the castle hill of Paroikia near the modern port, as well as by another basilica, the “Treis Ekklisies”, outside Paroikia.

The existence of other Late Roman settlements of the island is indicated by the preserved parts of the basilica of “Aghios Georgios” in Voutakos on the SW side of the island, from which there are sculptures of this period. It has been hypothesized that there were also two other basilicas in the current location of the Byzantine churches of Eyagelistria at Episkopiana, to the SW of Paroikia and a ruined anonymous church at Protoria, to the SW of Naoussa.

At Naoussa, a big natural harbor on the north coast of the island, the recent research by the 2nd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities (2nd EBA) and today by EFAKYK has brought to light one mass production center of Parian early Byzantine amphoras: At the site of Lageri, in the cove of Zoodhochos Pighi that is well protected from the winds, the excavation has revealed two quite well preserved amphora kilns, amphora workshop wasters and architectural remains connected with a very active port, near which those amphoras were produced and exported. This is the second known
mass amphora production center of the Aegean, the first one being at Halasarna in Kos; here the state control is clear since it is the first known workshop of stamped Late Roman amphoras with the depiction of emperors and inscriptions of officials. Both the Parian amphoras of the Lageri workshops and the Koan production are dated to the second half of the 6th c., therefore after the creation of the quaedestra Justinianae exercitus unit, the needs of which it probably served (supplies to the army), and until the first half of the 7th c. Finally, another Late Roman settlement on the SE of the island is indicated by burials of the end of the 6th–start of the 7th c., which were revealed at the surrounding of the Byzantine church of Ag. Georgios Thalassitis at Piso Livadi.

At Naxos it seems that coastal activities, habitation and agriculture were interrupted during the 7th c. There is not solid archaeological evidence from coastal sites except Chora, where numismatic evidence from excavations stops abruptly after the reign of Heraclius. However, a solidus of Constantine V (741-775) and a miliaresion of Leon V (813-820) rather indicate that the site was never totally abandoned. The aqueduct remained in use until the 7th or 8th century.

The main indication for the reorganization of the settlement pattern of Naxos derives from the locations of the new churches which were constructed during the 8th and 9th c. They were all located in the hinterland in remote and naturally protected sites, which usually had no visual connection to the sea. These churches had generally limited dimensions, simple architectural plans, and almost no sculptural decoration. Most of them were related to the network of paved pathways which encompass the inland of Naxos. Their locations indicate old and new sites of agricultural and stock raising production. Additionally, the inland early Christian monuments remained in use. But the western coastal Basilicas, were already in ruins during the middle Byzantine period and small churches were constructed upon their sanctuaries. Only part of the vaulting of Ag. Akepsimas remains intact today. It is estimated that about 20 monuments in the inland of Naxos have layers or traces of aniconic painted decoration. Previous research ascribed them mostly to the period of Iconomachy. Although this is not confirmed, there are a few examples rather securely related to this period as Ag. Kyriaki Apeiranthou, Ag. Artemios Sagriou, Ag. Ioannis Adissarou and the second layer of Protothronos.

The diaspora of the Dark Ages monuments indicates that earlier settlements remained inland at the valleys of Chalki and Sagri while new settlements were developed on the mountainous areas of Apeiranthos and Danakos. The fortified settlement on the Apalirou hill at Sagri succeeded the Polis of Naxos as the main settlement of the island. K. Aslanides distinguishes by size Agios Georgios, Panaghia Protothronos and Agios Georgios at Kastro Apalirou, Chalki and Apeiranthos respectively, indicating that these were the larger settlements of Naxos during the Dark Ages. During the survey program of the 2nd EBA around the churches of this period we discovered that many of them were constructed on sites where activity was already intense during the late Roman period.

A representative picture of the movement of coastal population eastwards to mountainous and protected sites is provided by the locations of monuments in the area to the west of Kastro Apalirou. On the coastal plains of Plaka and Polichni, the basilicas of Ag. Matthaios and Ag. Akepsimas were located in sites of intense agricultural activity protected by ancient towers. The size of Ag. Matthaios, its architectural and sculptural remnants, the floor mosaic which has been recently conserved by EFAKYK and many potsherds in the surrounding area indicate that a late Roman settlement existed at this site. At a distance of 2 km. to the east, on a higher plateau about 150 m. above sea level,
stands the cross-shaped church of Ag. Kyriaki at Stavropigi. The site has no direct visual contact to the sea. The church preserves aniconic decoration similar to Ag. Artemios at Sagri, which is dated to the 9th c. On the plateau north of the church during the survey program we discovered many sherd of late Roman terra sigillata and amphorae. From this site the settlement of Gyroula at Sagri and Kastro Apalirou are easily accessible. Later on, around the 11th c. when a certain feeling of security was reestablished at Naxos after the recovery of Crete, Ag. Konstantinos Tripodon was constructed westwards on the edge of a lower plateau with direct visual contact to the sea. Even later, a small church was constructed using spolia on the site of the demolished Basilica of Ag. Matthaios. Similarly, near the plain of Engares on the north, two other monuments of this period, Panaghia Monastiriotissa and Ag. Dimitrios, were located inland on a narrow valley which develops from the west to the east, without visual contact to the sea. Evidence from later periods indicates a monastic use of these churches. In both examples the monuments were related to the network of the traditional pathways, which indicates not only the land trade routes, but also the itineraries of the movement of the population eastwards.

It seems that the coastal settlements of Paros, from the last quarter of the 7th c. onwards, were abandoned, asoin Naxos, and that the population moved inland. This is the general picture until around the 10th c. given by the published examples as well as the previously mentioned recent excavations of EFAKYK at Naousa and Paroikia. Only in very few cases, as from the dating of some wall paintings in the Ekatontapyliani or pottery finds at Paroikia, would be possible to extend the chronology to the 8th c. or even later. For this period, important information is found in the life of Hosia Theoktiste from Lesbos (9th c.) written by Niketas Magistros in the 10th c. Theoktiste escaped from the pirate ship that moored at Paros on its way from Lesbos to North Africa, she managed to get from Naousa to Paroikia through a forest which covered the uninhabited island, and lived for 35 years in the abandoned church of Ekatontapyliani, where she finally died. Her life was narrated to Niketas Magistros in the 10th c. by the ascetic Symeon, who met him on the still deserted island at the abandoned church of the Panagia. The situation seems to change by the 11th c. The ecclesiastical connection of Paros and Naxos under the Metropolis Paronaxias (1083), is associated with population growth as well. Sculpture fragments of the first half of the 11th c. have been found in second use at the post-Byzantine chapel of Ag Anna and the Koimisis Theotokou of Kastellanos, near Marpissa. One small hoard of 12th-c. coins was found under the mosaic floor of the baptistery of the Ekatontapyliani and a larger one of the same period at Naousa. Of the few Byzantine churches of Paros that are so far known, with the exception of Ag. Ioannis Theologos at Kato Marathi (11th-13th c.), most date from as late as the 13th c. (along with the Venetian castles of Paroikia, Naousa and Kefalos) and were built at the revived sites of late Roman settlements (the anonymous church in Protoria, Ag. Georgios Thalassitis at Piso Livadi, Evagelistria in Episkopiana). These settlements intercommunicated via routes like the so called “Byzantine path”, which formerly connected Paroikia, Lefkes and Prodromos, crossing the center of the island in a WE direction.

The picture of abandonment of the coastal settlements in Naxos and Paros is also confirmed in the case of the satellite late Roman settlement at Schinoussa. According to the pottery finds of the survey and excavations conducted by the 2nd EBA, late Roman activity on the spot covers the period from the second half of the 4th to the middle of the 7th c. The settlement was evidently abandoned, as traces of destruction have not been revealed. The latest types of red slip plates at Schinoussa characterize also the destruction layers of the settlement and the Acropolis of Emporio.
at Chios, which were dated by the excavators to the middle of the 7th c. and connected to the Arabic raids. The abandonment of the unfortified coastal Aegean settlements and the movement of the population to inaccessible fortified sites can be traced in other neighbouring islands as well. The citizens of Kamari and Perissa in Thera moved to ancient Thera, after clearing their houses of any useful items. The coastal settlement of ancient Amorgos at Katapola was abandoned during the 7th c. New fortified settlements were created in naturally protected sites like the Kastro at Chora and Langada at Aigiali.

The comparative study of Naxos and Paros in the period of transformation, during the Arab invasions, from the early Byzantine to the middle Byzantine period, confirms the general pattern that can be observed in other Cycladic and Aegean islands. Aegean coastal settlements were abandoned during the second half of the 7th c., in a dramatic change to the long lasting habitation pattern in the Aegean since the Classical period or even earlier. New middle Byzantine settlements arose inland, most notably on Naxos, the geomorphology of which (almost totally different of that of Paros) offered the highest level of security and self-sufficiency. Even if Paros was a quite large, prosperous and important island from ancient times until late antiquity, it did not emulate the flourishing of Naxos during the middle Byzantine period. The latter seems to have become the center around which the satellite smaller islands organized their commercial and cultural life. Naxos provides an exceptional opportunity to visualize this deep change through the uninterrupted continuity of human activity and material evidence, the plethora of monuments and especially the ongoing research of EFAKYK, often in collaboration with other research institutes, which will hopefully keep providing more information.
The Norwegian survey that began in 2010 has documented a larger urban settlement at Apalirou than archaeologists had expected. The question of how we now define the site is an important one. The discussion on Dark Age urbanisation has been dominated by the question of continuity and transition to the extent that definition can only move forward by looking backwards (Curta 2016, Zavagno 2009). In the case of Apalirou, which was laid out on a virgin site, the question of continuity exists only in a broader regional sense. Florin Curta recently pointed out “the endless and fruitless debates of finding a proper name for such urban centres - polis or kastron” (Curta 2016:96). However some form of definition is required in order to interpret the site. The situation on a steep and inaccessible mountain to the southern half of Naxos and a movement away from the coast suggests that Apalirou was constructed as refuge and kastron.

In terms of dating, preliminary interpretations based upon the historical and regional context, and unstratified surface material so far point to Apalirou as a mid-7th century fortified urban foundation (Hill et al. 2016). The use of urban in this context is based upon the scale of the site, and the density and type of structures within the walls. We have noted that as fieldwork continues it is becoming increasingly clear that refuge or fortress is an inadequate definition.

Apalirou is far from the developed city plans of Mistras, Trebizond and Salonica, with a typical tripartite division of the defences in a larger city, inner city and a citadel (Foss 1986: 8). On the other hand, we can see clear signs of an organised plan at Apalirou, with a large ecclesiastical complex, an “official” section separated to the North with access through what appears to be monumental stairs entering through massive walls on each side. The remaining and larger section consists of a complex terraced street plan, with 70 houses documented so far (that number is expected to at least double as many buildings lie underneath their collapse and cannot be clearly documented). Two hydraulic solutions are visible; a communal one that leads water from across the site, through a system of gutters into large community cisterns at the lowest part of the site, and numerous smaller private cisterns connected to the individual houses. Within the walls an olive/wine press has been found, and just outside the walls a system of cultivation terraces with a threshing floor, which is probably contemporary with the site, suggests that the community produced food for their own needs.

A presentation of the scale and density of urban structure will only give a one-dimensional discussion and at some point a social and economic approach will have to be made. The site is large enough to be called a town, but the situation upon a mountain that compromises economic activity, as well as the distance from the coast, which is important to insular societies, makes it difficult to discard the kastron label. On the other hand we have noted that what at first appeared to be a steep, mountainous site was not necessarily an obstacle for maritime trade and communication, since being on the coast could also be a way to isolate the (inland) economy (Laiou & Morrisson 2007:15). A steep mountaintop was clearly chosen from a defensive point of view; however the militaristic, defensive aspects of the site were never fully exploited at Apalirou. On the contrary, the most accessible and vulnerable side on the West slope has no visible towers for 166 metres, and the defence wall has only eight towers altogether.
A plan of all visible structures has been produced and will be refined through continuing fieldwork. What is also needed is a more detailed idea of the structural stratigraphy of the site and its phases. An urban place with a normal demographic profile should show signs of continuing development over time, and contain a varied typology of buildings and structures developing as private solutions and adoptions are sought. A fortress or refuge that is only used when it needed and/or populated by institutions would arguably not show the same diversity in typology and phasing.

In the last two seasons fieldwork focused upon the smallest church at Apalirou and have emptied the structure for collapsed rubble; we were primarily concerned with being able to identify building phases and recovering dateable and diagnostic material. The church was chosen due to its situation within a space in the cliffs that appears to have been created through stone cutting. We considered that the defensive walls were constructed first, and the quarrying needed to provide the stone would have created spaces for buildings. So far this approach has identified a number of phases:

1. The creating of a space from stone cutting.
2. The construction of the church within that space.
3. A collapse phase.
4. A rebuild.
5. A second and final collapse phase.

The church relates to neighbouring structures and as we identify those relationships it is possible to begin to build up a matrix of structural phases.

This presentation will present the status of the fieldwork to date and present one of the rare opportunities that archaeologists have—to work upon an urban site from the 7th century that is completely without historical sources. To highlight that aspect I would like to point out that we do not know what the site was called. The name Kastro Apalirou, which first appears in a text from the 17th century is clearly not the original name of the site.
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Kastro Apalirou and the Infrastructure of Southern Naxos

Recent archaeological fieldwork seems to have established that Kastro Apalirou was founded on a previously uninhabited site sometime in the 7th century AD. Although there were presumably important settlements and sanctuaries in the lower-lying areas to the west, the foundation of a new, fortified urban centre on a hilltop must have created a completely new infrastructure in this part of the island.

Although it is too early to specify the population of the new urban site, fieldwork is steadily augmenting the number of habitations both inside Kastro Apalirou and immediately on the outside, in a small village-like cluster of houses on the western slope below Kastro. Providing the town with food and other supplies, for which ample evidence is available in the abundance of amphorae-fragments, would have necessitated a well-functioning network of roads.

The town of Kastro Apalirou has only one gate and this is quite obviously the departing point for any reconstruction of the infrastructure. There are few actual remains of the extraurban road network outside the walls, but we can presume they exploited the terracewalls that can still be seen on the western slope. The recent discovery of a new, large church on an artificial terrace immediately outside the gate to the southwest is probably an indication of the importance of the main road towards the town. The church is evidently part of a larger complex, since there are structures around it, including a house with a cistern in the basement. Because of these features, and the proximity of the town, it is possible that the complex once formed a monastery.

Beyond this point there are few clearly visible traces of the roads that led to Kastro Apalirou, but based on survey and aerial photographs, one road can perhaps be traced to the north and the Tragea. This may have linked up with a road which in later phases is still clearly visible and still in use towards Chalki.

An important question regarding the foundation of Kastro Apalirou regards communication by sea. The distance and difficult access to and from Chora, which functioned as the main harbour and settlement during Antiquity and after the Latin conquest, would probably have necessitated use of harbours on the southern side of the island. The closest candidate is the Bay of Aghiassos, right to the south of Kastro Apalirou. Based on a preliminary survey of the Norwegian Maritime Museum, it is, however, not likely that this bay was suited as harbour. First of all, there are shallows and reefs right outside the sandy bay that would make access to the beach difficult. Secondly, ships entering into the Bay of Aghiassos would have had to face the predominant strong northern winds and it is doubtful whether larger ships in ancient and Byzantine times were very efficient in crossing against such strong winds. Better candidates for a harbour would have been further south, almost on the southern tip of the island, where promising features, as well as amphorae, has been reported. One may therefore suggest that a main road led along the coast and northwards into the Marathos-region, before climbing up to the village on the western slope below Kastro Apalirou. This would have been an ideal spot for unloading carts and transporting goods on donkeys and mules the last and steepest part up to Kastro Apalirou.
The aim of this presentation has been to show what we know so far about the immediate vicinity of Kastro Apalirou and the infrastructure linking the town to the interior as well as to possible ports in the southern part of the island. This is still very hypothetical, but forms one important research topic for the future, when it will also be possible to integrate the results from the archaeological survey conducted by the universities of Newcastle and Edinburgh into a more detailed study of the Byzantine infrastructure of the southern part of Naxos.
Landscape and Settlement on Byzantine Naxos

Naxos is the largest of the Cyclades and its distinctive landscape character has long been recognised by islanders and visitors, who frequently describe it as one of the most beautiful Greek islands. Topography, geology and climate have combined to create a series of markedly different environment zones. A high spine of limestone mountains runs from north to south, separating the steep valleys of the island’s eastern third from the alluvial plains and low granite hills of the west. Today most people live in these low-lying western areas and in the fertile upland plain of Traghea/Dhrymalia, which nestles below the highest peak in the Cyclades, Mount Zas.

Whilst the special qualities of the island’s landscape are well-known to geologists and ecologists, its historic character is not so well understood. Historical sources provide some information about the historic landscape. An Ottoman tax register of 1670 shows that the island was divided into 56 estates (called *topoi* in Greek). They seem likely to have been the same 56 estates established by the Venetian conqueror Marco I Sanudo when he had established Venetian supremacy in 1207 (Slot 1991, 197-98). In the seventeenth century much of the agricultural land on Naxos comprised large fields subdivided into small plots that were cultivated side-by-side by different farmers. The outer boundaries of the fields were sometimes stone walls, but also irrigation channels, trees, boulders and other natural features (Kasdagli 1999, 90). In mountainous areas, it seems likely that the steep hillsides were terraced to create blocks known as *louroi* in the written sources (Kasdagli 1999: 88).

As in many Mediterranean countries, the origins and evolution of the cultural landscape of settlements, roads, fields and terraces, remains poorly understood. Whilst these elements are valued by local people and tourists for their contribution to the island scene, their medieval and earlier histories remain largely unappreciated. The many archaeological interventions on the island have usually focussed on specific monuments. Major excavation and survey projects have focused on important classical sites like the temples of Giroulas and Iria, or the aqueducts which brought the waters of Flerio to the island’s classical and late Antique centre at Chora (Sfyroera and Lambrinoudakis 2010). Relatively little archaeological research has considered the landscape context for these monuments. In the 1980s a French team undertook extensive field survey in the north-west of the island. Their work identified a number of prehistoric and classical sites, but did not consider the post-classical landscape in any detail (Dalongueville and Renault-Miskovsky 1993). In 2015 a new field survey in the south-eastern part of Naxos began under the aegis of the University of Cambridge. Although this research will greatly improve our knowledge of that area and its maritime relationships, its focus is mainly on the settlement systems of the early Bronze Age.
The heritage of Naxos is best known to Byzantinists for its dense scatter of small rural churches dating to the Middle Ages, which has long been recognised as exceptional not only in the Aegean but also in the wider context of the eastern Mediterranean (Dimitrokallis 1968; 2000; Chatzidakis 1989; Mastoropoulos 2006; Aslanidis 2014). Naxos is particularly unusual because a relatively high proportion of these buildings appear to date to the early Middle Ages (AD c. 600-1000). Out of a total of around 150 Byzantine churches, perhaps as many as 50 should be dated to the early medieval period. Of these early examples, more than 20 preserve the distinctive geometric decoration known to art historians as ‘aniconic’ (Crow and Turner 2015,202). This means that Naxos preserves a greater density of Byzantine churches with significant surviving early medieval fabric than anywhere else in Greece.

Characterising the historic landscape

The possibility of researching a relatively unexplored historic landscape with many surviving Byzantine churches led us to initiate our research programme using Naxos as a case study in 2006-7. Our initial work took the form of a desk-based assessment using GIS (Geographical Information Systems) to analyse the historic landscape using data from aerial photography and satellite remote sensing. The research was part of a project designed to investigate the applicability in Mediterranean contexts of a method developed in the UK which is known as ‘historic landscape characterisation’ (HLC) (Turner 2006). Through case-studies on Naxos and around Silivri (Thrace, Turkey: Crow and Turner 2009), we were able to show that distinctive historic landscape types could be recognised and used to map patterns of historic landscape character (Turner and Crow 2010). During this initial phase we were fortunate to establish a collaboration with Dr Athanasios Vionis, who had recently undertaken fieldwork on behalf of the 2nd Ephorate of Byzantine Archaeology and its then Ephor, Dr Charalambos Pennas. Together we used the GIS analysis and the historic characterisation to help understand some aspects of the location of the churches, for example their relationships to areas of cultivated land (Crow et al. 2011). We were also able to indicate the strong likelihood that many of the terrace systems on Naxos have early origins, dating at least to the medieval period and in some cases earlier. Nevertheless, because our early work did not involve fieldwork, our conclusions about the chronological relationships between churches and landscape types were only tentative. Vionis’ recent fieldwork had included rapid ceramic survey around a selection of the known early medieval churches which suggested that early Byzantine settlement was often located in their vicinity. The potential for renewed fieldwork to inform the landscape analysis was clear.

Apalirou Environs Project

Since 2009 a team led by Prof. Knut Odegard from the University of Olso (Norway) has been carrying out detailed survey of site at Kastro Apalirou, which occupies a mountainous spur rising to 474 m above sea level on the south-western approach to Mount Zas. The Norwegian survey has been able to document and plan the houses, streets, churches and other structures within and around the walled area of this mountain-top kastro. Our team has had the opportunity to collaborate with the Oslo group and the Cyclades Ephorate to develop a field survey of the wider region in the form of the Apalirou Environs Project. This began in 2015 with systematic ceramic survey in the immediate vicinity of the kastro combined with detailed survey of remains of an extensive village which has been discovered on the west flank of the mountainside, and which we call ‘Kato Apalirou’. In addition we commenced a detailed documentation of some of the important early churches in the survey area, including Ag Ioannis at Adissarou with its distinctive aniconic decoration, and the several ruined churches associated with the Kato Apalirou settlement.
The mountainside immediately to the west of the kastro drops steeply into a shallow bowl before sloping down sharply towards the fertile plain of Lathrina. In July 2015 we carried out an intensive pick-up survey using systematic line field-walking with participants spaced at 10m intervals on 100 x 100m transects (using the method based on that described by Bevan and Connolly 2013). Having established a grid with a Leica dGPS we were able to collect approximately 20,000 sherds which are now stored in the Byzantine Museum at Chora Naxou. The method employed quantities of ceramics which were collected represented a total sample approximating to around 10% of the material from the western slope, which was surveyed from the outer face of the west curtain wall of the kastro, down to the lower field wall of Kato Apalirou (a total area of around 11 hectares in 2015).

Processing of the finds was begun during the field season at the Byzantine Museum in Chora by Mark Jackson, Maria Duggan and Hallvard Indgjerd. At the first level body and feature sherds (handles, rims etc.) were split with initial quantification by count and (more usefully) weight. At this stage the team began construction of a working ceramic type series for the project. A second level of detailed quantification by type and estimated vessel equivalent was begun but will be completed during future museum study of the finds.

From preliminary observations by the ceramics team it was possible to suggest that the main period of occupation on the kastro itself extended from the later-sixth to the eleventh century AD. On the steepest scree slopes immediately below the kastro walls the evidence suggests the main period of occupation extended from the later sixth to the eleventh century. Although there are the remains of structures in this area including terraces and some buildings, the majority of this material is assumed to derive largely from the kastro above (this theory will be tested using spatial analysis to establish the likely movement of objects downslope when the ceramic analysis has been completed). Lower down the mountainside, the initial evaluation of ceramics collected from the area of Kato Apalirou suggests a more restricted period of occupation, perhaps from the late-sixth to the ninth century AD.

**Kato Apalirou**

Below the steep, sherd-covered flanks of the kastro is an extensive walled enclosure measuring 200m N-S and 250m W-E, today partly covered with dense juniper wood which obscures traces of old terraces and stone buildings. Further down the slope to the west the ground becomes more open and level and there are the remains of a later farmstead and other buildings probably contemporary with the enclosure wall. The area of Kato Apalirou is limited and screened from the plains of Lathrinou and Marathos to the west and south by a series of rocky knolls. The enclosure wall is clearly secondary to the terraces and buildings which extend across the upper slope for over 200 m from N-S. Survey with a total station has been able to define dense groups of buildings, many of them set on stepped and braided terraces. In the south part of the site some of the houses are seen to be approximately square and laid out in rows. Further north and beyond the north side of the enclosure wall there are traces of long houses, with clear internal subdivisions. All appear to be dry-stone built or clay/soil bonded with no evidence for lime mortar. Unlike the structures of the kastro there is no evidence for cisterns either associated with or below the houses. It is still not possible to discern the density of the settlement, although in places there are rows of four or more buildings, with lowers rows down the slope. Altogether we have been able to identify at least 50 individual structures and we are confident that further survey will be able to document many more.
The ceramic survey noted from the slopes towards the *kastro* has not yet completed the area of Kato Apalirou, however a preliminary assessment suggests that it dated between the later-sixth and tenth centuries, with a terminal date significantly earlier than from the *kastro* itself. Four churches are known, the church dedicated to the Theoskepasti situated on the boundary wall on the east side is discussed in the next section. Towards the centre of the settlement is a ruined single-apsed church with a secondary side aisle on the south side. It is located on a distinctive knoll and provides a central focus for the settlement. Below the south enclosure wall traces of an apse indicate another chapel. Villages of later medieval date are known from the Peloponnese and elsewhere (Kourelis 2005; Gregory 2013) but what is significant about Kato Apalirou is the early date in the Transitional period and its association with the *kastro* above.

**Building Survey**

In 2015 our team also began to record selected buildings using detailed methods, including photography and terrestrial laser scanning. These monuments included the archaeological remains of two churches in the deserted settlement of Kato Apalirou, along with two standing monuments: the small churches of Ag. Ioannis Adissarou to the north-west of Apalirou and the church of (?) Theoskepasti in Kato Apalirou. Although the island’s Byzantine churches have been subject to relatively sustained research, many questions remain about their foundation and context. Our aim is to produce detailed analyses of these structures using the methods of digital buildings archaeology and try to understand how the histories of the buildings may be related to the long-term histories of their surrounding landscapes.

In the field conventional survey using photography and record sheets was complemented by digital survey undertaken by Alex Turner and Sam Turner with a Faro Focus x330 laser scanner. The resulting data was processed using Faro SCENE software to create 3D point clouds. These point clouds provide a detailed survey of the buildings that can be used directly for analysis, or exported to provide the basis for 3D solid models of the buildings. All the buildings we studied were shown to have long histories of development and change, including the ruined or part-ruined churches of Kato Apalirou.

The church of Theoskepasti in Kato Apalirou provides an example of a surprisingly complex building. This deceptively tiny structure today measures just 3.32 m long x 2.29 m from the west wall to the springing of its apse, which is set without windows directly against the rocky mountainside. The church has the appearance today of a post-medieval chapel but detailed survey showed that this is certainly due to a renovation which took place sometime before the late nineteenth century. Careful analysis showed that this work effectively remodelled the second of two medieval phases, whose stone roof is preserved in the current vault. The survey also showed that in the earliest phase the church was at least twice its present size, extending a further 3.6 m to the west. The building is surrounded by the archaeological remains of domestic structures and it seems most likely that it was one of at least four churches we have identified so far in Kato Apalirou. Our detailed survey of the site is enabling us to understand how the space of an early Byzantine village was articulated, including the relationships between streets, houses and churches.
Conclusion

Our programme of research on Naxos aims to take a multi-scale assessment of the landscapes of the island and focuses particularly on the periods from the end of the classical world to recent times. Through HLC assessment we have been able to demonstrate the potential for future landscape research which will be combined with intensive surface survey in the Apalirou Environ Project. Analysis of the detailed survey data from the flanks of Apalirou Kastro can contribute to a better understanding of the chronology of the occupation of the kastro and its settlement. In addition the large sample of ceramic material collected so far will also contribute to a better awareness of the economic and cultural connections of the community through trade and exchange in the Aegean and beyond and potentially help to define the character of the defended settlement. Study of the lower Kato Apalirou has been able to discern an extensive open settlement contemporary with the kastro. Settlements of this period (better termed ‘Transitional rather than Dark Age) are extremely rare in Byzantine Greece and Asia Minor and the juxtaposition of a defended settlement with possible elite structures, cisterns etc and the lower, more uniform dwellings below, helps to define a service/agricultural function for the latter, with a more public/state administrative role for the kastro. Further survey and study will ensure greater granularity to the chronological range of the ceramic material which can assist in assessing the historical context of the settlements. The transitional age in the Aegean was a period of new challenges by land and sea and the combined settlements of Apalirou show how the state and the island communities could reconfigure and demonstrate both resistance and resilience to external threats. Within the settlements of the transitional period and in the adjacent countryside the rich heritage of Byzantine churches reveals both patronage and a distinctive creativity defined by their aniconic decoration. Our documentation of the churches in the study area will enable a greater recognition of their structural complexity, as demonstrated at the Theoskepasti, and can ensure they are better contextualised as part of a wider diachronic landscape.
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Ag. Ioannis Adissarou, north-west of Kastro Apalirou, Naxos.
Profile showing north internal elevation based on laser scan data, July 2015.
Discussing Byzantine Churches with Monastic Use on Naxos (and the Neighboring Islands)

Naxos is renowned for its great number of Byzantine churches, and more so for the fact that the majority of them bear wall-paintings dating from the Early Christian period, and the period of Iconoclasm, to the 13th-early 14th centuries. Most specifically, in an island of around 450 square km, the number of known Byzantine churches is around two hundred.

Byzantine churches, most of them little chapels of small dimensions, are found everywhere; they are inside fortified kastro, mainly those of Apalirou and Tsikalario, outside their walls but near them, inside villages, in the midst of plains, and on inapproachable rocky mountains. But the greatest density of churches occurs in the plains dominated by the Early Byzantine kastro of Apalirou, in the broader area of Sagri, and in the central basin of Drimalia (Traghaia). The only place where Byzantine churches have not been detected as yet, although tradition mentions one, is Chora itself, the capital of the Venetians.

This abundance of churches begs the question of why there are so many; what were they all used for? In attempting to answer this question, we must bear in mind that churches, as sacred buildings, were not easily abandoned. They were constantly in use from the time they were built throughout the Byzantine era, as is proved by the fact that many of them have many successive architectural phases and more than one layer of wall paintings. Therefore, each new church constructed was, for the most part, added to the number of the already existing and functioning churches; it increased their number; it did not lead to the abandonment of any old one. It is as if each new one fulfilled a need.

We come back to the question: “What were they? Why are there so many?”

A few of them, indeed, were parish churches. Some of the villages of the island certainly go back to the Byzantine period. They are in the interior of the island, away from the coasts, which for many centuries were threatened by pirates and Saracens, they are mentioned in Late Byzantine and mainly in early Post-Byzantine (late Venetian and early Turkish) written sources. A few of the initial parish churches are still surviving. Protothronos in the village Chalki, big by Naxos' standards, with splendid wall-paintings in five layers, Early Byzantine (6th -7th c.) to 13th century, must be one of them. Apart from the church itself, a field survey carried out by the ex-2nd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities in 2006 came to the conclusion that a Late Roman (Early Christian) and a Middle Byzantine settlement-had existed on the site of the modern village. The fact that, in the Middle Byzantine period, Protothronos was also an episcopal church does not contradict its being the parish church of the settlement at the same time.

Some must have served as “parish” churches to small agricultural settlements. This could be the case of Aghia Kyriake Kehreon Stavropigis Tripodon and Panayia i Kera at Ammomaxi, both surrounded today by the ruins of settlements; Aghia Kyriaki Kallonis Aperathou, famous for its
aniconic decoration, could have served the settlements of miners, since it is near the emery mine, an important factor in the wealth of Naxos. In some cases little chapels are found near humble huts, built of dry stone, the ‘mitati’, forming with them family hamlets, locally known as “mazomi”, that is small husbandry’s settlements. This must be the case of Panaghia Chrysopigi at Korakia, near Apeiranthos.

Others could have been private chapels, on landowners’ properties, for private prayer or for housing the deceased members of the family, thus serving as funeral chapels.

Last of all, I left the category concerning us here, churches and chapels which had a monastic use, either serving as katholika in monastic settlements, monasteries and lavrai, or as chapels (εὐκτήριοι οἶκοι) for the life and prayer of individual ascetics.

Up to now, on Naxos, monastic use has been attributed to twenty-four churches dating from the Early Christian Period to the 14th century (the beginning of Venetian rule). Three caves, with monastic use, should be added to their number. This makes a total of twenty-seven known Byzantine monastic settlements on the island.

Yet, there is no documentary evidence for any of the above churches; no foundation charters (Τυπικά or Υποτυπώσεις), no testaments (Διαθήκαι), no codicils, no memoranda (Υπομνήματα), or even Lives of saints-mongks to serve as primary sources for the origin and function of any monasteries. Thus, for Naxos, as for many other places, the only surviving testament to a monastery is its physical existence plus tradition.

Therefore, other questions arise here: how far one can trust tradition to attribute monastic use to any church or chapel from the very beginning of their existence? Could they not have changed use in the course of their “lives”?

For some cases there can be no doubt.

This is, for example, the case of Moni Genniseos, commonly known as Kaloritsa or Kaloritissa. It is a cave monastery with two chapels built inside the cave and some later Byzantine and Post-Byzantine outbuildings at the entrance to the cave and on both its sides. Four or five successive layers of wall paintings, dating from the Middle Byzantine period (9th-10th centuries), and for some scholars from the pre-iconoclastic, Early Byzantine period, to the beginning of the 17th century, act as testimonies for the continuous use of the cave.

Caves have always been favoured by hermits for their seclusion. Many known cave hermitages, with time, were developed into monasteries. The most famous example is offered by the Enkleistra of St Neophytos at Paphos in Cyprus. In Kaloritsa the existence of a Byzantine refectory at the entrance to the cave on the left, as well as, of some cells, probably Post-Byzantine, outside the cave, leave no doubt about its monastic use. Further evidence is offered by tradition considering Aghios Ioannis Theologos Kaminou and a cave church, Panaghia sti Spilia, on Naxos, as ‘metochia’, dependent on the Monastery of Kaloritsa.

An anonymous humble chapel, a few metres to the right of the cave, built with the dry corbelling technique and bearing remnants of wall-paintings, must have been a “house of prayer” for further reclusive use by the monks of Kaloritsa, when it functioned as an organized monastery. Thus it adds to the physical evidence that this was a monastery.

For some other cases, one should be more cautious.
Panayia Drosiani, for example, is renowned mainly due to its wall-paintings, in four successive layers, dating from the Early Byzantine Period (mid 7th century) to the 13th century. The fact proves that the church never ceased to be in use. Moreover, Drosiani is the only triconch church of the island, with triconch side chapels.

According to local tradition it is a monastery. The nearby village, called Moni (=Monastery) after it, strengthens the tradition. Difficult theological meanings in the initial (7th century) decoration, like the unique double depiction of Christ in the dome, as a youth and as an adult, seem to be intended for a special, theologically cultivated congregation, who could very well have been monks. Yet, the plan of the katholikon, a triconch, led Drandakis who first studied the monument in depth, to suggest that perhaps the church was initially built as a mausoleum. The one use, though, does not necessarily exclude the other. Theodore Metochites, when he renovated and refurbished the Chora Monastery in Constantinople, at the beginning of the 14th century, added a funeral chapel for himself on the south side.

So, Drosiani could very well have been a mausoleum for the founder and his family, but at the same time, a monastery, where the founder or his family could retreat, an act which was a common practice.

Another study case is Moni Christou Photodoti or simply Photodotis (Christ the Light Giver). By Naxian standards, it is a large, impressive establishment, a 'pyrgomonastero' (tower-monastery). Initially there was a free-standing Early Byzantine three-aisled Basilica with a narthex. But, sometime during the Venetian era (14th or 16th century), when major rebuilding was undertaken, the church was incorporated into the basement of a tower, on the first floor of which a refectory, store rooms and cells were added. In the post-byzantine period it became dependent to the great monastery of Aghios Ioannis Theologos on Patmos.

Written sources referring to Photodotis as a monastery occur only from the 16th century onwards. Even so, there is nothing to make us doubt its being a monastery from the beginning. Its site, mountainous and idyllic, is ideal for a monastery. The 2006 Field survey, undertaken by the 2nd Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities, did not reveal any nearby settlement, to which Photodotis could have served as a parish church. The ruins of a single-aisled chapel, discovered at the southeast of the monastery, could belong to a "prayer chapel", a hermitage, dependent on the monastery, like the one near Kaloritsa.

Finally, St Akepsimas, initially a three-aisled basilica, which has been dated to the 6th century, according to tradition and the remains of various outbuildings, is connected with the presence of monks at a date later than its construction. The above mentioned 2006 Field Survey has proved that there existed a flourishing Late Roman settlement around the church, for which St Akepsimas could very well have served as a parish church. The area continued to be inhabited, less densely though, in the Middle-Byzantine and in the Venetian Period, during which time the church probably functioned as the katholikon of a monastery. So, archaeological data seem to prove tradition right and even more, in the case of St Akepsimas, tradition seems to "remember" the change of the use of a church.

Thus, when a church is known as "Moni" (monastery), there should not be much doubt about its use. This is the case of Moni Aghias, Monasteriotissa, Moni Stavrou, Aghioi Apostoloi Metochiou (= monastic dependency). The same applies to caves, like Spilaio Genniseos (Cave of the Nativity), at the top of Kalon Oros (Good Mountain), Panaghia sti Spilia (Virgin Mary in the Cave), where according to tradition monks from the Byzantine Monastery of Kaloritsa took refuge
and Theologaki (Little Theologos, John the Divine) near Chora. In other cases, one can rely on architectural remnants to postulate a monastic use. Such is the case of St Demetrios at Halandra Kynidarou and of an anonymous chapel outside the walls of the castle of Apalirou. The former, St Demetrius, which is known to be a monastery also by tradition, is complemented by cells and a refectory; and the latter, the anonymous chapel outside the walls of Apalirou, by a cell and a cistern. Their position, the first in an idyllic landscape near a rivulet and miniscule waterfalls, the second outside the walls of a fortified city, does not contradict such a use. For another church, Panaghia Kritommati, apart from the ruins of cells, we know it was a “metochi”, dependent on the Monastery of Panaghia Chozoviotissa on Amorgos.

If we plot the known churches with monastic use on the map of Naxos, we notice that, with few exceptions, they are all found in the central and northern part of the island, west of the mountain ridge running north - south. Nine of them are in the northwestern part of the island, in the areas of Galene, Egares, Aghia, Melanes, Chalandra, Kynidaros. Seven are in the plain of Sagri and three in the basin of Drimalia (Tragaia). Two are in the area of Chora.

Still, churches and chapels with monastic use were certainly more numerous and widespread. In the area of Aperathou, for example, where no church to which monastic use has been attributed is known, in our opinion, two small adjacent chapels, St Hermolaos at Kakava and Stavros (Holy Cross) to its right, were hermitages. Their small size, their position, the first abutting on a shallow cavity in the natural rock, the other half-built under the rock, in a beautiful landscape conducive to spiritual life, with running water and abundant vegetation, all seem suitable for hermitage chapels. So is the free cross-plan of the first chapel, and the compressed cross in square type of the second, found often in churches with monastic use. The 2006 Field survey, does not contradict such an attribution. According to it, “the area has no archaeological interest, no ceramic finds; it is barren, with berms and is used as a sheep farm”. So, it could be argued that the chapels would have been initially prayer chapels of a shepherds' settlement. But such a use would not be able to explain the number, two adjacent ones, instead of one, or the large number of niches found in the conch of the apse, the side walls of the sanctuary and the eastern wall of the transept, whose existence has not been interpreted yet, but could not have been of any use to a shepherds' community. A shepherds' prayer chapel wouldn't be able to explain the fact that, according to an inscription, Kakavas was endowed by a priest (presbyteros Petros).

Monastic use could also be attributed to Profitis Ilias Vlachaki, a single-aisled barrel vaulted chapel, built on a small rocky pre-historic fortification overlooking the bay of Moutsouna, again in the area of Apeiranthos. Apart from the suitability of the location, one should bear in mind that prophet Elijah lived in a cave like a hermit and together with John the Baptist was considered a model for ascetics.

Some of the churches with monastic use, such as Drosiani and Photodotis, are surrounded by fertile land; others, like the small monastic establishment outside the walls of the kastron of Apalirou, stand on barren rocky land. The difference could be explained by the fact that the first must have been katholika of organized monasteries, the others kathismata, that is, small monastic establishments, or even hermitages.

From the data to hand, we conclude that monasticism on Naxos, was practiced from the Early Christian period. Caves, such as is that of Kaloritsa, and the Spilaio Genniseos (Cave of the Nativity) at Kalon Oros, could have been occupied by monks, as early as the 4th century, since asceticism, was much flourishing then.
In the 6th–7th century, organized monasticism seems to gain ground. It is then that the ‘big’ monasteries, of Drosiani, of Photodotis, probably of Aghia, which according to Mastoropoulos bears pre-iconoclastic wall-paintings and the Monastery of Sagri are founded. The katholikon of the latter, a three-aisled basilica dedicated to St John the Theologian, which functioned from the 6th until the first half of the 8th century according to archaeological data, replaced the ancient temple of Demetra.

What is most interesting and needs further investigation is the fact that in a few of the churches considered to be monastic, there is aniconic, and iconoclastic decoration. Such are the cases of Photodotis, Aghios Dimitrios Chalandron, Monastiriotissa and even Kaloritsa. Whether that means that part of the monks accepted iconoclasm or that aniconic decoration had simply gained ground for decorative reasons, or for reasons not directly connected with the controversy over the use of the icons, is at the moment uncertain.

In the Middle Byzantine period monasticism flourished, since all the already existing monasteries remained active and many more were founded: Panaghia Attaleiotissa, Aghios Thallelaios, Panaghia Kritommati, Moni Stavrou, Aghioi Apostoloi Metochiou.

A few date from the Venetian period, 13th–14th centuries: Panaghia Rachidiotissa, Aghios Ioannis inside the castle of Apano Kastro, Aghios Ioannis o Theologos Kaminou (Ai-Theos).

Therefore, it seems that monasticism and asceticism were widespread on Naxos during the whole of the Byzantine era, as in all parts of the Byzantine world. Monasticism in the Aegean has not received any special attention from scholars until now. There are of course a few known monasteries, like Aghios Ioannis o Theologos on Patmos, Nea Moni Chiou, Panaghia Chozoviotissa on Amorgos. In addition to that, place names signifying churches or hermitages demonstrate that the area housed many monks and nuns. On the island of Chalke in the Dodecanese, at a place called Kellia (Cells), there is a cave hermitage with 6th-century wall paintings, Asketario sta Kellia. In Santorini, there are caves known as Asketaria (hermitages) on Mesa Vouno mountain and others dug in the tuff, like Panaghia I Tripiti at Vothonas, Aghios Antonios at Merovigli, all not yet studied. On Paros, across from Naxos, nothing is known about monasticism in the Byzantine period. Still, a place named Kellia is mentioned (Yapanti sta Kellia); Hosia Theoktiste from Lesbos lived as a hermit in the abandoned church of Katapoliani and the cave church Aghios Ioannis o Spiliotiis (in the Cave) was most probably a hermitage at first. On Anaphi, the church of Aghios Antonios, according to location, dedication and iconographic programme was a hermitage too. On little Heraklia, the cave dedicated to St John the Precursor, could have been a hermitage, as well. Besides, little islands have always been favoured by hermits and monks.

So, perhaps monasticism is the answer to the question why such an abundance of churches on Naxos and some other islands. On Chalke of the Dodecanese, a small barren island of only 32 km2, that is fifteen times smaller than Naxos, there over fifty byzantine chapels, that is only four times less than those of Naxos.

But since there is neither written evidence, nor physical remnants in most cases to confirm such a use one needs to be really careful in detecting it. As Kirby and Mercangöz have put it “where hybrid monasticism is involved, a very cautious archaeological eye is essential"
Naxos between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Decline or Stability?

Introduction

The debate about the decline, ruralisation and demographic decrease that followed the period after Late Antiquity, that is, during the Byzantine Early Middle Ages in the late 7th and 8th centuries is still ongoing and well-known through numerous case-studies in Asia Minor, Cyprus, mainland Greece and the Aegean islands.

War, earthquakes and plagues are usually listed amongst the most popular phenomena for explaining the ‘shrinkage’, ‘decline’, ‘transition’ and ‘transformation’ of urbanisation and rural life in the Eastern Roman Empire during this period. Several scholars have seen variations in the scale and effects of external threat and natural disasters but these changes have been poorly understood by Byzantinists. The overstressed historical validity of textual sources has shaped our perception of this period in a negative manner for too long, perceiving Slav land invasions and Arab sea raids as the sole explanation for almost every misfortune in the early medieval Balkans and the Eastern Mediterranean.

A re-evaluation of the archaeological record at hand is of emergency before we move on to interpretations and concrete conclusions about early medieval decline in the Byzantine provinces. I would argue that major transformations did happen throughout the period in question, although the criteria for determining changes, accommodations and transformations in the Early Middle Ages should be viewed in a different, rather more optimistic, angle. Examples for applying alternative interpretative approaches to material culture, settlement decline and stability will be drawn from rural sites in Naxos, with particular reference to Pyrgos Heimarrou in the SE of the island.

Pyrgos Heimarrou

The Tower of Heimarros is located in SE Naxos, 5 km NW of the bay of Panermos. It is circular, made of white marble, and survives to a height of 15 m. A ground floor and three upper storeys can be discerned, with cantilevered steps leading to the uppermost level of the building. The monument comprises a fine example of a well-preserved defensive structure of the 4th century BC, and it is surrounded by a roughly square precinct wall up to 2 m high. From 1997 to 2001 systematic work was undertaken at the site, including the conservation of the tower and excavations within its enclosure wall by Dr Olga Philaniotou on behalf of the then 21st Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities.

Excavations revealed seven adjacent rectangular areas along the W side of the enclosure, with the circuit wall itself acting as exterior wall of the complex. These areas, with paved floors, small rectangular cisterns and an olive-press bed, have the characteristics of olive presses of the Hellenistic period and later. Square and round towers comprise distinctive monuments of the Classical and Hellenistic periods in rural Greece, and are common on many Aegean islands. The use of these clearly defensive constructions was to protect property, private or public. Most of these towers were
reused or reoccupied during the Roman period, and the installation of olive presses in such sites is not an unusual phenomenon. Their association with fortified compounds underlines the need to protect this expensive production process.

On the basis of the ceramic study to date, the olive-press complex was founded in the 2nd century AD and remained in use until the late 6th or 7th century AD, when the cisterns were covered with earthen floors and new walls were built, which closed the oil production units. Thus, the area enclosed by the circuit wall and the tower itself continued in use throughout the Roman and Late Roman period as an industrial installation. Substantial traces of Early Medieval activity suggest that changes in the use of the complex occurred after the middle 7th century, but use of the site seems to have been as intensive as that of the preceding period. A three-aisled (possibly barrel-vaulted) basilica church built on the E side of the enclosure wall between the 5th and 6th centuries should have existed in parallel with the olive-press installations.

_Ceramics and degrees of contact_

Naxos and the Cyclades remained participants in the cultural koine of the Eastern Mediterranean, largely retaining traditions that were present in the Aegean prior to the arrival of the Arabs. The period between the 5th and middle 7th centuries was a time of relative prosperity and stability for most of the islands, with coastal settlements functioning as processing and exporting centres. Archaeological survey work on the islands has shown that most settlement sites of the period were located close to the coast, and their centres were focused on a nearby basilica church. It is noteworthy that in most cases, settlement sites in Naxos are located in fertile areas and coasts and always by a basilica church. The Cyclades acted as island supplier stations of commercial importance within the Eastern Roman Empire for vessels following the route from Spain and Italy to Constantinople and the Syro-Palestinian coast, through Sicily, the Ionian Sea, the Cyclades and finally Cyprus.

The centuries that followed this period of prosperity is a rather problematic one, as securely dated evidence for religious and secular life in rural areas is rather limited. There are quite a few sites in Mainland Greece, where archaeological evidence, such as amphorae of the 'Late Roman tradition', other wheel-made pottery, and handmade vessels, such as the so-called 'Slav Ware', have been found in the same archaeological contexts, a fact that might suggest a rather 'peaceful' co-existence of Slavs and Byzantines. A similar pattern has been identified at the site of Sagalassos in Asia Minor, where handmade, often poorly fired cookware suggests habitation continuity into the 8th and 9th centuries and a shift from the Roman mass-produced and customised wares to non-specialised local/regional production, as a result of a number of economic, historical and environmental factors, as in much of central, west and north-west Europe throughout this period. The same phenomenon has been observed in Cyprus, where the tradition of handmade pottery continues into the 20th century, thus, not necessarily related to issues of contraction.

The island of Naxos, on the other hand, offers a rather different picture in terms of pottery technology and settlement distribution. Surface potsherds at several sites dated to the late 7th, 8th and 9th centuries testify to the existence of small and large settlements associated with contemporary ecclesiastical monuments decorated with layers of uniconic fresco paintings. Interestingly enough, habitation sites of this period are not merely restricted to the interior of the island but have also been identified close to the coast, a picture that contradicts traditional historical views about desolation of coastal regions in the 7th century, and retreat of populations towards mountains and island
The ceramic assemblage of this period from several sites on Naxos includes the so-called 'Byzantine globular amphorae' (a survival of the LRA2 type), table jugs and juglets, cooking pots (with deep ridges and relatively thin walls), and other closed vessels (possibly used for short-distance transport and storage), all made on the fast wheel.

The systematic study of the ceramic material from Pyrgos Heimarrou to date reveals a fascinating picture of continuity in both ceramic types and use of the site from Late Antiquity into the Byzantine Early Middle Ages. All known Late Antique ceramic types are 'replaced' in the Early Middle Ages by developed or altered pottery forms, in more or less equivalent proportions. The examination of ceramic fabrics and the categorisation of pottery shapes and uses has allowed us to distinguish the amount of local, regional and other imported wares at the site. Although the quantity of local products of all shapes is expected at an inland industrial site where goods are exported from, the amount of 'regional' wares of the Late Antique assemblage and imports from North Africa, Cyprus, the Levant and the Black Sea, indicate the degree of regional and interregional connectivity between Pyrgos Heimarrou and other sites in the Eastern Mediterranean. Similarly, the Early Medieval assemblage contains a fair amount of regional amphorae and a small portion of imports from Constantinople, confined to chafing dishes in white and red fabrics and dated to the late 8th and 9th centuries. The term 'regional' here refers to products from neighbouring areas, including Paros and possibly other Cycladic islands, as far as Crete, Rhodes and the eastern Peloponnese.

Production, settlement and economic patterns

Turning to issues of settlement decline or stability in the Byzantine Early Middle Ages, archaeological surveys have concluded that after the traditional collapse of a complex urban life from the late 6th century onwards, the countryside went back to being a landscape organised around peer villages. Extensive survey in the region of Sagalassos in SW Asia Minor in the past and ongoing intensive surface exploration in the region of Kofinou in SE Cyprus, reveal a picture where a booming Late Antique countryside of villages and agro-towns, such as Kofinou itself, were transformed into rural communities dispersed and scattered into a cluster of small sites in the open country during the Byzantine Early Middle Ages. Similarly, the distribution of small early medieval sites in Naxos suggests that by that time rural communities had established ways of becoming self-sufficient but retaining to a certain degree the pre-existing regional network of interaction. In the 7th-9th centuries, villages may have remained in use, but rural communities were rather smaller in size. However, the landscape continued to be occupied and exploited continuously throughout the Early Middle Ages. Unfortunately, the nature of this use was such that it left less visible archaeological traces.

The Late Antique olive-press complex at Pyrgos Heimarrou and the presence of a basilica church at the same site is not an unusual phenomenon in Naxos and beyond. Excavations at Gyroulas in western Naxos have confirmed the conversion of the Archaic temple of Demeter into a basilica in the late 5th or early 6th century and the installation of kilns and workshops for pottery, lamp, oil and wine production. It becomes evident that churches became by the 6th century the meeting-, production- and commercial-place of civic and rural communities. It seems that populations in Late Antiquity were no longer interested in symbolic capital or in investing on the construction of monuments of prestige, but rather, and most importantly, on production, and economic infrastructures and activities. It is certain that the olive-press installation at Pyrgos Heimarrou was transformed into a local production and storage centre of agricultural goods from SE Naxos in the early/middle 7th century, very much like other sites in Naxos and beyond, where continuity into the Early Middle Ages has been recognised.
Conclusions

Let us now summarise what the evidence from Naxos presented above tells us about the degree of ‘decline’ after the conventional end of Antiquity in a wider Byzantine and Aegean context:

1. It goes without saying that the re-evaluation of the material-culture record of this rather difficult period, previously unrecognised, is of emergency here. To recite Guy Sanders’ own wording, “until we know when, questions about where, why and how remain largely irrelevant and abstract scholarly exercises”.

2. The systematic study of the ceramic material from Pyrgos Heimarrou reveals a fascinating picture of continuity in ceramic types and an equally intense use of the site from Late Antiquity into the Byzantine Early Middle Ages.

3. A review of the early medieval material culture from Pyrgos in Naxos and other sites in the Aegean testifies to the existence of a regional network of communication with the imperial centre.

4. Villages may have remained in use throughout the Early Middle Ages, but rural communities were rather smaller in size and the landscape continued to be occupied and exploited continuously. However, the nature of this use was such that it left less visible archaeological traces.

5. Evidence for processing illustrates that several sites were overtaken by significant production activities in Late Antiquity and that populations were interested in investing on production, and economic infrastructures and activities. The same phenomenon of investment in production and distribution seems to have continued in a transformed fashion into the Early Middle Ages, as exemplified through evidence from Pyrgos Heimarrou and other rural sites in Naxos.

6. Referring to this period of transition and transformations, one must not forget that any signs of decline or stability and revival, where really present, should be seen as evidence for a gradual and smooth, I would argue, transition to a rather different world: from ‘antique’ to ‘medieval’ life-ways and mentalities.
Dhaskalio Keros: An Unknown Early Byzantine Church, Its Ceramic Finds, and Small-Scale Navigation in the Central Aegean

The present contribution discusses a small church located on the islet of Dhaskalio, off the west coast of Keros, 10,500 km south-east of Naxos (fig. 1, 2). Excavated in 1964, this church remained undated and unknown in scholarly literature until a new investigation in 2006-2008, this time by the University of Cambridge, under the supervision of Professor Colin Renfrew and Olga Philaniotou, when ceramic remains connected to its use were recovered. Study of this pottery enabled the precise dating of the church’s use towards the end of the Early Byzantine period. Consequently the discussion of its role and function as a landmark in small-scale navigation can be discussed.

The church

The church is a small single-aisled basilica (fig. 3, 4). It measures 6.60 m in length and up to 4.40 m in width (at the western end). It narrows to 3.60 m in width at the eastern end before the apse. The interior surface of the apse is lined with remains of a bench. Remains of a built square altar were found in the east part of the church. The walls are 0.40 m to 0.60 m in thickness (0.80 m in the apse), currently preserved to ca. 0.20-0.40 m above ground level. The walls are made of imported marble blocks despoiled from the surrounding remains of Early Bronze Age buildings. An entrance was found in the middle of the west wall. At the centre, in front of the apse, remains of the altar base were found. A photo of the church taken at the end of the 1963 excavation demonstrates that the preservation of the walls was then marginally better than today. Dating evidence for the erection or the use of the church was not found, or not reported, after the 1963 excavation.

The architecture of the church does not offer any safe chronological indication about the date of its construction.

The finds

Since dating of the church based solely on architecture was impossible, the evidence of the movable finds proved important to pin down the period of use of the church. The finds were very few in number: twenty-two sherds of clay and four of glass. The diagnostic sherds hint to a date either towards the end of the Early Byzantine period, in the 6th c. – 1st half of the 7th c., or the earlier part of the Dark Ages: 2nd half of 7th c. – 8th c.

The cup C 2410 (fig. 5, 6) is the only ceramic find from Dhaskalio which can provide a relatively safe chronological indication for the use of the church. Its rather generic shape creates some uncertainty regarding its type and chronology. However, cups of similar shape and manufacture have been found in Samos and Eleutherna (Crete); in both cases they appear as burial finds in graves which have been securely dated to the 7th c. A cup of similar shape, found in a stratigraphic context of the 7th-8th c., was found in the cemetery of Perissa, Thera.
The rim fragment C 2420 (fig. 7) cannot be attributed with certainty to a specific kind of vessel. It possibly comes from an amphora. Amphorae with a broad cylindrical neck and plain vertical rim circulated in Corinth and southern Greece in the 7th c., but the known parallels are not close enough to C 2420 to provide a secure chronology. The abundance of mica in the fabric and the soapy feel of the surface are reminiscent of the Middle Roman Amphora 3 / Late Roman Amphora 10 / ‘micaceous water jars’. If C 2420 does not belong to an amphora, then it probably belongs to a pitcher with a broad neck; an example of this shape, made of highly micaceous fabric, has been found in Corinth.

The amphorae body fragments C 2422 (fig. 8) and C 2423 (fig. 9) have broad and shallow grooves on the exterior surface. The exclusive preservation of body sherds prevents the identification of the exact type of amphora. However, this kind of broad grooves appears often on amphorae throughout the Early Byzantine period, and slightly later. Amphorae become far less common in the Middle Byzantine period, as they are gradually replaced by leather sacks and wooden barrels. The few amphorae types known from the Middle and Late Byzantine Aegean show a very different wall thickness, surface treatment and exterior grooving than C 2422-2423.

Four fragments of glass were found in the fill of the apse. Two, a foot and a handle fragment, belong to oil lamps (κανδήλα) (fig. 10), while two of them are wall-fragments of unidentified vessel shapes. Κανδήλαι normally had a calyx-shaped body and three little loops used for hanging the oil-lamp.

Given the fact that no later Byzantine or post-Byzantine finds have been found during the excavations, it appears that the church was erected at some point during the Early Byzantine period, possibly towards its end, and was used until the 7th or possibly a bit later. No pottery of these periods was found on the rest of the islet of Dhaskalio. The Cambridge excavations on the shore of Keros across from the islet yielded a few Hellenistic to Roman sherds, but no Byzantine pottery. One can therefore legitimately suggest that this was only a small site. A further Early Byzantine site has been reported at Konakia, on the north coast.

Discussion

The role and function of the church is a subject which deserves discussion. Its small size appears as rather unusual at first glance, since we are used to think of Early Byzantine churches as destined to house large communities. In fact, however, recent research has brought to light examples of small single-aisled vaulted Early Byzantine churches. This evidence deserves attention, since it expands our understanding of the function of churches in this period.

Single-aisled vaulted basilicas of the Early Byzantine period (5th-7th c.) and the transitional period (8th-9th c.) are located in Naxos: (Monasteriotissa at Engares dates to the mid-7th century, Agios Ioannis at Danakos, Agios Mamas at Driti, Agios Georgios at Ropike, late 9th century.) All belong to the single-aisled vaulted type. Although their size is larger than the Dhaskalio church, their ground plan bears strong similarities with the latter church.

In South Attica two single-aisled churches were revealed in neighbouring locations, with a size and ground plan similar to the Dhaskalio church, with Early Byzantine pottery associated with them. Similar is the case of a church in the territory of Sikyon in Northeast Peloponnese. It is possible that these churches belonged to private estates or to small communities.
The motive behind the foundation of the Dhaskalio church is not clear. It may have been built as a small pilgrimage site connected to sailing routes, or as a landmark of an estate (for cattle-breeding?) on western Keros, or as a hermitage site (asketerion). Asketeria are known in the Early Byzantine Aegean, a recently documented example has been identified at the site ‘Kellia’ on the island of Chalki (Dodecanese).

The available evidence does not allow a clear establishment of the site function. Nevertheless, it is quite clear that the south coast of Dhaskalio, and its coast facing Keros, could provide provisional shelter in cases of sudden storms (fig. 11, 12), and therefore the small church of Dhaskalio appears as a minor religious site, where sailors could stop to worship briefly. Dhaskalio, thanks to its protected side facing Keros, would be suitable for anchorage in case of sudden storms. The northeast, north and southeast slopes are relatively even and accessible.

A portulan manuscript of the 16th-17th century mentions Keros as part of an island group which includes also Ios, Sikinos, Cariotissa and Polykandros (Pholegandros). These islands form a bow with a northeast to southwest direction, Keros forming the northeast end of the bow. What is particularly interesting is that Dhaskalio is mentioned in this portulan, though it is not named: “Η Κέρος και η Νίος και η Σίκινος και η Καριότισα και η Πολύκανδρος, όλα βλέπονται εις την κάρταν του πουνέντη εις τον γαρμπήν, μίλια ν’ Ἡξευρε ὅτι η Κέρος ἔχει μιαν ξέρην εις τον πουνέντη.” The reef mentioned just west of Keros cannot be other than Dhaskalio, since there is no other ridge rising above sea level, or lying just underneath sea level (ξέρα), west of Keros. It seems therefore that ships sailed along this coast of Keros, and knowing about the existence of the reef was useful for them.

A further attestation to the fact that Dhaskalio was known to medieval ships is its name. ‘Dhaskalio’ is a common name for rocky islets in close proximity to a mainland. The name has been used in the northern and southern Aegean, in the Saronic and Argolic Gulfs, as well as in the Ionian Sea. The etymology is the Italian word ‘scoglio’ (d’ ascoglio) which means a reef, a rock or cliff in the sea. Islets named ‘Dhaskalio’ were taken in consideration by navigators, since they were potentially useful as they cut off stormy weather from the open sea, when a ship tried to reach the coast of the mainland.

Keros seems to have been a local landmark in the maritime area between Naxos, Amorgos and Ios, as it appears persistently, usually as ‘Chiero’, in maps of the 16th and 17th century. In comparison, the neighbouring islands of Koufonissia and Irakleia are omitted much more often.

The literary evidence preserved about navigation in the Byzantine Aegean, though scanty, stresses the difficult sea situations and the sudden weather changes encountered by ships. Epigraphic evidence of the 5th-7th centuries at the ‘Grammata’ site on Syros testifies to circulation of ship captains and sailors from the islands of Naxos, Paros, Melos, Yaros, Andros, Thera and Hydra around the Aegean. Navigation in maritime areas which provided scattered bays and gulfs, useful for anchorage in urgent circumstances, was especially desired. Monasteries which were built at strategic insular sites in the Middle and Late Byzantine periods potentially functioned also as landmarks, guardposts or even lighthouses, especially before the era when maps were created and circulated.

Sites with this character are not widely known yet in the Aegean. However, the last two decades of research have highlighted the intensity of activity on small islets and promontories from the 5th to the 7th centuries. Numerous such sites are known in the Corinthian, the Saronic and the Argolid Gulfs. Recently a stronghold of the same period was identified on the southeast of Naxos (Irokastro) by the Cambridge team of Professor Renfrew and Dr Boyd.
Moreover, the overall significance of informal landfalls and anchorages along the maritime
trunk routes and highways of the Aegean has been suggested in the area of the Dodecanese with the
example of the traits between Kalymnos and Telendos.

The insular vicinity of Keros shows habitation and architectural activity between the 5th and
the mid-7th centuries. On Keros itself, the site of Konakia, at the northern part of the island, housed
a settlement: a three-aisled basilica and the apse of a further church have been found through field
survey, both associated with Early Byzantine pottery. On the neighbouring island of Ano Koufonissi
the apse of an Early Christian basilica has been identified beneath the church of Agios Nikolaos at
the Loutra site, across the sea from Dhaskalio. Numerous architectural and sculpted members have
been integrated in the church of Agios Georgios. Moreover, ruins of an Early Christian church are
preserved at the Prophetes Elias site. Remains of a contemporary church have been attested also on
the islet Antikeri. On the island of Schinoussa recent excavations in the bay Livadi have revealed a
settlement used in the 6th and 7th centuries, while Early Christian architectural members were found
at Stavros, the promontory Agios Vasileios, and the Panagia church at the town of Schinoussa. On
Naxos, the central island of the broader region, thirteen Early Christian churches have been located.
At least two among them, Panagia Drosiani and Panagia Protothroni at Chalki, bear wall paintings
which have been dated to the mid-7th century. On Amorgos, an early form of a church (εὐκτήριος
οἶκος) has been identified west of Arkesini, while Early Christian churches have been found at
Katapola and Kolophana, both on the side of the island facing Keros. Building remains which have
been tentatively identified as Early Christian churches are recorded at the broader area of Arkesini
and Kato Kambos.

In the 7th c. demographic and economic contraction begins in most areas of the Empire;
however the Cyclades continue to bear signs of economic activity. Naxos acquired a strong
fortification (Kastro tou Apalirou) between the 7th and the 9th c., as well as numerous professionally
decorated churches. Fifteen church monuments on Naxos bear wall-paintings which have been
dated to the Iconoclastic period. Especially interesting is the re-use of the Hellenistic Cheimarrou
Tower, located in southeast Naxos (the coast facing Keros), in the Late Roman period but also in
the 8th century, as revealed by pottery; an Early Christian basilica, dated to the 5th-6th century, with
a subsequent construction phase, and press installations were built in the courtyard of the tower.
Numerous ancient Cycladic towers were re-used in the Byzantine period, but specific studies on the
chronology and function are still awaited.

A well-attested example of a re-used tower stands on Amorgos: a follis of Phocas dated 607/8
and a belt buckle with a Maltese cross were found at the Pyrgos Vasili sto Chorio (Ayia Triada),
while a vaulted cistern was built in the courtyard possibly in the Byzantine period. A further vaulted
cistern was built in the courtyard of the tower of Terlaki at Agios Georgios, in northern Amorgos.
The church of Agios Ioannis Theologos on Mount Kroukelos and the churches Evangelismos and
Agioi Anargyroi at Katapola have been dated to the late 7th – 9th centuries. Moreover, the hoard with
coins of Constantine IV (668-687), found at the natural acropolis of Arkesini, suggests the presence
of military or administrative officers.

Further west, on Ios, the fortress of ‘Paliokastro’, considered to date to the 7th-8th century,
oversees the northeast part of the island and the sea route in the direction of Keros. In Perissa,
Thera, recent excavations revealed a large 6th-c. Christian basilica, the use of which continues in the
7th and the 8th c., as attested by coins and pottery.
Conclusion

The islet of Dhaskalio is one of the two sites of Keros (the other being Konakia) where archaeological research revealed Byzantine activity. A small church and a few ceramic and glass remains are the only finds preserved; these date towards the end of the Early Byzantine period and the beginning of the transitional period. Despite its scant character, this evidence is interesting since it demonstrates activity even on a small barren insular site. It thus belongs to a well-documented category of Early Byzantine sites, which is formed by islets lying near larger islands or the mainland. This category of sites is so far known along the coastline of southern mainland Greece, and Dhaskalio contributes to the geographical expansion of this scheme.

The south coast of Dhaskalio, especially the part facing Keros, must have provided provisional shelter in cases of sudden storms, and the small Dhaskalio church therefore appears as a minor religious site, where sailors could stop to worship. Even though the function as an asketerion cannot be excluded, the location of the church on top of Dhaskalio, as opposed to a more protected site on the islet, reinforces the interpretation of the site as a local landmark rather than as a hermitage site. The church could also have served purposes of maritime communication.

The erection and use of the chapel took place during a period when the neighbouring islands show intensive economic activity, coupled with a new administrative and military role from the late 7th century onwards. Already by the late 7th century Naxos is one of the bases for the fleet of the Karavisianoi – a meeting point for the ships during the expedition to Carthage in 697/8. Therefore, the maritime area around Naxos played not only a commercial role, as it lay on the regional and supra-regional trade routes, but also had political and military significance. This is confirmed by the high number of hoards found in the central Cyclades during this period.

The evidence on the small site of Dhaskalio does not allow further precision in the identification of its function. However, sites of this character played a role in the everyday maritime life of this economically active area, as well as in cases of urgency. The site should be seen as part of ‘the dispersed town of the Archipelago’ (Asdrachas), of which the main island, Naxos, was a decisive factor during this period.
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Metaphrasis in Byzantine Literature

Throughout the centuries Byzantine ambitious authors were conscious of the significance of literary registers for the reception of their texts. They deliberately made use of stylistic elements or refrained from using certain features in order to reach their target audience. There are certain groups of texts dating from various periods on which these stylistic elements can be tracked precisely by comparison of two or even more versions with their model text: such examples of rewriting can be found particularly within genres with a broader audience appeal, namely hagiography and historiography. It is in both genres that we encounter metaphrastic processes, in terms of stylistic elaboration and in terms of stylistic simplification.

As well as stylistic reshaping, metaphrasis may also encompass the addition or removal of literary and/or thematic aspects. All these processes signify intent as well as authorial interpretation. Teasing out these strands for exploration helps to supply a potential wealth of information on the author (if known), cultural (social, religious, historical) context, and creative ability, as well as levels of education and literacy.

It is the aim of this round table session both to point out common features of the metaphrastic process and to examine certain such metaphraseis in depth. The rather loose concept of metaphrasis, never clearly defined in Byzantine times, allows us to take into consideration texts that so far have not been labelled as metaphraseis, like chronicles. Vocabulary as a stylistic marker is also investigated because this feature connects hagio-graphical and historiographical metaphraseis through the centuries. Since metaphraseis are texts in their own right, but depend on other texts in a higher degree than other kinds of texts, editorial problems will also be discussed.
Revising Metaphrasis: The Evidence of Tatiana of Rome

Using the metaphrasis of Tatiana of Rome (BHG 1699b; hereafter, the MT), I wish to bring more attention to literary technique as opposed to style. I will also posit that new themes add another level of meaning. Viewed cumulatively, these approaches indicate a desire for engagement, possibly showcase an ideology, and thus elevate an anonymous metaphrast to the status of author, rather than functional reviser.

Tatiana's story survives in four forms: the metaphrasis, a Synaxarion report, and two passions (BHG 1699 and 1699d). The latter, which is concise, is present in the menologion of Michael IV. The metaphrast must have had access to the longer passion (BHG 1699) because he systematically remodels every sentence but leaves the plot intact. Stylistically, the MT contains many features of other pre-metaphrastic metaphraseis - that is, it has much in common with the work of Symeon Metaphrastes and his team (Zilliacus 1938, Peyr [Schiffer] 1992, Efthymiadis 1991, Schiffer 1996, Høgel 2002, Demoen 2005, Franco 2009, Hinterberger 2011 and 2014). For example, the optative, perfect, pluperfect and mi-verbs are used. Periphrasis, participial clauses, wordplay on names, and reduction of biblical citation are features. Dialogue is either paraphrased, partially eliminated, or is transferred from direct to indirect speech. The most obvious differences from Symeon's team are the inclusion of Latin loan words and the lack of a prologue.

In terms of literary technique, narrative pace is increased by reducing direct speech. The metaphrast clarifies antique formulations or locations that no longer exist. Static scenes and characters are dramatized through description and amplification. In addition, when grouped collectively, various additions and substitutions appear to focus attention to certain topics. For example, we find an interest in declamation, given specific voice by Tatiana's reconstruction as a powerful orator, and a preoccupation with idolatry is noticeable.

Refutation and parrēsia

In accordance with the progymnasmata, the metaphrast adds, subtracts, substitutes and also varies his syntax. Consequently, as might be expected, Tatiana is adorned with affirmative epithets. These elevate her, emphasise her purpose, and possibly justify the re-writing. However, her refashioning as an orator is noteworthy and presented unambiguously when the metaphrast informs us that she possesses ταῖς τοιαύταις δημηγορίαις, which τοῦ ἐξ ἡμιώνου τυχάνου τὴν καρδίαν ὡς ρομφαίας πληγέντος. Another effect of these skills is that Alexander is rendered with ἀφασία.

Tatiana's vocal prowess is lent deeper resonance by the appearance of the technical term ἐλεγχος and its cognates to describe her manner of speaking: διελέγχω (and also, in that sense, δισλέγομαι), ἐλεγχος and ἐλεγκτικός. One of the goals of elenchic rhetoric is to expose contradictions in the opposition; another is to provide proof (pistis). Interestingly, when utilising ἐλεγχος, the metaphrast adheres to pistis and in a curious way. In Aristotelian terms, pistis has three means: character, emotion, and argument. Tatiana's pistis is an act, a performance.
The first time ἐλεγχός is invoked, Tatiana declares: “ἔλεγχος αὐτοῦ (Alexander) τῆς πλάνης
deiknύμενη πρὸς τῇ ἀπολλύμαι ψυχᾶς τῶς ἐλπιζούσας ἐπὶ τῶν πάντων σωτήρα… Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ.” Her statement is echoed by the metaphrast in the following chapter when her
πίστις takes place: …τὴν ἑκείνην βοᾷς ἐπικαλεσμένη παρασχέθηκαί αὐτῆς ἀπὸ ἐλεγχοῦ μὲν σαφῆ τῆς ἀπατηλῆς λατρείας τῶν εἰδωλολαμοῦντων…

After the metaphrast’s words, we learn the dramatic result of her prayer: the obliteration of Apollo’s temple and cult-statue, and the theatrical appearance of a demon, coated in the figurine’s dust, which she then exorcises.

When διελέγχω is used to refer to Tatiana’s dialogue with Alexander, the metaphrast’s understanding of refutation also appears based on deeds. At this point, Tatiana has refused to recognise Zeus. Since being hanged and having her flesh slashed to pieces has had no effect on her mentally, she is shackled and hurled into an inferno where she remains unharmed, defiantly performing the works of God by singing, dancing, and reciting. These actions are all new additions. At this point, the metaphrast states …τῶν τε λυμέων Ἀλέξανδρον περιφανῶς διελέγχουσα καὶ τὴν πλάνην τῶν εἰδωλολαμοῦντων ἐμβριθως στηλιτεύουσα.

Thus, the metaphrast’s usage of ‘refutation’ seems firmly focussed on performance, especially since Tatiana’s original speech comprised 5 biblical citations (all referring to attributes of God), a plea for help, and the statement that endurance is learned through the ἀποστολικῆς φωνῆς;the reward for which is knowledge of God.

Especially striking is the use of παρρῆσια and related factors to describe this virgin martyr. The metaphrast directly attributes παρρῆσια to Tatiana twice; and once, it is the martyr’s own claim. One example is when Justin, an eparch, has just threatened her: “τὰ ἐνδοσθία σου διασπαράξω καὶ παρέξω κυσίβοραν· καὶ ὑπῆρει ἐνυψαμένη σοι ὁ Θεὸς σου ὁ θεός.” In this minatory context, Tatiana’s defiance can certainly be labelled as παρρῆσια, emphasised by her own use of the term: ἡ δεπαρμησισικότερον διατεθείσα ἀπεκρίνοντο· “ἰδο γοῦν παρέστηκό σοι μετά πλεί ονος παρρησίας ἀντιτασσομένητο εἰκιν ν προστάγματι…ποιεῖ ὁ θέλεις”.

Although παρρῆσια is certainly a feature of some martyrdoms, the MT exhibits an extended spatial component of candid speech. The metaphorst also gives her the mental characteristics associated with παρρῆσια, as described in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Sextus Empiricus: courage, confidence, and self-assurance. The metaphrast tells her that she speaks with θαρσολέος. These traits are reinforced by the persistent additions of ἰλαρός and φαίδρος to descriptions of her countenance despite relentless adversity and during torture. Furthermore, when she is seized, she offers prayers ὁταρσοχός and when she prays, she often does so μεγαλοφώνως. At one point, the herald cries out with a loud voice, ‘confess that Zeus is God and be saved’ and we are told, μεγαλοφώνοτερον ἐκείνῃ χριστιανῇ ἑαυτῆν ἀνεκλήτην. Though these adjectives and adverbs could be ascribed to any martyr, these additions are particularly interesting for a virgin martyr since they do not centre on her body or her beauty.

Together with spatial and mental aspects, παρρῆσια is conceptually linked to ‘pure’ (unambiguous) speech, and is therefore allied with ἀλήθεια. Tatiana often declares that she speaks with ἀλήθεια. ‘True’ is adjectivally affixed to λατρεία, ἔπιγνωσις and Θεὸς and, in two of those examples, the claim is made in the speech where Tatiana explicitly speaks with παρρῆσια.
In opposition to alētheia and parrēsia stands ekkapelew (adulteration/being impure). According to Photios, a synonym is panourgos, with connotations of flattery, craftiness, and deceit. This synonym and these traits are all commonly ascribed to Alexander. We might take this further since parrēsia is a right belonging to the people, and the enemy of the dēmos is the turannos. Alexander is called a tyrant 11 times in the MT.

Moving on from parrēsia, we are constantly told that the martyr responds to Alexander συνετῶς. It is significant that the metaphrast prefers to laud the saint’s intellect over her beauty. It is even given emphasis by a Platonic allusion when the metaphrast refers to τοὺς τῆς δισνοίας ὁ φθαλιμοῦσ φθαλιμοῦσ although this is not the exact formulation used in Republic or Symposium.

Tatiana’s verbal prowess now compliments her supernatural power and its overwhelming effect. She previously had the abilities to create earthquakes, demolish temples, and exorcise demons, but now she has been shaped into a formidable character. She has absolute certainty about herself and her purpose. The force of her oratory, her claim to parrēsia, her intellect and her overwhelming power all lend her the ἐξουσία that the metaphrast claims for her.

The amplified characterisation of the brutal persecutor and the heroic martyr has been well-documented (for example, Høgel 1996). But in the MT, the metaphrast renovates his characters by labelling them, commenting on them, and using their words and actions to portray their reactions and sentiments. What is equally fascinating is the psychological depth in his characterisation (see also Lukhovitskiy 2014) and thus the protagonists are not semiotic representations, functioning within the narrative realm. Their internal dilemmas are of importance rather than their place within the contextual framework. The reviser is not merely fulfilling the stylistic criteria of metaphrasis. All the characters in this text benefit from the metaphrast’s involvement, but, aside from Tatiana, the most complexity is allotted to her antagonist, Alexander Severus. For example, Alexander is ascribed a new series of emotional responses, which add variety and tone to the account, and as they occur in response to Tatiana’s actions, underscore her impact. Throughout the text, he is pronounced ἐν ἀ πορία, ἐν ἀμηχανία, βακχευόμενος, or πάνω καταπληττόμενος.

Most interestingly, the emperor’s behaviour is now also linked to a lack of perception, a literal use of senselessness. He simply cannot understand that what is happening is due to God’s power and that Tatiana functions as His intermediary. Whilst this is certainly a topos, the metaphrast connects this inability to a mind that is defective (ὁ δὲ πεπερωμένος τὰς φρένας βασιλεύς). We learn that Alexander τὸν νοῦν καὶ τὰς φρένας τὴν κακὴν ἀλλοίωσιν ἀλλοιωθεὶς καὶ μηδαμῶς συνιέσαι δυνηθεὶς. The implication is that there is a change in consciousness that leads to ignorance.

This idea continues when Alexander and the executioners thrice claim they ‘did not mean’ / ‘were unwilling’ ἀκόν to torture Tatiana. Akōn’s framework is akrasia – a lack of mastery. It is possible that the metaphrast’s understanding has Aristotelian echoes. Aristotle believed that an akratic person submitted more to feeling than reason. Then, once his act has been completed, he regrets what he has done but the thought process he goes through after he acts comes too late to save him from error.

An explicit example is Alexander’s final words (all additions are in bold): στένων τε καὶ τρέ μων κατὰ τὸ ἄδελφοκτόνον Καίν, ἐλεεινὴ τῇ γωνῇ θηλάτοις μοιστεῖ βασανίζομενος ἐ κραύγαζεν ἐλεησόν μετὸν ἀθλιον, ὁ τῶν χριστιανῶν μεγάλας ἀσθένειας ἢς σεπαρήκουσα τῶν ἐντολῶν σου καὶ παρεπικρανά σε τὸν μόνον ὑψίστοτιν γνησίαν δοῦ λῃν σου Τατιανὴν ἀνατίως τιμωρησάμενος καίνων ἰδοὐδικαιώς ὑπότης δικαίας σου δī
Furthermore, an akratic person experiences passions that conflict with his rational choice. It is a chronic condition. The passions he experiences are pleasure or anger and one illustration Aristotle uses is someone who is asleep, drunk, or mad. Of all Alexander’s amplified characteristics, the ones that receives the most prominence is madness and rage. The passions he experiences are pleasure or anger and one illustration Aristotle uses is someone who is asleep, drunk, or mad. Of all Alexander’s amplified characteristics, the ones that receives the most prominence is madness and rage. The metaphrast uses all the weaponry at his disposal. Just 2 examples: ‘He’ is changed to ‘επερριψε’ τηνψυχήν εν τιμωρίας χαλέπαις εξεταζόμενος.

The metaphrast’s interest in the role of the mind in madness, anger, and lack of perception also extends to reason. Alexander’s extreme irrationality is also clearly signalled. Just a few examples of how he is described in the later text: τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀλογίας ἀνδράποδον καὶ τὸ τῆς ἡλιθίου τητος ὑπάλημα Αλέξανδρος... ὁ δὲ ἀλογωτατος’ Ἀλέξανδρος, ἀλόγος τῷ λόγῳ... ὃς ἡ νοσθήτως διακείμενος... πεπρωμενή ἔχον πᾶσαν τὴν τῶν σοισθηρίων... Incidentally, the metaphrast’s interest in reason extends beyond Alexander when he ascribes rationality to a lion, when, miraculously, it does not maul Tatiana but, instead, licks her gently.

What might this all mean? The lack of a prologue, the anonymity of the author, the absence of a fixed date, and the text’s general ahistoricity are complicating factors. Based on internal evidence, the date of the MT points to around the ninth century: (1) an analysis of the vocabulary indicates the C8th-9th; (2) the metaphrast’s substitution of the archangel Uriel for Gabriel points to a date after 745, when Pope Zacharias rejected the former at the Council of Rome; (3) the addition of κακολήξια to describe the Church points to the 9th century and onwards, and was used especially during Iconoclasm.

This last point leads to my first hypothesis; the MT might be an iconophile text. We know that the two periods of iconoclasm and post iconoclasm was a time when we first see lives being systematically re-written. What we deduce from some of these texts is either (a) direct refutation of idol worship and thus an iconoclastic text or (b) an iconophile text in which only worship of pagan gods was idolatry whilst Christian icons were beneficial – as in the life of St. Nicholas, for example (Sevčenko, 1977). This could apply to the MT. An increased preoccupation with idolatry and paganism is noticeable from the inception of the texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passio 1: 3-6</th>
<th>Metaphrasis 1: 3-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεύοντος μὲν πρὸ πάντων τῆς οἰκουμένης τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, στρατηρχοῦ δικαίαντικείμενον κατάτων δύουλον τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ διαβόλου, ‘ε βασιλέως’ Ἀλέξανδρου ἐν τῷ τετάρ τετεί...</td>
<td>βασιλεύοντος ἐν τῇ μεγαλοπόλει Ρω κατὰ θεοῦ συγχωρήσιν Ἄλεξανδρῳ ἄνδρος ἀδίκου καὶ πυνηρτάτου καὶ ταῖς τῶν εἰδωλικῶν θυσίαις σποῦδ δεινὸς εκτετράκτος καιμεμήνοτος κατὰ παντὸς τῶν χριστιανῶν γένους κ βλασφήμως λυττώντος καθάσεον τοῦ υψίστου, πάσα ἢ ὑπ’ ἀνταρχὴν μιαράς καὶ ἀθέμιτο πῶς δαιμονὸν ἐπεπλήρωτο λατρείας.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If sacrifice is called for, the metaphrast deliberately reminds us that it will be made to an idol by using supplementary information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passio</th>
<th>Metaphrasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὁ παμμαρώτατός Ἀλέξανδρος θυσίαν ἐπιτελεῖ ἐπί τῆς Ῥώμης τῷ Ἄπολλ</td>
<td>αὐτὸς δέεν τῇ βασιλευοῦσῃ πόλεις διατριβάς ποιούμενος τὰς μιαρὰς θυσίας τοῖς εἰδωλικοῖς ξανά ἐπιμελῶς προσέφερε καὶ πάσι μὲν τῶν ψευδαμυμοὶς θείς, ἔξορτῶς δετῶ τῆς ἀπωλείας ὁδηγῶ ἐπον κληθεντὶ Ἀπόλλωνι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tatiana originally proclaimed that the Holy Trinity παραλύει καὶ παραδειγματίσει τοὺς ὑπεναντίους. In the metaphrasis, the Trinity continues to παραδειγματίσει τοὺς ὑπεναντίους but now will also τὴν τῶν εἰδώλων δεισιδαίμονα λατρείαν καταλύει.

Every heathen, priest or non-Christian artefact now has a negative epithet or action attached to it. ‘Temple’ is modified to μιαροῦ ναοῦ; ‘priest’ is revised to μιερεύς, or μισσόρος or εἰδωλοκτιστα. The crowds killed during Tatiana’s obliteration of Apollo’s temple are changed from η τῶν μιαρῶν σύνοδοστο η τῶν άθεων…πληθὺς and the dead are now described as Ἑλλήνων. Non-Christians behave atrociously. As Tatiana is taken from prison to Alexander, the passio states: κατε στρεφαν αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῆς καθεδρᾶς…καἰ ἐκείνην αὐτὴν ἀπότις ἑιρκτῆς καὶ ἐκείνην πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα…The MT intensifies the priests’ brutality and emphasise her violation. Tatiana is praying when the menἀναδεικνύει τὸμεν χρησάμενοι οἱ πάσης θηριωδίας ἀνάμεσοι χεῖρας ἐπιβαλόντες ἀπότις ἀκρατοῦ καθεδρᾶς ἐκείνης ἀφήρπασον…

Iconophile works emphasised God’s tri-hypostatic nature (as in Photios’ homilies). The MT has additions of τῆς ὑπερθέου τριάδος or alterations: ὁμοούςιος χαρίς τῆς τριάδος σου becomes εὐλογημένη ὑπάρχει καὶ δεδοξασμένη εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας ἡ τρισυπόστατος καὶ ἕπερθες παντοκράτορι τῆς ἀγίας τριάδος. Thus, it is possible that the MT carries such a message and Tatiana has been rewritten to argue the metaphrast’s cause. Interest in sense perception and the imagination is also found in this period in Methodius, for example, who Krausmüller believes was influenced by Theodore of Stoudios (Krausmüller 2009).

Another hypothesis is that the emphasis on idolatry in this period could also trigger associations with the current Arab incursions and could have stimulated the urgency underlying God as protector in the MT whilst the concept of a martyrdom itself could have been adapted to deal with a new concept of pagan persecution – Islam. This then would account for the MT’s popularity in the C14th when 4 of its 6 extant manuscripts were copied. In this later period, Islam was again a very real threat. We know that the Byzantines were accustomed to reading signals both in text and in art. These conclusions also technically do not dispute Photios’ dictum that metaphrasis ‘preserves the main thoughts without extending or compressing them’ (cod. 183, 128a). The ‘main’ concept of the MT - a martyrdom – remains; indeed, it is also perfectly possible to read the MT as a standard passio.

To sum up, I have shown (1) the plausibility of the MT being an encoded text; (2) the remarkable adaptability of hagiography; (3) the literary merits of the MT, which opens it up to literary criticism as well as translation studies; and thus finally (4) that some revisers may indeed be authors.
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The Metaphrasis of Niketas Choniates' History –  
Forthcoming Publication of a Critical Edition

Martin Hinterberger and I are currently well advanced in the preparation of a critical edition of the 14c “Metaphrasis” of Niketas Choniates’ History. My present task is to persuade you to buy it when it is published. For those unfamiliar with the background to the Metaphrasis, the surviving text of the Metaphrasis, as preserved in four mss, corresponds to just over 90 per cent of Niketas’ original History – in other words, it is a very substantial text. The publication history of the Metaphrasis in the modern era can be summed up briefly as follows: Three short extracts of it were published by van Dieten in 1979, with a detailed analysis and evaluation of the language. A longer section of the text – corresponding to the last 100 pages approximately of van Dieten’s edition of Niketas’ History – was published in the apparatus of Miller’s Recueil des Historiens des Croisades (Historiens Grecs vol. I (Paris 1875)). The Bonn edition of the History, edited by Bekker and published in 1835, of course contained copious references to the Metaphrasis in its critical apparatus. And last, in 2005, roughly half of the edited text became available when the Greek National Documentation Centre, in line with its practice of making doctoral theses in Greece available to the research community, posted my doctoral dissertation on the Metaphrasis online in pdf format. That’s where the matter stood until three years ago when we decided to seek a publisher for the text, which we would jointly edit in – at last! – its entirety. We have been very fortunate in securing the kind encouragement of Prof. Albrecht Berger, who suggested that the Metaphrasis be included in the Byzantinisches Archiv series in collaboration with publisher De Gruyter. All being well, as I said, we hope that the edition will be ready for publication in the next twelve months.

As most here are aware, the term metaphorasis applies to a variety of “translation” endeavors through the long Byzantine era, though in using the term metaphorasis we mean intralingual rather than interlingual translation. The great hagiographical project of Symeon Metaphrastes is, of course, a major chapter in the history of this activity, recasting older texts in a “higher” stylistic register. I have suggested in the past that the metaphrases, in the reverse stylistic direction from high to low, of Anna Komnene’s Alexiad, Niketas’ History, and Nikephoros Blemmydes’ Speculum Principis perhaps comprise another coordinated project in metaphrastic activity, albeit of secular texts, dating most probably to the fourth or fifth decade of the 14c.

With regard to the textual history of this group of three metaphrastic texts of the works of Komnene, Blemmydes and Choniates, the Metaphrasis of Niketas’ History presents a few particularly interesting features, and I shall focus on these now. First, the sheer size of the text makes it stand out. It provides us with an almost embarrassingly large quantity of data on the ways in which an individual, or perhaps group of individuals, would go about the task of recasting the entire historical work of Niketas into simpler language. Second, it is preserved in four mss, three of which date to the 14c. These four mss do not always agree, not because of mere scribal error or the intervention or
improvements of copyists, but because a certain element of reworking and alternative preferences seems to have been present at the birth of the Metaphrasis – in other words, we have two slightly differentiated texts. I shall focus on this point in a couple of minutes.

My third remark: the Niketas Metaphrasis stands, as already mentioned, in a vague linguistic region below high-style Byzantine literary language, in a humdrum, though not particularly vulgar, register of Greek that any literate writer or reader of the last Byzantine centuries could be expected to compose or read. Accordingly, we are given an interesting view onto Choniates’ original text and how it could be read in the mid-14c, while also benefiting from a guide through Choniates’ text (though I should warn that the guide is not always faultless!). It is important to note, however, that the metaphrases in general are inevitably “contaminated” by the vocabulary items and syntactical features of the source text in ways that normal translation from one language to another obviously is not. Thus, we see opposing tensions: on the one hand, the pressure of the already existing formulation of the source text on the target text and, on the other, the pressure of the lower, simpler linguistic register on the target text. A kind of balancing act appears to be going on, where we are asked, among other things, to gauge the tolerance for vernacular elements and for classicizing elements alternately. This balancing act means that we tend to get shifts of emphasis from now more learned style (i.e. not radically altering the text of the original) to now more vernacular style, without apparent consistency throughout the work. One becomes aware of the limits to which it is necessary (or not necessary, depending on which angle one looks at it) to shift the style down in order to make it more easily intelligible, but not to debase the gravity of the matter narrated.

There are some reasons for believing that the work of “metaphrasing” the History was the product of more than one person. Two important passages in M-NCH give us an interesting glimpse into how the Metaphrast (or Metaphrasts) was (or were) working. I give here an example of just one sentence from these two passages (which cover approximately 5 pages in total):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὅ δε, τοῦ πρεσβευτοῦ, ὡς ψαπι, Εἰφιλίνου τὴν προσβείαν ὑπονοεθεσάντας καὶ μη ἐνδούναι ὁ ἄνδρὸν ὧν ἦν τὸ θεία δεινοῖς, ἠρρεῖν τὸ παρακαταθεθῇ ἐν τινὶ πράγματι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ μὴ βασιλεῖ στάχυς αὐτὸν, ἤ ἀνδρόνικος, δεῖκεν ἐν αὐτῷ ἑλ indict, ἀφοσιωθῆναι μὲν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου ἡ συναπεσάς ἡς προς ὑπόγην ὡς ἦν ἄνδρόνικος, βούλοιτο παλίνορσον ἀναργὴν ὡς ὃς ὑπεῖναι παρακελευσαμένῳ, ὡς τὴν κοσμικὴν, ὁ δὲ βασιλεῖς κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν διαθεκὴν ἀρχέτω ἡς στάχυς αὐτὸς τοῖς παραδυναστεύεσθαι συμπνιγόμενος.</td>
<td>τοῦ Εἰφιλίνου δὲ ὡς ἐλέγετο τὴν προσβείαν ὑποκλείσαντος, καὶ μηδὸς συγκατατεθῆναι ἐν τινὶ πράγματι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ μὴ βασιλεῖ στάχυς αὐτὸν, ἤ ἀνδρόνικος, δεῖκεν ἐν αὐτῷ ἑλ indict, ἀφοσιωθῆναι μὲν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου, καὶ ἡς δοὺς λόγοι υπὸ ἑλ ὡς ἐποτεξαν· ἡς κριθῇ τὸ πράγματα, καὶ ἡς ἀπελήθη εἰς μοναστήριον, καὶ ἡς ἐξουσιάζεται μόνον ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ μὴ συμπνιγόμενος καὶ ἐξουσιάζεται παρ᾽ αὐτῶν.</td>
<td>λέγεται δὲ τὸν Εἰφιλίνου κρυφῶς τὸν ἐπειν μὴ ἐποκύψαι ἀρχέτω ὡς ἦν ἄνδρόνικος, παρρησία ἡς προσβείαν υποκλείσαντος, καὶ μή ἐπειν μὴ στάχυς αὐτόν, ἤ ἀνδρόνικος, δεῖκεν ἐν αὐτῷ ἑλ indict, ἀφοσιωθῆναι μὲν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου, καὶ μὴ βασιλεῖ στάχυς αὐτὸν, ἤ ἀνδρόνικος, δείκεν ἐν αὐτῷ ἑλ indict, ἀφοσιωθῆναι μὲν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου, καὶ ἡς δοὺς λόγοι υπὲρ ὡς ἐποτεξαν· ἡς κριθῇ τὸ πράγματα, καὶ ἡς ἀπελήθη εἰς μοναστήριον, καὶ ἡς ἐξουσιάζεται μόνον ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ μὴ συμπνιγόμενος καὶ ἐξουσιάζεται παρ᾽ αὐτῶν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Admittedly, this is an extreme case of differentiation in the mss tradition of the Metaphrasis. It is a differentiation, however, which, logically, must belong to the compositional phase of the Metaphrast’s work. It is an indication, in my view, that more than one person was involved in translating the text: that a few folios were perhaps mistakenly translated in parallel, before the Metaphrasts became aware of the overlap, but nevertheless the two different renditions were kept in two separate early copies of the work: ms B on the one hand, and the other three mss (or their exemplar) on the other. Accordingly, the differences between the two branches of the mss preserving the Metaphrasis arise not as result of the vagaries of time and copying, but as a result of different renderings of Choniates’ original text in the earliest stages of the metaphrastic undertaking. These two enticing snapshots into the Metaphrasts’ methods illustrate eloquently the indisputable fact that no two translations will ever be the same, and also the diverse ways in which the pressures of the original and the vernacular exert themselves on the metaphrastic outcome.

The rather peculiar status of the Metaphrasis linguistically and stylistically speaking means that we were faced by a number of dilemmas in respect of how to keep these peculiarities clearly visible in the edited text. There’s no need here to go into detail about our final editorial decisions about how to deal with these peculiarities, but it may be useful to briefly indicate some of the issues that we have decided to allow to remain in the foreground of the edited text. For example:

The status of the text. As many of you are perhaps aware, the publication status of the original text of Niketas’ History was, in all probability, already complex before Niketas himself passed away. A number of versions were probably floating around already in the first decade of the 13 c – the intricate web of mss involved in the stemma testifies to this, and I shall say no more here, except remind you of the apparent succession of reworkings that the text underwent during Niketas’ lifetime, and the difficulties that this posed for its modern editor(s). The Metaphrasis appears (in the eyes of the editor) to suffer from the opposite problem – lack of revision, lack of “polish”. There seems little justification, indeed, for believing that the Metaphrasis was ever “finished”: the text as it survives in the mss is as good as it gets, whether we like it or not, and its imperfections are not deviations from a hypothetical fair original but part of its flesh and bones. This, therefore, needs to remain visible to the contemporary reader, even as the text is rendered into the deceptively solidifying medium of print. Furthermore, although it is not a truly vernacular text, many of the “transgressions” which it contains reflect the background pressure of the vernacular (e.g. modern noun paradigms or verbal forms, conflation of indicative and subjunctive), though some also reflect weakness of comprehension, on occasions, by the Metaphrast of the original text, or maybe just a failure to reformulate the matter effectively in the new idiom. Accordingly, on a case by case basis the editor has to decide whether genuine scribal “error” has occurred or whether certain rules simply have less authority, and require less strict observation and application in texts of this kind. This touches on the question of normalization and standardization, and a definite impression that these issues are not central to the agenda of these metaphrases. There is a comment that Herbert Hunger used in his critical apparatus of the Metaphrasis of the Alexiad on one occasion and which applies absolutely to the Niketas Metaphrasis in many places: he leaves a plural participle ἀνοίξαντες where properly a singular participle ἀνοίξας agrees with the grammatical subject of the sentence, making the comment: “sed noster ab anacolutho non abhorret”.

Thus, on a first level, we let the text of one of the ms (i.e. Monacensis gr. 450) stand more or less as is, and refer to the alternative readings of the other mss in the apparatus. On a second level, we have tended to let, as I have just explained, apparent eccentricities or infelicities (e.g. “minor
anacolutha") to remain in the text, and simply comment on them in a separate section of the volume.
If these eccentricities or infelicities actually lead to a breakdown in meaning, we either appeal to the
other mss in order to intervene in the main text or, though very rarely, emend, always making this
evident for the reader.

Again: the purpose of the Metaphrasis was certainly not to standardize or present a model text
for literary emulation. This observation automatically begs the question: so what was the purpose of
the Metaphrasis? Indeed, of all these metaphrases? Since the mss are mutilated at beginning and end,
we are deprived of authorial declarations that might have enlightened us, with the exception of the
Βασιλικὸς ἀνδριάς of Belmmydes. We can only guess. In view of the many imperfections, one suspects
that they were not an attempt by a literary circle to read and render anew these highly ornate literary
monuments. In fact, many of the purely literary and rhetorical passages are simply left out of the
Metaphrasis if they do not seem overtly to serve the basic flow of the narrative. Clues such as these can
perhaps provide us with a few grounds for hypothesizing as to the genesis of these texts.
Our introduction to the text, besides the usual discussion of the manuscript sources and their
relationship to one another and Niketas’ original, examines these issues. It will make some
comments on the general patterns observed in the Metaphrast’s method, as well as the nature of the
language and linguistic register in which the Metaphrasis is couched. Following the text will be a
commentary on the more notable features and complexities of the Metaphrasis, as well as an index
and select glossary.
Observations on the Methods of the Metaphrastic Re-Writing: 
The Case of the Passio of St James (BHG 773)

Michael Psellos’s *Encomium* on the Metaphrast is a fundamental source concerning the Metaphrastic process Symeon followed in his *Menologium*. He suggests that this reworking was a product of ‘team’ work (Fisher 1994, lines 334-341) and states that Symeon changed the style rather than the content of earlier hagiographical material (Fisher 1994, lines 280-295).

Notwithstanding the fact that we can never be certain which premetaphrastic sources did the Metaphrast or his ‘team’ actually use, including alternative traditions not yet discovered or indeed lost for ever (cfr. Høgel 2014, p. 182), to identify the characteristic elements of Symeon’s prose we need to undertake a detailed textual analysis, comparing the re-worked texts with the sources we have at our disposal.

A number of methodological problems arise as the Metaphrastic corpus is remarkably wide and modern reliable editions of these hagiographical works are still scant. This stated, what do we compare and how do we compare it? The operation is in itself rather arbitrary because in certain cases parallel passages retain more or less the same length and content, hence they are comparable in terms of structure, syntax and grammar, while in other cases the re-elaboration of a whole text is so drastic that a close comparison seems impossible, as it was first pointed out by Zilliacus (1938, p. 338) and later on by other scholars. Nevertheless, even considering the uncertainty, if not the impossibility, to exactly determine which version was employed by Symeon, this sort of systematic comparison with the earlier texts still represents the only firm grounds for any attempt to examine Symeon’s methods in his re-writing technique.

Symeon’s style cannot be labelled as high, as Sevčenko (1981, pp. 289ff.) showed in his seminal article, but rather medium or medium-high. As a general tendency he inserts rhetorical devices in the earlier texts, but in some cases he simplifies the earlier texts if they are convoluted (cfr. Høgel 2002, p.140). It seems, therefore, legitimate to assume that the Metaphrastic prose retains a coexistence of various linguistic registers.

The typical Metaphrastic ‘features’ can be summarized as follows: as a general principle Symeon has the tendency to amplify a number of passages of the old text and, at the same time –as a ‘compensation’– to shorten or omit other passages; this condensing of sections of the early texts, among other stylistic reasons, also prevents expanding the re-worked texts to an unreasonable length (cfr. Petitmengin 1984, p. 25). The Metaphrast has also the tendency to limit the resort to dialogues, direct speeches, the use of the first person, and the habit to insert ‘transitional’ or ‘connective’ sentences as well as explanatory sentences to facilitate the reader (or the audience) to better follow the account. Moreover, he tends to avoid Latin borrowings, to extensively use participles and compound verbs, and to avoid parataxis.
All of these 'tendencies' are documented –although not in a rigorously consistent way– in three Metaphrastic texts, namely the *Passio of St James the Persian* (BHG 773), the *Passio of St Plato* (BHG 1551-1552) and the *Vita of St Hilarion* (BHG 755). These hitherto unpublished texts were analyzed in my doctoral thesis, which includes their preliminary edition on the basis of a small number of earlier MSS as a basis for a proper critical edition. All three Metaphrastic texts show a number of similarities in the technique of re-writing. Given the limited space of this paper I shall focus on a few considerations concerning the re-writing technique enacted by Symeon in the process of re-elaborating his sources, concentrating on the analysis of selected passages mostly taken from the *Passio* of St James and referring only sporadically to the other two texts (for the Metaphrastic texts I shall refer to the paragraphs and line numbers of my edition).

The four premetaphrastic versions (α, β,γ and δ) of the *Passio of James* are edited by P. Devos (δ only partially, cfr. Devos 1953, and idem 1954). All four texts are very similar in terms of structure as the first nine paragraphs (1-9) focus on the events prior to the martyrdom and in the second part (par. 10-41) a meticulous description of the martyrdom is given, through a long list of each and every single part of the martyr's body systematically mutilated by his executioners. The enumeration of fingers, toes and limbs cut off is structured as a long prayer pronounced by the martyr using, in the invocation, a religious symbolism related to each number of this list. The distance between these texts and the Metaphrastic re-elaboration is evident especially as regards the second part of the earlier accounts: this section (par. 10-41) has in fact almost no relation with Symeon's re-working where the description of the martyrdom is very concise, the progressive mutilations of the saint are absent as is the numeric symbolism related to them. On the contrary, the first part of Symeon's version (par. 1-13 lines 1-205 ) shares several elements in common with the earlier sources examined.

Among the premetaphrastic sources only γ and δ are preceded by a prologue, whereas α and β start in medias res, describing James' place of birth and his family. The Metaphrastic prologue (lines 1-10) is rather concise, it does not show particular efforts in terms of rhetorical devices and contains pieces of information that can be found in the first paragraphs and in the epilogues of all the premetaphrastic sources, although not all these data are present in all four texts (e.g. the reference to Arcadius is found only in δ). More specifically, in α, β and γ the name of the Persian King Yasgerd is mentioned at the beginning of the text (par. 1), while that of his son, Varham, appears only at the end (par. 44), when the date of the martyrdom is given. In this way the reader has to infer that he succeeded his father and that James was executed under Yasgerd's successor. The Metaphrastic prologue, after reporting the essential pieces of information needed to follow the narration, including the names of the Roman Emperors Arcadius, Theodosius and Honorius, followed by those of the Persian King Yasgerd and his son Varham (lines 3-4), clearly explains (lines 18-20) that Varham succeeded his father (Διὸ δὴ καὶ τῆς Περσικῆς ἀρχῆς ἀρχής εἰς Οὐαραφάτ, τὸν Ἰσδιγέρδου παῖδα μεταπεσούσης). In this way, the reader is informed that the martyr was executed under Varham's reign. As a result the Metaphrastic re-elaboration is more cohesive, clear and informative in comparison with the earlier sources examined.

In the first line of the *Passio* we also find one of the typical formulae (διέποντος σκῆπτρα) employed by Symeon in his prologues, as identified by Zilliacus (1938, p.334), as well as another typically Metaphrastic feature, i.e. a proverb: πάντα λίθον ἐκίνει. Another three proverbs quoted one after another also occur later on in the account and none of them appears in the earlier sources (lines 144-145: εἰς ὕδωρ γράφειν 145 λίθον ἔψειν and θάλατταν σπείρειν).
If any of these four premetaphrastic texts edited by Devos lies behind Symeon’s version (even though this is difficult to ascertain, he seems to have followed especially versions β and γ) this can give us a clue about the metaphrastic technique, as, in fact, we find common elements between the premetaphrastic and Metaphrastic texts, coming from different sections of the earlier accounts and re-elaborated by the Metaphrast in a different way. For example, in the Metaphrast version the passage presenting the saint speaking to the King against the idols echoes some elements contained in all four premetaphrastic recensions (underlined below).

Metaphrastic version (par. 13 lines 194-196): "Ἡλιον δὲ καὶ σελήνην, καὶ ἀστρα, καὶ πῦρ παρὰ Θεου δεδημιουργήθαι πιστεύομεν, καθάπερ δὴ καὶ τάλα στοιχεία, καὶ τὴν αἰσθητὴν ἀπασαν κτίσιν. Θεὸν δὲ, ἢ τέκνον Θεοῦ λέγειν, τί τούτων καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς, ἢ φρονεῖν, ἢ τὴν προσήκουσαν Θεὸν προσκόνησιν αὐτοῖς νέμειν;

In the earlier texts the short reference to the sun, moon and stars with relation to the Zoroastrian faith is contained in the dialogue between James and the King (chapter 5 in all four premetaphrastic versions) but in the sources the person who is speaking is the Persian King and not the martyr:

Recensio α. 2: Ακούσασα δὲ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς χαράξασα γράμματα ἐδήλωσαν αὐτῷ, ἐπόμενα τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ ἀκολουθίᾳ, λέγοντας:

Recensio β. 2: Ακούσασα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ, μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς χαράξασα γράμματα, ἀπέστειλαν αὐτῷ ἐπιστολήν ἐπόμενα τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ καταστάσει, περέχονταν σύμφωνας

Recensio γ. 2: Ακούσασα δὲ ταῦτα ἢ τῇ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς χαράξασα γράμματα, ἀπέστειλαν αὐτῷ ἐπιστολήν ἐπόμενα τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ καταστάσει, περέχονταν σύμφωνας

Recensio δ. 2: Ακούσασα τούτων ἢ μήτηρ, τουγαροῦν σχεδον εἶπεν τε καὶ ἡ γυνὴ γραμματίων τε διὰ πάσης σπουδῆς ἐγχαράττοσαν, ἐπέμεινα τοῦτον τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ ἐπιστεῦσθαι ἀκολουθίᾳ.

The fact that we read about the Persian religion in the first part of the premetaphrastic versions while in the Metaphrast narration it appears only at the end of the first half of the text may give us a hint of the way Symeon might have used to re-work earlier texts, that is, by collecting material from different sections of his sources in a selective way, adjusting them to serve his own account, without necessarily following the same order as his sources. It is worth noting here that the comparison of the Metaphrast description of the martyrdom of St Plato (par. 20-26 lines 206-266) with the premetaphrastic corresponding sections (PG 115, 416B-417A) shows that a similar method is adopted by Symeon in his re-working of earlier sources, as the two different redactions share several elements despite the fact that they do not appear in the same order in the new text.

Symeon’s re-writing technique is further illustrated by the passage describing James’ mother and wife’s reaction on finding out that he abjured his Christian faith (par 5 in all four premetaphrastic versions).
By comparing these texts, Symeon's predilection for periphrasis is evident: ἀκοὰς πάντων διήει, instead of a simple verb (ἀκούω) appearing in the form of the participle in all premetaphrastic recensions, and ἡ κοινωνὸς τοῦ βίου instead of the noun γυνή, of the earlier texts. In addition, the Metaphrast uses another short periphrasis to give the Christian identity of the two women: τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν μερίδος ὑπάρχουσα resorting to a participle.

The use of periphrasis is not the only reason for Symeon's redaction to appear to be longer than all the earlier recensions. This is also due to the presence of three connective sentences (underlined above). The first one explains what the bad news (πονηρὸν τοῦτο διάγγελμα) was about, namely James abjuring his faith, the second one stresses that both women were Christian and the third one clarifies the reason why his mother and his wife had to send him a letter, namely his absence from home. In the earlier texts this explanation is given only after the letter is quoted, so, once again in the Metaphrastic re-working the account is more cohesive.

Another typical aspect of Symeon's re-elaboration is the attention devoted to the psychological attitudes of the characters. In this case particular attention is drawn to the reaction of the two women: they are shocked by the unexpected news (ἰσχυρῶς πληγεῖσαι), and their souls are burning (ἐκκαυθεῖσαι) with zeal, for what they want above all is to save their son and husband from impiety, and both of them are bitterly lamenting (ἀποδυρωμένη). The resort to participles is substantial in the whole sentence. The following rhetorical question (introduced by πῶς γάρ) is functional both in explaining their reaction and reinforcing the pathos of the scene. At the same time it shows that Symeon intended to keep a higher level of style. This is also suggested by the employment of the compound verb διαφθείρω to indicate the degree of his loss of religious faith, ultimately leading to the destruction of the soul. In terms of grammar, typical of the Metaphrastic re-working is the presence of a periphrastic construction ἐτύγχανεν ὀν. It is worth noting that the use of atticism is not consistent, for example the alternative use of γλώσσῃ / γλώττῃ.

The inclination to describe the psychological reactions of the protagonists is evident in other passages of the Metaphrastic re-elaboration of St James's Passio. For example, in the dialogue between the martyr and the Persian King (par. 9 lines 117-130) much emphasis is given to the theme of the latter's rage: he is described as entirely incapable to exercise any control over his own passions: (lines 118- 120) πόθον ἐκεῖνον εἰς ὀργὴν ἀκρατοῦ ἀφόρητος ἀκάθεστος, ὡς τῷ πάθει νενικημένος. Moreover, the Metaphrastic version gives a detailed account of his psychological reactions, even illustrating the way in which his voice was altered, as a result of the heart beating faster, to the extent of sounding as if it was 'broken' (lines 122-123 τῷ σάλῳ τῆς καρδίας ἐπικοπτόμενος τὴν φωνὴν ὡς πάθει νενικημένος). In the premetaphrastic versions the King's anger is mentioned very briefly in a short sentence where we are informed that the King was burning like fire from his anger (par. 6 in all premetaphrastic versions). A detailed comparison with the premetaphrastic sources shows that both in St James' Passio and in the Passio of Plato, Symeon's versions devote much more attention to the psychological attitudes of the characters, to the point that we can conclude that, at least in these two cases it can be considered a significant Metaphrastic featur, and this tendency is confirmed by numerous examples in other Metaphrastic works that cannot be exhaustively quoted here.

Another typical Metaphrastic technique is represented by the condensing of the material appearing in the earlier texts, resulting in a shorter redaction. For example, the dialogue between the King and the martyr in Symeon's version (par. 9 lines 121-130) is shortened and differently treated.
In all premetaphrastic redactions (α, β, γ and δ) the dialogue occupies a quite long paragraph (5), consisting of a sequence of very short questions and answers, echoing the typical style of the Acta martyrum. In the Metaphrastic text, however, this sort of stichomythia is summarized into a few lines (121 and 125-130). In Symeon's version questions and answers are reported in direct speech and, in syntactical terms, they are more complex than those in the premetaphrastic texts. In fact, even though the re-elaborated text is shorter, the periods are much longer and often structured as brief rhetorical speeches.

We can note a similar procedure also in the Passio of St Plato, where the most striking difference between the premetaphrastic text and Symeon's redaction is that in the latter the dialogue is employed to a lesser extent in comparison with the earlier text (67 changes of speakers in the earlier text against 26 in the Metaphrastic version). Even if we consider that the latter version is shorter, it is quite clear that, as far as the employment of the dialogue form is concerned, the Metaphrast was more economical than the redactor of the earlier text. As in the case of St James, questions and answers generally consist of longer sentences, usually rhetorically built, in which the content of the earlier texts is condensed.

To sum up, the examples presented here represent a necessarily limited repertory of parallel passages which can offer us only a glance on how the ‘Metaphrastic’ process was brought about. The overall impression from a comparative reading of the three abovementioned texts is that there are general trends, but these guidelines are not systematically followed, as it is possible to observe several ‘inconsistencies’, which seem to confirm Psellos’ suggestion that Symeon's Menologium is a collective work of a team carried out under the supervision of the Metaphrast.
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Metaphrasen als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des byzantinischen Wortschatzes


Bisherige Ergebnisse


Im Zuge der Datenbearbeitung zeichnet sich ein hoher Grad an Regelmäßigkeit ab, das heißt dieselben Wortpaare (Entsprechungen) treten wiederholt auf, z.B. ἁλίσκομαι – κρατοῦμαι, ἐκ - ἀπό. Jedoch entspricht oft ein Wort der Metaphrasis mehreren klassizistischen Termini bei Choniates, besonders die Verben βοηθέω, κρατέω, τολμάω weisen ein breites Anwendungsspektrum in der Metaphrasis auf (siehe Appendix 1).

Aus der Gegenüberstellung ergeben sich auch wertvolle Rückschlüsse auf den literarischen Charakter von Choniates’ Geschichte. Liest man Choniates durch die Brille der Metaphrasis, stellt
man oft fest, daß der Autor klassizistische Wörter vielmehr als klassizistische Platzhalter für Termini der „normalen“ Schriftsprache denn als Wörter in ihrem klassischen Sinn verwendet (vgl. auch Hinterberger 2014b).

Allgemeine Beobachtungen zur „Umarbeitungstechnik“


Zukunftsperspektiven

In einem früheren Artikel (Hinterberger 2014a) habe ich darauf hingewiesen, daß sich bei der Umarbeitung von einem stilistisch niedrigeren Text zu einem stilistisch höheren und bei der Umarbeitung in die umgekehrte Richtung von stilistisch Höherem zu Niedrigerem die gleichen oder zumindest ähnliche sprachliche Phänomene beobachten lassen. Dies heißt, daß in beiden Fällen das Vorhandensein etwa von Plusquamperfektformen, Dual oder attischer Deklination jeweils den hohen Stil markiert, während die Abwesenheit dieser morphologischen Kategorien charakteristisch für den niedrigen Stil ist.


Vergleicht man diese Korrespondenzen mit denjenigen historiographischer Texte stellt man folgendes fest: Es zeigt sich, daß so, wie bestimmte morphologische Kategorien diachron charakteristisch für den hohen Stil sind und über Jahrhunderte konstant in syntaktisch/semantischer Hinsicht „normalen“ Formen entsprechen (Plusquamperfekt – Aorist, Optativ – Konjunktiv/

Einige Beispiele für diachron konstante stilistisch hochstehende und stilistisch niedrig stehende Wortentsprechen:

- ἀναρέω – φονεύω
- βασίλεια – παλάτιον
- δέδοικα/δέδια – φοβέομαι
- δράω – ποιέω
- ἐάω - ἀφίημι
- ἐγγύς – πλησίον
- ἐξεμι – ἐξέρχομαι
- ἐτερος - ἄλλος
- ἐφίεμαι - ὀρέγομαι
- θεάομαι - βλέπω
- μονή – μοναστήριον
- οἶδα – γνωρίζω
- οἰκέτης – δοῦλος
- πίμπλημι – γεμίζω
- προεστώς - ἡγούμενος
- φημί – λέγω
- χαλεπαίνω - ὀργίζομαι
- ὄνεομαι – ἀγοράζω

Keine dieser Beobachtungen stellt eine echte Überraschung dar. Ihre systematische Erfassung und Auswertung sollte aber dennoch aufschlußreich und auch nützlich sein, nicht nur was die metaphoristischen Umarbeitungstechniken betrifft, sondern auch das Verständnis der byzantinischen Literatursprache im allgemeinen.
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τῶν ὁμοφύλων ἐκείνων (15.5.7 (276.22))

present (Both)
πέμπτε (15.6.3 (277.16))

aorist (Both)

ἐξέστησε (NChonChron 465.31)

ἀγαπῶ (Ambiguous)
τὴν ταραχὴν ἀγαπάντων (15.2.2 (270.30))

φιλοτάραχος (High)

φιλοτάραχος (NChonChron 455.65)

ἀγάπη (Both)
φλῦς ἀγάπης (21.12.3 (374.14))

ἐρως (Ambiguous)

ἐμπώγισμα ἔρωτος (NChonChron 670.17)

ἀγοράζω (Both)
ἀγοράζω (12.1.1 (199.2))

ἀνέσωμα (High)

ἀνέσωμα (NChonChron 355.4)

ἀδελφός (Both)
ἀδελφός (269.26 (15.1.2))

κασιγνητός (High)

κασιγνητός (NChonChron 454.24)

ἀδιάβλητος (Ambiguous)
μάρτυρες ἀκτιμαλογίας καὶ ἀδιάβλητος (15.6.6)

ἀπαραλογίστος (Ambiguous)

διετήτης ἀπαραλογίστος (NChonChron 466.49)

ἀδιαντρόπης (Low)
ἀδιαντρόπης (12.2.1 (200.4))

ἀνάτιθην (High)

ἀνάτιθην (NChonChron 356.25)

ἀδιάφορος (Low)
ἀδιάφορος (15.2.2 (270.30))

βάλανος (High)

βάλανος (NChonChron 455.65)

ἀδύνατος (Ambiguous)
τὰ ἀδύνατα (15.5.8 (276.32))

ἀκέχιστος (High)

τὰ ἀκέχιστα (NChonChron 464.3)

ἀδίπτορος (Ambiguous)
ἀδίπτορος (15.6.3 (277.21))

ἀδίπτορος (Ambiguous)

ἀδίπτορος (NChonChron 465.56)

ἀδίπτορος (High)

ἀδίπτορος (NChonChron 472.14)
καταφύγιον (Low)
cαταφύγιον μακριάγιον (12.8.2 (211.22))
cαταφύγιον και μακριάγιον (12.8.2 (211.21))

καχλίας (Ambiguous)
δωστέρο το καχλίας είναι το από τον φυσικόν πότην

κρατέο (Ambiguous)
ἐπξον τον Τριβόνον ἐκχίστη (15.8.1 (281.21))
ἡ τον πόλεον βυσσινίας ἐκχίστη (21.12.1 (373.3)
ἐκχίστη (15.8.7 (276.21))
ἐπξον στάτοι λακτήρι (16.1.3 (305.8))
ἐκχίστη (11.1.8 (173.11))
ἐκχίστη (11.1.5 (192.10))
κατά τον ἄρος βλέπων κρατοῦμεν (21.12.4 (374.20)
κρατοῦμεν (15.6.2 (277.11))
κρατοῦμεν (13.8.14)
κρατίμεν (15.8.1 (281.18))
κρατοῦμεν (12.2.1 (200.3))
κρατοῦμε (21.10.7 (373.1))
κρατοῦμεν (11.1.8 (173.12))
κρατοῦμε (12.2.2 (230.19))
κρατοῦμε (12.2.3 (200.22))

κρημνούδης (Ambiguous)
ἀνάλοι κρημνούδη (16.1.1 (304.9))

κρήτης (Ambiguous)
κρήτης (15.6.4 (278.1))

αἱματός (High)
διάστροφος (High)

κατά τον το κέλυφος βυσσινίου σκύλων (NChonChron 4)

εἶν τὸν Τριβόνον ἐλευ (NChonChron 471.1)

ταίς τὸν πόλεων βυσσινίας ἀλκοότης (NChonChron 609.86)

ἐλάξ (NChonChron 463.82)

εἰς στάτοι λακτήρι (NChonChron 504.54)

ἀλώνια (NChonChron 320.83)

ἐλάξ (NChonChron 319.45)

tο τον ἄρος ὅρον ἐχομεν (NChonChron 611.26)

ἐλώται τον ἄρος Ἀλέξιον (NChonChron 465.26)

κατασκόνες (NChonChron 414.81)

κατασκάτων (NChonChron 471.92)

κατασκάτων (NChonChron 356.25)

ταῖς τον κατασκάτων (NChonChron 608.45)

κυραλιδίων (NChonChron 320.87)

κυραλιδίων (NChonChron 356.39)

κυραλιδίων (NChonChron 356.42)

λαμπροεύον (NChonChron 356.16)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀπεκτημι (High)</td>
<td>(77 (3057D))</td>
<td>πορεύομαι (Ambiguous)</td>
<td>πορεύθηκα (VSymStylf 73.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλέα (High)</td>
<td>(76 (3057B))</td>
<td>παλάτιον (Low)</td>
<td>τοῦ παλάτιου (VSymStylf 72.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δράω (High)</td>
<td>(76 (3057C))</td>
<td>πολέω (Both)</td>
<td>ἐποίηκα (VSymStylf 72.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκονηματί (Ambiguous)</td>
<td>(75 (3097A))</td>
<td>μεθύσαμε (Ambiguous)</td>
<td>τῶν ἀνθρώπων μετάστη (VSymStylf 71.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔχω (High)</td>
<td>(77 (3060A))</td>
<td>ἐξέρχομαι (Both)</td>
<td>ἐξέρχομαι (VSymStylf 73.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπάνεναι (High)</td>
<td>(77 (3060A))</td>
<td>ἀπέρχομαι (Ambiguous)</td>
<td>ἀπῆλθεν (VSymStylf 73.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νεανίσκος (High)</td>
<td>(78 (3068B))</td>
<td>νεανίας (Ambiguous)</td>
<td>νεανίας (VSymStylf 74.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσεπτικός (High)</td>
<td>(76 (3057B))</td>
<td>ἤγγορέμενος (Both)</td>
<td>ἤγοράθηκαν (VSymStylf 72.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metaphrasis in Byzantium

When attempting to draw the bigger lines of historical development within Byzantine hagiography, levels of style is in a sense the fundamental tool. It is through an approach based on stylistic observations that has produced the quite clear image of the development in Greek-Byzantine hagiography with an early period in which simpler texts would be written (low-level saints’ lives) together with more rhetorically elaborated texts on saints, primarily enkomia. This would then in the middle Byzantine (and even in the late Byzantine) period give way to a much higher proportion of high-style lives, often the product of rewriting, metaphrasis. It is the aim of this paper to redefine this general historical perspective by turning away from style and instead looking at audience/aims for the text, and at the status of author. Through this, a two-tier model of hagiographical rewriting in Byzantium will be offered, as a correction to viewing hagiographical rewriting in Byzantium as primarily, or even solely, exercises in metaphrasis.

Much earlier scholarship, unless based on pious approaches, deemed saints’ lives of interest according to the amount of historical information they yielded (on places, larger events, institutions, customs, etc.). Yet for more than a century, at least since Delehaye’s Les legendes hagiographiques (1st edition 1905), the possible literary qualities (detrimental perhaps to historicity, but otherwise enjoyable) have received quite some attention, and scholarship now engages in very diverse approaches to hagiography. But apart from studies into metaphrasis (rewriting), the main scholarly interest in Byzantine hagiographical texts has consistently been, and still is, on viewing texts in the context of their time of composition, and not in that of later use and readership. Many anonymous texts have therefore found little interest, not least since their dating is insecure and only to be narrowed down within centuries, and their place of origin (together with their author) often completely unknown. The focus on datable, authored texts has been of great importance for how scholars have dealt with the genre as a whole, namely as a genre into which new texts appear with new information and new manners of presentation (of sanctity, social reality etc.). The following general presentation of hagiography in Byzantium will, instead of focusing on texts in the time they were written, look at the collected mass of texts at the time they were read and copied, and in what contexts. This puts very serious restrictions on our approaches to the earliest, pre-minuscule period. Very few hagiographical manuscripts with majuscule (uncial) script have been transmitted to us. Caution will therefore be shown in talking of the earliest period, even if it is probably developments in this period that have most eluded us.

If adopting a perspective on hagiography from the view of our transmitted evidence, i.e. our manuscripts, a first observation is that the vast majority of our hagiographical texts appear in liturgical collections, i.e. manuscripts that order texts according to the place of the saint’s feast day in the church calendar. In Ehrhard’s magisterial three-volume Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literatur der griechischen Kirche (1937-52) – even today the best entrance into the world of Byzantine hagiography through a structured presentation of manuscripts
– two-thirds of volume 1, half of volume 2, and a third of volume 3, cover manuscripts (primarily menologia) that exclusively contain hagiographical texts, ordered according to the church calendar. The remaining parts of Ehrhard's volumes are taken up by descriptions of year collections (in which half of the texts are hagiographical and ordered according to the fixed calendar, the remaining texts relate to the major feasts according to the moveable church year) and of panegyrika/homiliaria (acc. to moveable church calendar), whereas only at the end of volume 3 do we find Ehrhard's “Nebenwege der Überlieferung”, the non-menological collections/ manuscripts. As clearly emerges from this overview, hagiography in Byzantium was, from a statistical point of view, found in liturgically ordered collections. Admittedly, the menologion formed the backbone to Ehrhard's work, and he did not survey miscellaneous manuscripts as diligently as the 3750 more or less purely hagiographical manuscripts that he indicates to have seen. In fact, for a hagiographical text as the Life of Barlaam and Ioasaph only 6 of the 158 manuscripts listed by Volk find mentioning in Ehrhard's volumes. Ehrhard clearly paid little interest to manuscripts containing a single hagiographical, as is the case of many of those including the Barlaam-story. But apart from the Barlaam-story, few popular hagiographical texts have been transmitted in large numbers outside hagiographical collections (most long saints' lives as the Life of Andrew the Fool and the Life of Basil the Younger have reached us only in a manuscript or two; popular lives written by famous authors as Gregory of Nyssa's Life of Gregory Thaumaturgos or Athanasios of Alexandria's Life of Anthony are mainly found in liturgical collections). So even a full listing of Byzantine manuscripts containing hagiographical texts would not alter the picture much: hagiography was – at least from the middle Byzantine period onwards – primarily found in liturgically arranged manuscripts. Our preserved collections date mainly from ninth to fifteenth centuries, with a clear climax in terms of numbers in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Though numerously attested, the historical origins of these collections have proved difficult to establish, at least in the Greek world. (see Ehrhard vol. 1; Hegel 2002). Also no clear development within the transmitted material has been ascertained, except the rise of the Metaphrastic menologion. Apart from the Metaphrastic, menologia seem to have been produced in much the same fashion all the way through, yielding a quite uniform selection of texts on a very stable group of saints, with a gradual but slow inclusion of texts on new saints. Given the commissioners'/producers' generally free choice as to texts and versions, no two menologia contain exactly the same selection of texts (apart from the many volumes that are exemplars of the ten-volume Metaphrastic collection). The fact that such collections form the backbone of transmission of hagiography has therefore not been historicized or really discussed as the main conveyer of hagiography. The task to trace the minor developments within menologia would in any case be enormous. It would require recording and tracing the genealogies to be reconstructed within hundreds of texts that are in most cases poorly edited and offering in many cases little material for historians or others. Perhaps online manuscripts collated through crowd sourcing is the only manner that such a project may be envisaged ever reaching a firm basis. Until then we will have to make do with what we have.

The hagiographical collections offer a variety of genres, though martyr accounts form in almost all cases the major single group. Lives (bios/bios kai politeia) and texts on translations of relics are also common, while miracle collections – when given – are in most cases appended to lives. Texts that may be deemed – and are in some cases labelled as – enkomia appear together with ‘ordinary’ martyr accounts and lives. The distinction between enkomia (purportedly laudatory speeches composed according to rhetorical rules and often demonstrating a keener awareness of
addressing a specific audience) and martyr acts/lives is often hard to draw, both from a literary point of view and by the fact that they appear interchangeably in these collections. What is most important to stress in this overview is the preponderance of martyrs, which is normally also the case in pictorial programmes. Martyr accounts very often get little treatment in modern accounts. Ever since editors like Musurillo and others narrowed down to a few the martyr accounts that have any chance of dating back to the times of persecution, only texts on martyrdoms from later ages – and of possible higher historicity – have received attention. In the end, more than hundred martyr acts, purportedly relating events from (ancient) times of persecution, hardly ever receive any real scholarly attention (except in studies of *metaphrasis* and when used in combination with pictorial programmes), even if these form the largest – and thereby to some extent the fundamental – aspect of sainthood in Byzantium.

To give an example: The so-called *Menologion of Basil II* (Vat.gr. 1613, in fact an illustrated synaxarion, now online: http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1613) contains 430 texts and images for days from beginning of September till end of February. Based on purely iconographic analysis of the images, a very high proportion of the 430 – namely a total of 242 images – obviously depict martyrs, shown at the scene of execution and portrayed variously just before, during, or just after the moment of loosing their lives. Of these 242 images no less than 150 show executioners/soldiers swinging (or having swung) swords, making this specific action central to more than a third of all the images. But other manners of death are also depicted: no less than 25 show saints are shown being burnt to death (or approaching a fire), 9 are being tossed into some kind of water, and 58 find their deaths in other ways. The number of people in the process of being killed can be held up against the 129 that, judging from the images, seem to be confessors: here 4 are stylites, 40 some sort of eremites (based on the predominance of a ‘wild’ landscape), and 85 are depicted standing erect in front of a building. Confessors therefore seem to be primarily thought of associated with an institution of some sort (or perhaps the Church as such). Finally, around 40 out of the 430 depict feast days of Christ, Mary, and/or apostles, as well as of councils, various miraculous and other (to the uninitiated less obvious) events. In any case, the amount of standardization is – despite the lovely colours and the variation in layout – obvious. Two main categories dominate – martyrs and confessors – and in the first group the ‘death by sword’ type and in the second the ‘institutional representative’ type.

And this standardization has not only taken place in pictorial programmes. To reach the high degree of alignment within saintly types, a heavy standardization took place also within the texts. This standardization has – in the majority of cases – meant that author names have disappeared (or do we really believe that so many lives were written without their authors leaving any stamp?), that individual narrator voices have been eliminated (we have some indications of this), that much historical material and assumed knowledge of this disappeared from the accounts, and that certain standard phrases may have been introduced (though this is much harder to ascertain, for hagiographical texts were clearly produced with heavy reuse from earlier texts). To understand this process of standardization, we first need to state the exceptions. Texts by famous authors – in fact primarily sanctified authors – were not taken through this process. The *Life of Anthony* and the *Life of Makrina* survived with (probably) very little readjustment, protected as they were by the retained author names of Athanasios of Alexandria and Gregory of Nyssa, as were later the Metaphrastic versions (and as we know from Psellos, also Symeon Metaphrastes was sanctified). A few authors who seem not to have been sanctified, like Kyrillos of Skythopolis, reached a comparable renown.
as authors, not least by being the authors of several lives, and this would protect their texts. This also goes for some enkomiasts, as Andrew of Crete, whose works found some protection in the later transmission. A good example of an intermediate hagiographer is Leontios of Neapolis. His inventive writing – not least the Life of Symeon the Fool – clearly earned him a name. On the other hand, his hagiographical writing on John the Almsgiver (Eleemon) was only a supplement to the first life composed by Kyros and Ioannes (Leontios’ text was entitled Eis ta leiponta …). Some rewriter would soon take the time to combine these two texts and downwash all individual authorial voice – as well as in general simplifying the prose (see Deroche in Flusin 2011). So the tenuous survival also of Leontios’ original text on John Eleemon was helped through by his ‘name’ as a hagiographical writer. But the most commonly read version of the Life of John Eleemon would be the combined version of that of Kyros and Ioannes (which is now lost) and of Leontios’, with either no author name or that of Symeon Metaphrastes.

Also the disappearance of narrator identities can be evidenced. In the pre-Metaphrastic Life of Pelagia, the name of the narrator – Iakobos – was retained in parts of the transmission (the family π of Flusin and Paramelle), but though retaining the ‘eye-witness’ perspective, the narrator’s name disappeared in the Metaphrastic version. It is of course hard to assess – in the lack of early material – the exact amount of such standardization, and much ‘standard language’ may have been part of an original composition, to make a text based on little actual evidence fit into a liturgical collection. But it is hard to believe that pious writers would accept giving such standardized accounts of a saint and leave out local references. In numerous texts – especially martyr accounts – no true local features appear. Even famous lives of saints as Aiketarina (Catherine) hardly give us any original information on Alexandria or display any familiarity with places, names etc. In the early account of Palestinian martyrs, left to us by Eusebios of Caesarea, the martyr Prokopios has a history. In the standard accounts found in Byzantine liturgical collections, Prokopios has become a standardized martyr, who goes through a process of questioning and execution so very like that of other martyrs (see Detoraki in Efthymiadis 2014). In the Life of Athanasios of Klysma (Suez), however, we do get a few original pieces of information, and a place “where is now the cross” receives mentioning. But our (sole) witness for this text is then also a non-liturgical manuscript containing lives of Palestinian saints, i.e. one of the few collections we have that are based on a local interest and is not a liturgical menologion. Local details or passages reflecting assumed knowledge of these (author names, place descriptions, local communities etc.) must have occurred in previous versions of some of the standardized texts, but once expelled they would be irretrievable – and probably unwanted – for later copyists. There was a harsh policy for minor writers in Byzantium, a fact that is hardly commented upon by Greek writers, but the eleventh-century Georgian translator Eprem Mtsire (the Small), who was intimately familiar with Byzantine procedures, explains in a colophon that in saints’ lives – unless by a famous author – change was allowed (Høgel 2002). Eprem was speaking in the context of translation, but on the basis of Greek Byzantine habits.

The allowed intervention into hagiographical texts is obviously what we witness with the rise and flourishing of metaphorasis, a major transforming event in the literary history of Byzantine hagiography. Beginning probably from a rhetorical school milieu, authors as John of Sardes, Niketas the Paphlagonian and then, in a scale surpassing his predecessors, Symeon Metaphrastes transformed a great number – or even a very representative selection – of the standardized texts into the style of new texts (see Høgel, Flusin, Resh). The importance of this for hagiography, other types of literature, and notions of sainthood have long been noticed and studied. What has, however, passed more
unnoticed is the influence that the introduction of hagiographical collections must have had on the genre of hagiography in Byzantium. The very fact that hagiographical texts – martyr accounts, lives, translations of relics – were placed side by side in collections informed the status as well as the actual words of these texts. Texts by well-known authors were left more or less untouched, often with the retention of author names, as is the case with a number of texts in the Metaphrastic menologion; others were reworked. This development apparently had two, partly overlapping phases. Beginning even before the rise of *metaphrasis*, widespread standardization took place. Types of saints and/or texts would now enter into a more fixed taxonomy, even if titles did not end up forming a clear and consistent system (on e.g. combinatory titles, see Hinterberger in Efthymiadis 2014). The language of a text would now – as in the case of so many other texts in Byzantium – be assessed according to what status the author was accorded. Texts whose authors – and origins in general – were of low status would soon become anonymous. This widespread standardization was that caused the genre, at some point, to become a laughing stock of literati, as we are told especially in various laudations of Symeon Metaphrastes (see Høgel). Hagiography was a genre dealing with a serious subject, but standardization had ended up leaving a downgraded impression, which only *metaphrasis* could save it from.

*Metaphrasis* would also to some degree imply standardization – or at least removal of author names and narrative voices – but it would also – and this more consciously – work in the other direction. First of all it would introduce a new author name, the *metaphraser* of the text or – as in the case of the Metaphrastic collection – a name of the Metaphrastic rewriter, Symeon Metaphrastes (with the consequence that some, high-status texts would in a sense be double-authored, by their original author and by Symeon). And the rewriter’s name would also reintroduce an identity for the narrator (a fact that in some cases led to confusion, since an original “I” was taken to be that of the rewriter, as in the case of Symeon Metaphrastes and the narrator of the *Life of Theoktiste*, see Høgel 2002).

But *metaphrasis* actually also functioned in many cases towards the re-inclusion of lost historical material. Symeon Metaphrastes worked hard on including whatever historical information of the saints he could find in other sources (see Lackner and Høgel). But the process of standardizing had probably already in his days, not least since the shift into minuscular writing, done away with many older versions. Mouvance, to use Zumthor’s concept, can take many ways, but in cannot always retrace its path. In this way two processes of rewriting – first standardization, then *metaphrasis* – ended up yielding us a rich material of less informative but highly polished versions of Byzantine saints’ lives, just like the brilliant, but somewhat repetitive miniatures of the *Menologion of Basil II*.

Dissecting the Miraculous: Nicephorus Gregoras’ ‘Speeding up’ and ‘Freezing up’ Psychologizing Techniques in the Lives of Theophano and Anthony Kauleas

In a recent paper on the Life of St. Michael the Synkellos (BHG 1297) (hereinafter VMS), I argued that among Nicephorus Gregoras’ (ca. 1293–1358/1361) (hereinafter G) metaphrastic techniques can be observed two mutually complementary methods of psychologization and dramatization. In retelling his 9th cent. source (BHG 1296), G omits unessential historical details and secondary plot lines, vividly depicts his heroes’ emotions, ponders on the rules of human relationships, meditates on what a true friendship is, and unfolds monologues into dialogues. One cannot help noting, though, that the particular ways these techniques are applied have different effects as far as the pace of narration is concerned: certain changes are speeding up, intensifying, increasing suspense and dramatic tension, while others (e.g. pseudo-scientific asides on human nature in a form of γαρ-maxims), by contrast, slow it down and in a dispassionate way dissect the emotional life of the protagonists. As a result, the shifts of the first kind facilitate the reader’s self-identification with the heroes, whereas those of the second, on the contrary, extend this distance. The term ‘psychologization’, therefore (provisionally taken in a broad sense of G’s interest to the inner life of his characters), should be redefined in a more nuanced way taking into account the impacts on the narrative tempo of the texts and the possibilities these texts offer to the reader to identify him(her) self with the hero.

For this purpose, I examine two G’s hagiographic metaphraseis close to VMS: the Life of St. Theophano (BHG 1795, hereinafter VTh) and the Life of Anthony Kauleas (BHG 139b, hereinafter VAnt). Both texts, like VMS, deal with distant past, namely the 9th cent., and, also like VMS, draw on one primary source — BHG 1794 and BHG 139 respectively — both source-texts being composed soon after the death of the saint, thus separated by ca 400 years from G. The particular metaphrastic procedures, although, were different: if in the case of VTh G retold a Life and conduct as a Life and conduct, in the case of VAnt he had to transpose a Βίος σὺν ἐγκωμίῳ συμπλεγείς to the Life and conduct proper. Obviously, the case of VAnt is more complicated for the task G had to meet was untypical for the general metaphrastic trend of the Palaeologan period, which presupposed shift in the opposite direction — from Lives to Encomia. G’s source-text was a sophisticated piece of literature composed by a skilled rhetorician who embellished it with series of questions addressed to the reader, lengthy metaphorical periods, digressions, maxims, word-play, and references to Ancient culture. The technique of rhetorization (evident in VMS and VTh) was clearly inapplicable in this case and the text as a whole should be read, in a certain sense, as a simplifying and not an elevating metaphrasis: missing logical links were reestablished and explanatory historical remarks supplied, while lengthy comparisons of the saint with the figures of the Old Testament and accounts of miracles were left aside.

On the following pages I focus on VAnt primarily. Still, a brief recapitulation of what can be extracted from VTh on the issue of ‘psychologization’ (however vague this term may be) is needed. First, G inserts in VTh a programmatic statement of his authorial method: hagiographer’s primary interest
should lie within the character’s ‘intentions’ (προαιρέσεις) rather than his/her ‘deeds’ (πεπραγμένα) (VTh 2; investigated further by M. Hinterberger). Second, leaving aside all changes that affect the historical layer (apology of Leo VI’s adultery, complete silence on the emperor’s bride-show, additional chapters on Leo’s legislative activities and translation of the saint’s relics — cf. a complete list by I. Paraskevopoulou) a close reading of G’s version alongside its source-text shows that G:

transforms monologues into dialogues (Theophano’s and Leo’s meeting in prison: VTh 17),

makes extensive use of direct speech (the saint’s parents’ elaborate albeit verbose prayer to the Mother of God: VTh 7),

replaces ‘political’ chapters of the main source by atmospheric details borrowed from the historians (the chapters on Stylianos Zaoutzes’ role in reestablishing peace between Basil I and Leo left out in favor of the description of the parrots bewailing the emperor’s unfair lot: VTh 19),

adds meaningful details to the portraits (black garments worn by the saint’s future parents διὰ τῶν ἔξω χρωμάτων τοὺς ἐνδον τῆς καρδίας ύπεμφαίοντες ἄνθρακας: VTh 7),

substitutes psychological sketches for miracle stories (the miraculous breast-feeding of the saint with the childless maid’s milk is passed over in silence, instead the father’s conjectures about the saint’s future are presented in detail: VTh 10).

All these alterations may be listed under the ‘speeding up’ category, while others — in their turn, also indicative for G’s interest and acquaintance with theories of perception (e.g., an overextended demonstration of impossibility to have a divine vision otherwise than in one’s sleep: VTh 8) — similarly to what was observed in VMS, estrange the reader from the heroes and discourage him/her from excessive empathy.

Keeping this recurring pattern in mind, I proceed now to VAnt. Comparing the two Lives of Anthony, a historian’s eye easily picks up those shifts that alter the image of the epoch and indicate G’s usage of additional sources (e.g., a detailed exposition of the Photian-Ignatian conflict in VAnt 11, an account of the Leo V’s iconoclasm in VAnt 3). For the present task, nonetheless, all the more telling will be the most stereotyped passages that do not yield any essential historical data and are based almost exclusively on hagiographical topoi.

To illustrate my approach, I offer a close parallel reading of a paragraph concerning the saint’s early years and then give a list of the elements ‘lost’ and ‘gained in translation’.

The source-text runs as follows:

ἄρτι δὲ τοῦ ψελλίζειν ἀρξάμενος, γλυκτοῖς γεννησαμένοις, θαῦμα παρείχετο ὡς γὰρ ὑπολαλείπον 
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To illustrate my approach, I offer a close parallel reading of a paragraph concerning the saint’s early years and then give a list of the elements ‘lost’ and ‘gained in translation’.

The source-text runs as follows:

ἄρτι δὲ τοῦ ψελλίζειν ἀρξάμενος, γλυκτοῖς γεννησαμένοις, θαῦμα παρείχετο ὡς γὰρ ὑπολαλείπον ἀλλο τι σχεδὸν παρείχε τῇ ψελλιζούσῃ γλώσσῃ, πλὴν ὅσα τῆς μυστικῆς ἡμῶν λατρείας τῇ εὐλήπτω τέως καὶ παιδὸς ἀπαλή φύσει δυνατόν ἐντυπούθηκαν καὶ τῶν χειλέων προέρχεσθαι, καὶ τοῦτο τῇ κατὰ μικρὸν αὐξηθέντων σωμάτων ἐπίδοσιν λαμβάνων, συναυξάμενον εἰς τὸ θαῦμα καὶ πᾶς ὅρων προφήτης τοῦ μέλλοντος ἑρμηνεύει. εἰς δὲ πέμπτον ἀνάβας χρόνον καί τῶν γραμμάτων τύπων παρὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ πνεύματος διδασκόμενοι — οὔδε γὰρ εἰς παιδοτρίβου φοιτᾶν τῶν παίδων ἑρμηνεύει καὶ τῆς ἀλλῆς μειρακιώδη τερθρείας ἠνέσχετο — τὰς ἱερολογίας ἀπάσας, ὡς μάλιστα μὴ μυστηριαζόμενα τῇ τοῦ ἱεροτελεστοῦ φωνῇ εἰς τὴν ἀκοὴν ἐκπίπτει τῶν τελουμένων, ευφυῶς ἀποστομάτιζον λυπώντας καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων τὴν μίμησιν ἐπιθέτει, ἄρτον προτιθεὶς καὶ χειρίζων θυμιατήριον, ὡσπερ οὐκ ἀνεχόμενος τῆς ιερᾶς ψυχῆς μὴ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀτελεί τῆς
G. transforms this text in the following manner:

αὐτός τὸν πέμπτον ἡμέραν τῆς ἡλικίας ἀμείβοντας χρόνον τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ πρῶτα τῶν ἱερῶν ὁ πατήρ ἐκπαιδεύει γραμμάτων καὶ πρὸς τὰ κάλλιστα ῥυθμίζειν ἄρχεται τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ ἀποστέλλει, εἰ τι φλοιῶδες εἶχεν ἡ φύσις, καὶ ἀποκόπτειν, εἰ τι ξεκίνησαν δικήν παραφύσιν ἔβλεπε τοῖς τῶν βρέφων ἤθεσιν, ἵνα μὴ, τῆς ‘ψυχῆς ἀπαλῆς’ τινος ἡ ὑποστήν, καὶ τρία τῶν ἐκτήσατο καὶ ἀρχαὶ ἁρμόττουσαν τῇ ἐγκυμοσύνῃ καὶ προθυμίᾳ, τοιαῦτα καὶ πραττόντων, ἕχερσιν ἐργάζεσθαι οὕτως ἐπλούτει τὴν γλῶσσαν, ‘ἐπὶ πρώτης’ ὁβρεφικῶς ψελλίσματι προσέχειν τὸν παίδι καὶ ἄντω πάντα ἐποίει, ἀλλὰ τὸν χρόνον μετρεῖν (BHG 139, l. 69–89 ed. Leone).

Thus, almost nothing is lost in the transfer (one may observe only that G fails to mention the exact manifestations of the boy’s role play), but at the same time, many a detail is changed and several essential points are added. The most important transposition concerns the chronology of the events: if in the source-text the boy having reached his 5th year has already learnt by heart the entire liturgy (tας ἱερολογίας ἀπάσας) except for the words pronounced by the priest in the sanctuary, in G’s less spectacular interpretation he just starts to memorize some parts of the service (ἠνια παρακατεῖχε τῇ μνήμῃ). It is, after all, a rare ability, but not a pure miracle.
The second shift concerns the father’s willful activities in the boy’s spiritual instruction (σφοδρῶς ἀντείχετο τῆς ἐκείνου παιδείας) and his certitude that without this guidance the boy’s soul will be affected by ruinous influence of the outer world. Which is more, he doesn’t only protect the boy from the influence from outside, but also is concerned with the boy’s nature, which turns out to be imperfect and needing some kind of ‘trimming’ (ἀποξέειν, εἰ τι φλοιῶδες εἶχεν) and ‘weeding’ (ἀποκόπτειν, εἰ τι ζιζανίου δίκην παραφυόμενον).

These 2 shifts change the entire atmosphere of the passage and enrich the saint’s portrait as a boy. The narrative is devoid of the miraculous, more down to earth. The reader of the G’s version (just like the father of the saint) sees the boy’s surprising initial success, but at the same time realizes that his inclinations make him all the more vulnerable and his path more dangerous. His nature is human, thus imperfect, which means that he will be subsequently subject to temptations and, at least at the first stages, will need someone to help him to overcome them.

The hero of the source-text is portrayed as a saint from the first pages onwards. G, by contrast, presents Anthony as a future saint — a character in development. This principle is stated expressis verbis: the Maker reserves to Himself the design of our bodily shape (τοῦ σώματος πλάσιν αὐτὸς ἐνεργεῖ ), that’s why we are unable to change it and cannot accuse anyone of being ugly without angering God, but “the more precious part, that is the education and shaping of the soul, He bestowed upon us” (τὸ δὲ τιμώτερον, λέγω δὴ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς παιδαγωγίαν καὶ ἀναπλαστικὴν ἐνέργειαν, ἡμῖν ἐχαρίσατο) <…> we are entrusted with treatment of the illnesses of the soul, as well as with cleaning and whitewashing its stains” (ἐφ’ ἡμῖν ἐστι ταύτης τε ἱατρεύειν τὰς νόσους καὶ τὰς αὐτῆς καθαίρειν καὶ ἀποπλύνειν κηλίδας) (VAnt l. 238–248).

G’s intention is to show how the hero accomplishes this task of self-purification and spiritual ascendance. If at the initial stages he is still in need of an assistant, starting with l. 170–183, he becomes self-dependent. These lines describe the saint’s crucial choice when he “appoints himself a judge” (δικαστὴν <…> αὐτὸς ἐστιν ἡ δικαίωσιν) of every phenomenon of the inner and outer world “picking up what is helpful and leaving aside what puts obstacles in the way of the spiritual contemplation” (see the same judicial metaphor in VMS 263, l. 15–19 ed. Šmit).

The importance and tension of the moment, although, are, strangely enough, diminished by the following remark, which, contrary to the reader’s expectations, indicates that the case of Anthony is not exceptional at all: ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ ἦδη τῆς ἡλικίας ἦν ἀναβεβηκὼς, ἐν ὧν τὸ ἀστατὸν καὶ φερόμενον τῶν λογισμῶν πῆξεν ἡδη καὶ βάσιν λαμβάνει καὶ ἁσφαλῆ κρηπίδα καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων έμφρων διαλακτής ἢ διάνοια γίνεται καὶ σὺν λόγῳ διαμείνα τὰ φαινόμενα τε καὶ ἀκουόμενα ἰκανῶς ἐχει. In other words, it is simply natural for a young man of Anthony’s age to settle down and take responsibility for his decisions. The impression is that G can’t help providing a pseudo-scientific observation on the human nature, notwithstanding the fact that he thus belittles the achievements of his hero.

On the following pages the pattern recurs. G seeks to present the saint as a character with inner struggle and provoke empathy on the part of the reader, but repeatedly alternates deep insights with cold asides abundant in psychological termini technici of the epoch (to describe the saint’s resistance to the carnal desires he uses such expressions as τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς, πύλαι αἰσθητηρίων, παθητικὸς νοῦς, φανταστικὸς ἐναποτίθεσθαι πίναξ: VAnt l. 253ff, 281ff).
The climactic episode of the saint’s temptation by the demon of lust during the Easter service — wholly absent in the source-text and thus highly indicative of G’s literary approach — also contains irreconcilably different elements (VAnt l. 572ff). On the one hand, it is full of dramatic agony and tension. The demon attacks the saint while the priests are waiting for him to begin the service having in mind to lead him to a stalemate: he can either out of fear of ἀνθρωπίνην αἰσχύνην begin the service being sexually aroused (στρατόπεδα λογισμῶν ἐπαγόμενον) thus performing a sacrilege, or refrain from the service and περιφανῆ τὴν αἰσχύνην ἐντεῦθεν ὑπάγει ἐπὶ τοῦ σεμνοῦ καὶ πανδήμου θεάτρου. In any case, Anthony is compelled to commit a καινοτομία. G. intensifies the impression of a deadlock by emphatically repeating that there was no time to decide: ἐν οὕτως ὀξεῖ καὶ βιαίῳ καιρῷ / ὡς δὲ ‘χρόνος’ παρήκε τῆς ὠρας μάλα ‘συχνὸς’ / οὕτω λίαν ὀξεῖ καὶ στενῶ σταδίῳ καὶ χρόνῳ. G. remarks that it would be natural for anyone in such a situation to prefer the first option (l. 596–597), the more so as the bishops were beginning to grumble about the delay (l. 604–606). The hero, although, escapes from the trap by breaking the rules of the game: he chooses none of the options by announcing shamelessly to the assembly what was happening to him. This unexpected decision turns the theatrical metaphor of the previous lines (ἐπὶ τοῦ σεμνοῦ καὶ πανδήμου θεάτρου) inside out: what was meant to be public humiliation is now the saint’s theatrical triumph as he θεατρίζει τὸ δρᾶμα (l. 610). In this episode, G’s art of creating dramatic tension is evident. It is hence all the more striking that he does not care for sustaining it and ruins the impression by a pseudo-scientific remark (l. 529–535) implying that Anthony was attacked by the demon not because of his unique spiritual success but because he had θερμοτέραν ἐκ φύσεως κρᾶσιν and those who have such balance of bodily fluids easily become victims of lust.

How may this coexistence of ‘speeding up’ and ‘freezing up’ insights be explained? On the one hand, the freezing up model was adopted by G’s most renown predecessor — Symeon Metaphrastes, who, nevertheless, was consistent in his attempt to “reinstate the authority” (as Ch. Høgel puts it) of the texts retold: he simultaneously interrupted dramatic episodes by unemotional pseudo-scientific asides and changed speedy dialogues into full-fledged speeches. G, as has been shown, by contrast, borrows the first technique and turns inside out the second. The origin of the ‘speeding up’ technique, on the other hand, must be searched for in the historiographic tradition, which throughout the centuries had developed a specific mode of speaking about the heroes’ emotions allowing certain authors (Michael Psellos, Niketas Choniates) to achieve astonishing psychological authenticity. Being a historian as well, hence clamped between these two mutually opposed lines, ‘Symeonian’ and ‘historiographic’, G developed a unique metaphrastic method different both from that of Symeon Metaphrastes and that of his contemporaries (e.g. Constantine Acropolites). G overcomes the antinomy between these seemingly irreconcilable techniques by making them both to serve a common purpose of dissecting the miraculous: no matter how exactly this effect is achieved — by vividly depicting or anatomizing the emotions and mental life of the hero — a miracle story acquires a human dimension.
Zum Verhältnis der metaphrastischen Vita des Johannes Chrysostomos (BHG 875) und der anonymen Vita BHG 876

Vergleicht man hagiographische Metaphrasen mit Texten, die als ihre Vorlage erkannt wurden, so bleibt in den allermeisten Fällen eine gewisse Unsicherheit, ob es nicht doch eine weitere – unbekannte oder verlorene – Bearbeitung des Textes gab, die der Metaphrase näher steht, und die dann der eigentliche Text wäre, der für einen Vergleich herangezogen werden müsste. Als besonders günstige Ausgangslage kann man es da wohl bezeichnen, wenn ein Text vorliegt, der allein schon wegen seiner Abfassungszeit eine Nähe zum metaphrastischen Menologion aufweist und noch dazu nachweislich dem Metaphrasten als Vorlage diente, so wie das bei der anonym überlieferten Vita des Johannes Chrysostomos BHG 876 der Fall ist.
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Lexikalisch weist der Anonymus Savili relativ wenige Besonderheiten auf. Für folgende Wörter z.B. kennt das Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität bisher aber keine weiteren Belegstellen als die anonyme Vita BHG 876: ἐνόρθος (VJoChrysS 322,18), ξαπογυμνῶ (τὴν κακίαν, ib. 328,33), Παράπτερος (ib. 338,32), πανέφορος (ib. 358,34), παραποίναμαι (ib. 339,43) und τερατουργικῶς (ib. 363,10). Gelegentlich sind weitere Belege für seltene vom anonymen Autor verwendete Wörter in patristischen und byzantinischen hagiographischen Texten zu finden, so z.B. für: μισοθεΐα (VJoChrysS 345,2), προσανακράζω (ib. 338,23), συγκατασφάττω (ib. 312,7) und συνδιάκονος (ib. 356,23). Es begegnen aber auch Wortschöpfungen, die zum ersten Mal in mittelbyzantinischer Zeit belegt sind, wie z.B. ἐπισταλάζω (VJoChrysS 296,42), προσεμπέλαζω (ib. 325,14) oder προσεπικύρζω (ib. 361,26). „Typische Paare“, d.h. Autoren, die immer wieder gemeinsam mit dem Anonymus Savili genannt werden, woraus man eventuell auf einen Anhaltspunkt zum Umfeld des Autors schließen könnte, sind nicht festzustellen.

Text zur Personenbeschreibung des Propheten Elisha, der in der griechischen Namensform Elissaios genannt wird, auf bildliche Darstellungen verwiesen wird (οἶνον αἱ εἰκόνες τὸν Ἑλισσαῖον ἔχουσι VJoChrysM), dies steht im Gegensatz zur Vorlage, die auf eine verbale Beschreibung (οἶνον ὁ λόγος τὸν Ἑλισσαῖον γράφει VJoChrysS), wohl auf 4Kg. 2,22-23, hinweist:

VJoChrysS 323,32-37 ἐγγίσας (sc. ὁ Πρόκλος) δὲ τῷ ἱερῷ κοιτῶν ὃ κατὰ μόνας ὃ τὰ θεῖα σοφὸς ἐναποκλείομενος τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἑσχόλαζε συγγραφῆς, καὶ δι’ ὁπής τινός ἐνιδών ὧν Ἰωάννην μὲν ἀτενῶς ἐπικύπτοντας τε καὶ γράφοντα ἀνδρά τε (δὲ Savile 323,35) τινα φαλακρον πλατείαν ἐμφαίνονται τῇ γενειάδα οἶνον ὁ λόγος τὸν Ἑλισσαῖον γράφει (cf. 4Kg. 2,22-23), πρὸς τὸ δεξίων οὐς ἐπίκεκυψά τοὶ καὶ προσλαλοῦντα αὐτῷ οὕτως ὁ Πρόκλος ιδὼν …

VJoChrysM 1104Β καὶ κοιτῶν δὲ προσελθὼν (sc. ὁ Πρόκλος) ἐνθα σχολάζων ὁ μέγας πόνου εἰκετο, καὶ τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ προσκεκυφώς ἦν, ἐν χρῷ θυρών τε τὸν ὀφθαλμόν προσελπάσας καὶ δι’ ὁπής, ὡς ἐγχοροῦν ἡ διαβλέψας, ὧν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐχόμενον μὲν τοῦ γράφει, καὶ αὐτῷ προσπονοῦμεν ἀνδρά δὲ τίνα φαλακρον οἶνοι αἱ εἰκόνες τὸν Ἑλισσαῖον ἔχουσι, πλατύ τὸ γένειον καθειμένον ἐπὶ τῶν ὣμων ἱρέα τῷ μακαρίῳ προσμιέναται καὶ πρὸς οὕς ἐκεῖνως διαλεγόμενον. Ταῦτα ιδόντα τὸν Πρόκλον …

Auch von der Trauer und Niedergeschlagenheit (ἐπάνεις λυπηρῷ λυπηρος τῷ ἀνδρὶ φανεὶς 1104D und Λύπης, φεῖ, καὶ βαρουμίας μεστὸν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀποπέμπει 1105A) sowie den Selbstvorwürfen des Proklos (εαὐτῷ δὲ μέμφεσθαι μᾶλλον, ὡς παρὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἁμέλειαν τοῦτο συμβαίνον ib.) darüber, dass ihm die Ankunft des nächtlichen Besuchers dreimal verborgen geblieben war, erfahren wir nur ansatzweise in der anonymen Vita (διηπόρει μὲν οὖν καθ’ εαυτόν ὡς εἰκός τ’ ἐν ἐπὶ οἶκον ἐχόμενα προσομιέλειν τῷ μεγάλῳ τολμῶν. VJoChrysS 324,1-2). Im Text des metaphrastischen Menologions wird die Darstellung der Emotionen der handelnden Personen also mehr Raum gegeben als in der anonymen Vita. Auch die Beschreibung des Augenblicks, in dem sich Proklos dessen bewusst wird, dass es sich bei dem nächtlichen Besucher um eine übernatürliche Erscheinung handeln muss, ist in der metaphrastischen Version ausführlicher gestaltet:

VJoChrysS 324,8-11 ὡς δὲ προσελθὼν καὶ διὰ τῆς συνήθους ἑνατενίσας ὠτῆς ὡς μοιοτρόπως πάλιν τὸν μὲν ἱρέα προσομιλοῦντα, τὸν δὲ τοὺς χάρτας κρατοῦντα καὶ τῇ χειρὶ γράφοντα ἐθεάσατο, συνήκεν εὐθὺς οὐ γῆθεν, οὐφανόθεν δὲ προσφοίταν τὸν μὲν μεγάλῳ ἐπιφαινόμενον. VJoChrysM 1105Β τοῦτο εἰπών ἀπεις διὰ τάχους καὶ τῇ ὁπη τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν προσβαλὼν καὶ πάλιν ὠμοίωσες τῶν προτέρως ἀδικὸν τὸν μὲν τὸ στόμα θατέρα τῶν ἀκών παραβάλλοντα καὶ ὡς ἀπόρρητα τίνα διαψιθυρίζοντα, τὸν δὲ χάρτην μεταχειρίζοντα καὶ ἑοκότα γράφει τὰ εἰςφοίμενα, συνήκεν ὁ Πρόκλος οὐκ ἀδείη τήδε τὴν ὄψιν γίνεσθαι, οὕτε μὴν εἶναι ἀνθρώπων εἰ τῷ φαινόμενον, ἄλλα θείον τῷ χρήμα καὶ κρεῖττον ἢ κατ’ ἄνθρωπον.

Neben der peripherastischen Ausdrucksweise (ἐνατενίσας VJoChrysS – ὁ προσβαλων VJoChrysM; προσομιλοῦντα VJoChrysS – τὸ στόμα θατέρα τῶν ἀκών παραβάλλοντα καὶ … διαψιθυρίζοντα VJoChrysM) sticht mit οὐκότα γράφει eine gewisse Relativierung im metaphrastischen Text ins Auge, die die Vorlage nicht aufweist. Auch diese im Vergleich mit den Vorlagen größere Zurückhaltung gegenüber dem „Wunderbaren“ ist schon früher als typisch für Texte des metaphrastischen Menologions festgestellt worden und sie bestätigt sich auch hier an diesen beiden Viten.

375

Baur 1921  

Lackner 1984  

Halkin 1977  

Hinterberger 2014  

Molin Pradel 2013  

van Ommeslaeghe 1976  
F. van Ommeslaeghe, Une Vie acéphale de S. Jean Chrysostome dans le Batop.73. Analecta Bollandiana 94 (1976) 317-356.
Byzantine Chronicles and Metaphrasis

Introduction

What the Byzantines themselves meant by metaphrasis, and how it has been defined in modern scholarship, will, no doubt, be discussed by others in this session. I take it that there are at least two very widely known uses of the term. First, it is used with reference to hagiographical texts, rewritten so as to make them more palatable—an activity for which there is even an eponymous hero of sorts, Symeon the Metaphrast. Secondly, the term is used with reference to a small group of Late Byzantine translations, or paraphrases, of texts such as the Alexiad of Anna Komnena, the Histories of Niketas Choniates, and the Basilikos Andrias of Nikephoros Blemmydes—a corpus highlighted and subjected to scrutiny by Herbert Hunger, Ihor Ševčenko and others (for an overview of research, the reader may turn to M. Hinterberger (ed.), The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature, Turnhout 2014: Brepols).

In this paper I will present a text of a kind which does not belong to any of these metaphrastic categories and has never entered any discussion concerning Byzantine Greek (indeed, to my knowledge, it has never been the object of any research whatsoever). Although it is no translation, or even paraphrase, I will argue that it makes sense to compare it to such. In any case, it is to be hoped that my presentation can give input to a discussion of metaphrasis as well as to the wider questions of how and why we study linguistic variation.

Finally, as a short coda, I will add some thoughts about the future of research into Byzantine Greek, and more specifically what we should do with metaphrastic texts so as to achieve a more systematic basis for their investigation (which, as we will see, involves building an electronic corpus).

Object of study: an anonymous continuation of the Chronicle of Symeon the Logothete

The text studied here is a chronicle. More specifically, it belongs to the kind appended as continuations to other chronicles (in this case, the Chronicle of Symeon the Logothete, a world chronicle of the 10th c.; see for this St. Wahlgren, Symeonis magistri et logothetae Chronicon, Berlin-New York 2006: DeGruyter (CFHB 44:1)). There is a fairly large and diverse corpus of continuations in Byzantine (and post-Byzantine) literature, ranging from some very well-known cases of literary, or not-so-literary, projects modelled upon established predecessors (such as that of Michael Psellos, who writes a continuation to Leo Diakonos, or of Theophanes, who writes a continuation to George Synkellos), to more obscure cases, tucked away in MSS and seldom taken notice of.

The text studied here is one of the obscure cases. We do not know when it was written (it could even be post-Byzantine) nor by whom (theoretically it could have multiple authors and be a compilation in its own turn). Preserved in two 16th c. manuscripts (the Parisinus gr. 1708 and the Vaticanus Ottobonianus gr. 118), the text covers the period from emperor Constantine VII-Alexios I Komnenos (i.e. approx. 945-1118).
As already mentioned, the text is no translation, nor even a paraphrase. It is studied here because of its dependence upon the Chronicle of Symeon the Logothete, and I will argue that this dependence is of a similar kind to the dependence of a metaphrasis proper upon its prototype. Thus, our text bears a general resemblance to Symeon in the way how information is arranged and how the narrative is divided into units. Also, it can be argued that the continuator is working in a kind of dialogue with Symeon, and with a knowledge of what a specific sentence would look like if written by Symeon.

The analysis below is conducted on the basis of my forthcoming edition (the most readily available older edition is I. Bekker, Georgius continuatus, Bonn 1838 (CSHB), also printed in Migne (PG 109)). It is unclear how the two MS witnesses to the text are related to each other, but I operate according to the hypothesis that they are equally important, and that they go back to an original independently of each other. At any rate, there are no significant alternative readings to take into account.

The corpus of 2000 words mentioned in the investigations below is taken from the beginning of the text, until the beginning of the reign of emperor John Tzimiskes.

As I want to test the hypothesis that the continuation was written in a kind of dialogue with the text preceding it in the MSS, there is a focus in the investigations below on differences from the Chronicle of Symeon the Logothete.

Language

General impression of the language of the continuation

The general impression is one of simplicity. The dative is avoided, or replaced by another case form, and we move towards the three-case system of Modern Greek (i.e. nominative (vocative), genitive, and accusative). Cola are short, sentences uncomplicated, and there is a lot of parataxis. Participles seem rare. As far as subordinate clauses are concerned, the situation is somewhat complicated. If there is a tendency to parataxis, this ought to be at the cost of subordination. On the other hand, it seems that subordinate clauses are used as an alternative to even less preferred constructions, such as the infinitive (and participles). There is a lot of να - obviously where subordination cannot be avoided.

Spelling, phonetics, and morphology

The spelling is much less classical in this part of the MSS than in the parts (of the same MSS) transmitting SymLog, a fact that may suggest that the spelling differences are not so much due to the copyists as to the author. There is an abundance of itacisms, but also other cases which may reflect actual phonetic usage, e.g. γυναίκαν/νύκταν, and παλάτιν. Connected to this is morphological innovation, as well as the lack of declension (for the latter see below under participles).

The imperfect and the thematic aorist exhibit the thematic vowel a, e.g. εἶχαν, and παρέλαβαν (also known from SymLog). εἶτον is the normal form (for ἠν); further, ἐφαντάζετον and ἠρέσκετον are used (all this in opposition to SymLog). As in SymLog there are cases of double temporal augment, e.g. ἐδιέβενεν.

The status of the subjunctive, at least as a morphological category, is doubtful. Apparently, indicatives are used after ὅταν: ὅταν ἔχουσι ... καὶ ἀνακατώνουσιν (after να, -ει and -η (ῃ) occur in alternation for the 3rd person; however, this is hardly more than a matter of itacism).
Case and prepositions

As mentioned already, there are signs that the case system is on the move towards Modern Greek.

The dative is remarkably rare: in the sample of 2000 words I have counted only 18 cases: 5 times in the formula ὶ ... ἐτεί (τοῦ κόσμου), 1 ὁνόματι, 1 κακόν ... αὐτῷ, 2 ἐδωκεν αὐτῷ, 2 ἐτι + dat., 1 ἐν ὅνειρῳ, and 1 ἐν φ' ἐκείτο (there is not a single case of ἐν + dative in an instrumental sense, otherwise very common in Byzantine Greek). In another study I counted datives in a wide range of Byzantine texts and concluded that the case form is common almost everywhere (finding some 90 instances in 2000 words of SymLog and even more in most other texts: see St. Wahlgren, "Case, Style and Competence in Byzantine Greek", in Hinterberger 2014: pp. 170-75). Why the dative occurs so seldom in the present text deserves further attention.

The accusative is a frequent substitute for the dative (i.e. in cases where the dative is correct from the classical point of view). This goes with verbs normally taking dative as well as with prepositions. Some examples (see also ὡς ἠλθεν αἰρασικοθεῖ, ἔδοσάν τον σπαθέαν κατὰ κεφαλῆς):

ἀρετὴν ἐπὶ αὐτόν (also ἐρετὴ ἢ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ)
ἀφήκε τὴν βασιλείαν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν Ρωμανὸν
ὄμοιαζεν δένδρον
tὴν βασίλειαν γούν ἔφαν τοῦτο πολλὰ βαρὺ

In the sample of 2000 words there is one certain (ἐβλεπε τὸν Τζιμισχῆν συχνὰ εἰς τὸ παλάτιν) and one possible (ἐκαβαλίκευσε ... ἐσω εἰς τὴν Κωνσταντινουπόλιν) example of εἰς + acc. in a locative sense.

There is also some oscillation between the genitive and the accusative, especially after ἀπό (both case forms are common), but also after χωρίς (χωρίς βίας τινός, but χωρὶς φύλλα).

Negations

Negations are (as in SymLog) mostly used in a conventional Byzantine way, ὦ negating the indicative and μή anything else, even if this is not semantically justified in accordance with classical language (as in one occurrence of μή εὐρόντες, in which case, from a classical point of view, there is no reason not to employ ὦ). Sometimes οὐδέν is more than an internal accusative, as in οὐδέν ἐβλεπε τὸν Τζιμισχῆ. This is the forerunner of Modern Greek δε, which also occurs once: τὴν αἰτίαν ὅπου δεν ἐλαμπροφόρεσαν.

Participles, adverbial adjunct clauses, object arguments etc.

Participles seem rare (although I have no statistics to substantiate this claim), and they are rarely used as an alternative to constructions with a finite verb. Sometimes we may guess that the author does not handle participles with ease. There are some issues with their declination:

βασιλεύσαντος δὲ τοῦτον, ἐβλεπον αὐτόν, and Θεοφανὸν ἄνεβασε κρυφὰ τὸν Τζιμισχῆν μετὰ καὶ ἐτέρων ἀρματωμένων, δείξας (i.e. Theophano). Similar cases are, of course, known from earlier texts, including SymLog.

Several times, participles are employed in periphrastic constructions so as to convey a sense of continuity (instead of a simple imperfect), e.g. ἀγαθὸν ἦν σκεπασμένον, and ἐτὸν ἀπὸ τὸν Φωκᾶν
λυπημένος καὶ θυμωμένος. This is a construction known since Antiquity. Of special interest is the following: εἶτον ἀνθρώπος μισῶν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πονηρίαν. This may be a matter of emphasis, or topicalization, and thus pragmatically justified.

In at least one case there is a distinctly Biblical feel to a participle: ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον.

να is common (there are 19 instances in the 2000 word corpus), and there is a wide variety of subordinate (or not so subordinate) clauses introduced by it. There are object clauses as well as adverbial clauses, and the να-clause can be more or less part of the main argument, or a more dispensable adjunct. Some examples:

 ámbase να ἀνοίξωσι τὰς ἀποθήκας τῆς Μέσης
οὐδὲν ἐδύνατο πλέον να στρατηγεῖ
οὐκ ἔφερε να βλέπῃ
γυρεύει να ἐπάρῃ τὴν βασιλείαν
οὐδεὶς τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς γεννηθέντων ἀνθρώπων ἐστίν να μὴ δένῃ τινὰ ψόγον ἢ ἐλάττωμα εἰσῆλθε καὶ ἀδη να συγχύσῃ τὰ πράγματα
ἐπεσε νὰ ὑπνώσῃ

There are combinations with ὅτι as well as ὅπως: ὁμοσεν ὄρκους φρικτοὺς τῆς βασιλίσσης ὅτι ποτέ του να μὴν ἐπιβουλευθῇ τὰ παιδία του Ῥωμανοῦ, and ἀεὶ ἔπλεκε τοὺς βρόχους ὅπως να ἔχει αὐτοὺς εἰς καιρὸν χρείας.

The very existence of να is interesting (it is not used in chronicles such as SymLog). This is obviously one of the clearest indicators of the general linguistic level of the text.

ἴνα is very rare (twice in 2000 words), and it functions as an alternative to να. At both occasions it occurs after κελεύω, once in variation with να: ἐκέλευσεν ἔθεις ἱνα ἀνοίξωσι τὰς βασιλικὰς ἀποθήκας, and ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἱνα κάθηται ἐντὸς τοῦ ἱκονοστάσιον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἱνα ζῇ.

Also infinitives seem rare, with 15 occurrences in 2000 words (of these, 10 are very close to each other, and in a part of the text where να is missing). Some examples:

ἔμελλε ... τελευτάν
ἡγονίζετο εἴναι
ἐβουλήθησαν τοῦ φυγεῖν (infinitive with article)

Twice there is a consecutive, summarizing infinitive: ὡς εἰπέν, καὶ εἶτον δὲ ὁ Τζιμιχής ἄνθρωπος ὑφαίνει, ἔβλασθαν δὲ ἐπί τοῖς μεγάλοις χαρίτων. The second of these seems especially independent and remarkable.

Obviously, a reason for the decline of the infinitive could be the rise of να (for which see above). However, there are also (twice in 2000 words) forms of the type of the Modern Greek aparemphato, in combination with a slightly weakened θέλω: ἦθελεν καταλῦσει ὑπέρπυρα φ ("he was willing to pay etc."). and καὶ μόλις ὅταν ἦθελεν ἐλθῇ πρὸς βραχὺν ὑπὸν, ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ εἰκονοστασίου αὐτοῦ ἐπιπτεν ("and just before he intended to take a nap, (each time) he fell down etc."). This is far indeed from SymLog and the mid-Byzantine chroniclers.
Conclusion

This overview, although superficial, reveals quite considerable differences between the text under scrutiny - a chronicle serving as a continuation to the Chronicle of Symeon the Logothete - and Symeon's Chronicle itself: the continuation is simpler in style and shows distinct traits of more modern linguistic structures. Whether these differences are of a similar kind and dignity to those dividing metaphrastic texts proper from the texts they were translated from, is one matter we may contemplate.

One reason why I wanted to present this case here is, as hinted at already, that writers of continuations such as this may have found themselves in a situation similar to that of a metaphrast: as in the case of metaphrasis, here, too, there is a previous work which sets the pace and predetermines what the writer may or may not do - even down to the level of phrasing and language.

Here, as in the case of metaphrasis proper, we have to ask questions about competence and about the audience, questions which are fundamental to any discussion of linguistic variation. Is this kind of chronicle, with a simpler linguistic form, intended for an audience less familiar with educated Greek? Perhaps this was originally so - if, that is, the text once functioned as an independent work. However, in the setting in which it has been preserved to us (i.e. directly after the Chronicle of Symeon the Logothete and as a continuation to this) it is hard to think that its form is what it is in order to ensure an easier read. For, if you read this text you are surely supposed to read the one preceding it in the manuscript, i.e. the Chronicle of Symeon the Logothete itself. Perhaps we are more bothered than the Byzantines were about variations of language.

Coda: future research on metaphrasis

It is the fate of Byzantine linguistics and philology at this stage to go electronic, and there is no reason why metaphrastic texts should not be electronically processed, given linguistic tags and studied on a larger scale. One specific research question to be addressed (already pointed out by scholars such as Robert Browning and Ihor Ševčenko) is that of whether there are specific entities in a higher level (language) text which have generally agreed-upon equivalences in texts of a lower level (this seems to be the opinion of I. Ševčenko, “Additional Remarks to the Report on Levels of Style”, JÖB 1982: pp. 226-27).

Even though a conventional corpus, containing tagged metaphrastic texts, would be helpful in itself, we could also think of building a specialised corpus of metaphrastic literature, taking the exclusive characteristics of metaphrastic texts and the particular needs of this sub-field of research into account. Here, the growing interest among linguists in parallel corpora and text alignment should be taken advantage of (see Glottopedia under http://www.glottopedia.org/index.php/Parallel_corpus).
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Constantin Harménopoulos (fl. 1345- † ap. 1359) : homme de loi, copiste de manuscrits

Constantin Harménopoulos est sans aucun doute l’homme de loi le plus célèbre de la fin de la période byzantine, en raison notamment de son recueil de droit séculier, l’*Hexabiblos*, le plus important depuis l’époque des Basiliques (ixe siècle). Harménopoulos est aussi l’auteur, entre autres, d’une *Loi agraire* (*Nomos géôrgikos*), qui constitue un appendice à l’*Hexabiblos*, et d’une *Épitomè des saints canons*.

En dépit de sa notoriété, la vie et la carrière d’Harménopoulos demeurent assez obscures. Habitant à Thessalonique, il a exercé la charge de juge dans cette ville, accédant à plusieurs dignités et s’élévant dans la hiérarchie de l’appareil bureaucratique de l’Empire. Dans les années 1360, il est désigné par le titre de « juge général de Thessalonique », ce qui semble être la charge la plus élevée de la justice thessalonicienne. Mais, en dehors de son activité comme juriste, Harménopoulos participa aux débats qui déchiraient alors la société byzantine, notamment celui concernant la querelle palamite. Ce deuxième volet de la personnalité d’Harménopoulos, beaucoup moins connu que son activité de juriste, explique le nombre important d’œuvres qu’il a aussi consacrées à la théologie. Ses positions demeurent néanmoins ambiguës, car il semble avoir évolué des milieux antihésychastes aux cercles proches du patriarche Philothee Kokkinos.

L’implication d’Harménopoulos dans la querelle palamite explique probablement son ascension au sein du tribunal de Thessalonique, grâce en particulier au rôle du Patriarcat dans la réforme juridique. Mais, les détails de sa carrière nous échappent presque complètement : ses débuts à Thessalonique, la raison de son basculement vers la cause palamite, ou la nature de ses relations avec les élites patriarcales. Ce sont des aspects essentiels si l’on veut comprendre le contexte d’élaboration de l’un des plus importants recueils de lois de l’histoire byzantine.

C’est pourquoi, l’identification de l’écriture d’Harménopoulos, rendue possible grâce à la mise à contribution de la documentation conservée dans les archives du Mont Athos et à l’examen de plusieurs manuscrits, revêt une importance toute particulière, car nous avons pu rapprocher la main du juriste avec celle d’un célèbre copiste anonyme, actif à Thessalonique au milieu du xive siècle. Cette découverte fournit de nombreuses informations nouvelles sur la personnalité et la carrière d’Harménopoulos, qui loin de se borner à l’étude du droit et de la théologie, semble s’être intéressé également à la tragédie, à la rhétorique ou à la philosophie grecques. Cette diversité d’intérêts n’a rien d’exceptionnel pour un érudit de l’époque paléologue, mais elle est peut-être moins attendue dans le cas d’un juriste et théologien. Enfin, l’identification de l’écriture d’Harménopoulos s’avère essentielle pour mieux saisir le processus de compilation de l’*Hexabiblos* et de réforme du corpus juridique byzantin.
La *Collection canonique* du hiéromoine Macaire (olim Mikulov I 136, 16e s.) retrouvée à Orléans, ou comment réformer l’œuvre de Matthieu Blastarès

La *Collection canonique* du hiéromoine Macaire, autrefois la propriété de Ferdinand Hoffman (1540-1607) et longtemps conservée dans la bibliothèque du château de Nikosburg / Mikulov (en République tchèque), avait disparu depuis la vente de la bibliothèque du prince Alexandre von Dietrichstein en 1933 à Lucerne. Ce manuscrit, que nous avons retrouvé par hasard à Orléans et dont nous préparons l’étude, est important car Macaire est devenu depuis près d’un siècle une sorte d’auteur-fantôme de la littérature canonique. Redatée du début du 16e siècle, l’œuvre est une tentative remarquable de remanier la *Collection canonique* de Matthieu Blastarès (14e s.). Macaire, qui trouvait son usage malcommode, s’en justifie dans une préface inédite que nous présenterons. De même, nous illustrerons sa méthode et tenterons d’évaluer l’originalité de son apport à la pratique du droit canon.
Mobility and Legal Practice in the Patriarchal Register of Constantinople

Aim of this paper is to investigate the function of one of the most significant legal institutions in the Late Byzantine Empire: the ecclesiastical court of the endemousa Synod. Base of our research is the material of the so-called Patriarchal Register of Constantinople. It is a source which has been approached from many and various perspectives. As the title denotes, this paper will bring into the discussion the notion of mobility and its significance for the legal practice in Byzantium.

The paradigm of mobilities is closely related to the spatial turn in human sciences. Mobilities encompasses the movement of people, objects, and ideas, while at the same time also societies and systems are seen as being on the move. Our focus will be the legal mobility or in other words, the mobility for legal reasons.

In a recent article we have analysed the role of distance in the quality of information the synodic court had at his disposal [Ek. Mitsiou, Information channels leading to the Patriarchate of Constantinople in the 14th century, in: M. H. Blanchet-M.-H. Congourdeau-D. Muresan (eds), Le Patriarcat Oecuménique de Constantinople et Byzance “hors frontières” (Dossiers Byzantins 15). Paris 2014, 173-185]. This study demonstrated clearly that the mobility of individuals and objects (documents) plays a significant role in cases presented in the synod.

The Patriarchal Register includes abundant information on individuals travelling to or from Constantinople for legal cases. In other instances, local authorities were asked to acquire the testimonies of key-witnesses living in their sees. In many cases, individuals run away from the law.

Apart from registering the cases where mobility is included, another aim of this paper is to map the legal mobility and to proceed to qualitative and even quantitative analysis of the existing data.
Η πρακτική της πατριαρχικής συνόδου επί Ματθαίου Α΄ κατά την εφαρμογή του δίκαιου της επιτροπείας

Η πατριαρχεία του Ματθαίου Α΄ (1397-1410) συμπίπτει σε μεγάλο βαθμό με την εποχή του από ξηράς αποκλεισμού της Κωνσταντινούπολης από τους Οθωμανούς (1394-1402) καθώς και με την τελευταία φάση της εμφύλιας σύγκρουσης μεταξύ του Μανουήλ Β΄ και του Ιωάννη Ζ΄, που κατέληξε σε συμβιβασμό το 1399. Τα γεγονότα αυτά είχαν προκάλεσε στην Κωνσταντινούπολη ένδεια και ερήμωση από όσους μπορούσαν να την εγκαταλείψουν και ιδιαίτερα αξιωματούχους. Με τη λήξη της εμφύλιας διαμάχης ο Ιωάννης Ζ΄ και οι απαδοί του επέστρεψαν στην πρωτεύουσα και η επιστροφή τους συνδέθηκε, από τον Paul Lemerle, με την επανελειτουργία του αυτοκρατορικού δικαστηρίου στην Κωνσταντινούπολη. Παρόλο που μια τέτοια άμεση διασύνδεση έχει αμφισβητηθεί στη βιβλιογραφία, είναι βέβαιο ότι στην παραγμένη αυτή εποχή οι θέσεις στο αυτοκρατορικό δικαστήριο πρέπει να παρέμειναν από το 1398 μέχρι το 1400, έστω περιοδικά, κενές. Αποτέλεσμα αυτής της κατάστασης υπήρξε, η εκτεταμένη δικαιοδοτική δραστηριότητα της πατριαρχικής συνόδου, τόσο από άποψη αριθμού όσο και από άποψη αντικειμένου των υποθέσεων.

Κατά τη διερεύνηση της πατριαρχικής νομολογίας της εποχής διαπιστώνει, ακόμη, κανείς, πως η δικαστηριακή πρακτική του πατριαρχείου είχε διαμορφώσει ένα σύστημα αρχών και διαδικασιών που κάποτε διαφοροποιούσε από τους κανόνες του ισχύοντος δικαίου. Ως χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα για την παρουσία αυτής πρακτικής επιλέχθηκε το δίκαιο της επιτροπείας, το δεν έχει επαρκώς μελετηθεί. Σύμφωνα με τις πατριαρχικές αποφάσεις του τέλους του 14ου αιώνα ουσιώδη ρόλο στο δίκαιο της επιτροπείας έπαιζε η Εκκλησία η οποία ήταν αρμόδια για τη χορήγηση «συγγνώμης ηλικίας» στους ανήλικους ορφανούς και ασκούσε πολλές φορές διαχειριστικά καθήκοντα στην περιουσία τους κυρίως σε σχέση με τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους ή τη διατήρηση των ακινήτων τους. Παρά την εποπτεία αυτή, διαπιστώνεται, πάντως, ότι ανήλικοι που είχαν φθάσει σε μία σχετικά ηλικιακή ωρίμοτητα μπορούσαν να διαχειρίζονται ελεύθερα την περιουσία τους και χωρίς να τους έχει δοθεί «συγγνώμη ηλικίας». Κατά τη γνώμη μου οι πρακτικές αυτές -που είναι ασυνήθιστες στην πρακτική της επιτροπείας που επαλήθηκε το δίκαιο της επιτροπείας- ανταποκρίνονταν σε αντιλήψεις της κοινωνίας για το δίκαιο και το Πατριαρχείο κατά την ενάσκηση της δικαιοδοτικής του δραστηριότητας προσαρμοζόταν σε μεγάλο βαθμό σε αυτές.
L'authenticité des copies remaniées des souverains de la dynastie des Nemanjić (Archives du monastère de Chilandar)

Les archives du monastère de Chilandar renferment 65 actes de souverains de la dynastie des Nemanjić, dont plus de la moitié sont conservés sous forme de copies, tandis que l'on dénombre parmi eux trois faux. Les copies authentiques de chrysobulles ayant déjà fait l'objet de notre attention dans un travail précédent, nous nous arrêterons ici sur les copies remaniées qui, à première vue, pourrait être tenues comme des documents peu fiables puisque, par les informations contenues, leur texte diffère sur quelques points de celui de leurs originaux.

Lorsque l'on relève dans une copie, réalisée plusieurs décennies après la délivrance de son original, le nom d'un village dont il s'agit de l'unique mention en tant que bien appartenant à Chilandar, on est tenté de considérer qu'on est en présence d'un faux. De fait, il est habituel de penser qu'à travers l'adjonction d'un nom dans la liste des villages relevant d'un métoque, les moines visaient à s'accaparer le bien en question. On peut cependant douter que ce procédé ait pu constituer quelque preuve solide de propriété sur un village sachant qu'il est toujours explicitement indiqué dans les chrysobulles de donation des souverains serbes et des empereurs byzantins, que ce soit en faveur de Chilandar ou de quelques autres monastères, que le souverain (au moyen âge le souverain s'identifie à l'Etat) renonce aux impôts et aux corvées dont étaient jusque là redevables à son endroit les hommes dépendants – à savoir les parèques à Byzance et les meropsi et otroci en Serbie - des villages sur lesquels porte la donation. En conséquence, sans la présentation aux collecteurs publics d'une preuve évidente, à savoir d'un acte de donation délivré par un souverain, on ne pouvait guère s'attendre à l'Etat renonce à ses droits, alors qu'en aucune façon les parèques n'auraient été en mesure de verser l'impôt et d'exécuter des corvées au profit de l'Etat et d'un monastère. A cela s'ajoute le fait qu'en cas de perte d'un chrysobulle de donation et de confirmation, le renouvellement des droits de propriété de Chilandar sur les villages et les hommes qui y étaient mentionnés, ne pouvait se fonder sur une simple déclaration des moines. Pour ce faire, il était nécessaire que les participants d’une assemblée, convoquée par le roi et l’archevêque, reconnaissent explicitement ce droit au monastère, par leurs déclarations.

Outre le fait que les copies visaient à actualiser l’état des biens possédés par un monastère, certains autres points y étaient également reformulés en fonctions de la situation à l’époque de leur réalisation. C’est ainsi qu’au printemps 1355, les moines de Chilandar, entendant prouver leur droit de propriété sur des métoques situés en Serbie, font état des obligations et des droits du patriarche, de l’exonération des hommes des métoques de Chilandar les libérant du versement des taxes impériales et du kepahelé, comme cela est écrit dans le chrysobulle du saint roi, c’est-à-dire de Milutin. Sachant que le roi Milutin est décédé le 29 octobre 1321, alors que le premier patriarche de l’Eglise de Serbie a été intronisé au printemps 1346, et ce le même jour que le couronnement impérial du roi Dušan, à savoir pour le jour de Pâques, le 16 avril 1346, il est clair que les informations évoquant ces deux personnages
sont le fruit d'une actualisation de la copie du chrysobulle du roi Milutin. De telles modifications relevées dans un acte sont aujourd'hui considérées comme des anomalies. Il apparaît cependant que le fait d'actualiser des documents constituait au moyen âge une pratique courante et légale, comme l'atteste une donnée d'un acte conservé dans les archives du monastère de la Grande Lavra. Nous y lisons que les moines de cet établissement se sont adressés à l'empereur Alexis III Ange en 1196 pour lui demander de réaliser une copie d'un chrysobulle d'Alexis Ier Comnène daté de 1102 en y introduisant une disposition mentionnant explicitement l'exonération de la dîme sur le vin transporté par les navires de leur monastère. Les Lavriotes fondaient leur droit sur une disposition du chrysobulle d'Alexis Ier stipulant que ce dernier les libérait du versement de l'impôt sur toutes les marchandises transportées par leurs navires. Il s'agit là indéniablement de la raison principale pour laquelle les moines ont demandé l'introduction de ce complément dans ce chrysobulle. Ce faisant, ils étaient aussi probablement guidés par le fait que les chrysobulles jouissaient d'une validité unanimement reconnue, ainsi que par le principe accordant la plus grande valeur au document le plus ancien, à savoir une force légale supérieure à celle d'un document plus récent.

Que l'on ne puisse parler de faux du seul fait que des copies renferment des informations actualisées est un fait attesté précisément par deux faux chrysobulles attribués à l'empereur Dušan. En se fondant sur les caractéristiques paléographiques de leur écriture, il a été conclu que leur réalisation remonte, pour le premier, daté du 12 décembre 1347, aux dernières décennies du 16ème siècle et, pour le second, daté du 26 avril 1348, à la fin du 15ème siècle ou aux premières décennies du 16ème siècle. Renfermant un grand nombre de données identiques, tous deux avaient pour but de renforcer les droits de Chilandar sur les biens de ce monastère, situés dans la région frontalière de l'Athos. Du fait que ces chrysobulles ne s'appuient nullement sur des actes réels de Dušan, auquel ils sont attribués, leurs rédacteurs y ont introduit des noms inventés pour les higoumènes et les représentants de Chilandar, ainsi que pour le proto et tous les membres de l'assemblée du Mont Athos. Même s'agissant de faux, ils en ont pas moins été présentés par les moines de Chilandar, aux autorités turques comme des chrysobulles de l'empereur Dušan datant du milieu du 14ème siècle ayant, de ce fait, valeur d'actes juridiques, pour faire reconnaître leur droits fonciers.

Au vu de ce qui précède nous pouvons en conclure que les copies remaniées peuvent elles aussi être considérées comme des documents dignes de foi.
Les régions de l’Italie méridionale qui ont connu la domination politique de l’Empire constituent un terrain particulièrement favorable à une enquête sur les sources de la pratique juridique byzantine. Les documents qui y ont été rédigés témoignent en effet de normes et de coutumes qui relèvent de la légalité byzantine et qui impliquent tant la réception et la tradition des legal texts venant de Constantinople qu’une adaptation des mœurs coutumiers à la réalité sociale des différentes communautés locales. D’où le titre de cette communication, qui renvoie à un passage du Brébion de la métropole de Reggio (ca 1050) où il est question de définir les termes d’un pacte emphyteoctique.

Par rapport à l’intitulé de la table ronde, pour avancer dans notre analyse, on sera obligé de reculer d’au moins deux siècles : il nous faudra tout d’abord faire le point sur la consistance et les limites de la documentation conservée pour l’époque byzantine (IXᵉ-XIᵉ siècles) et vérifier par la suite les témoignages, bien plus nombreuses, conservés pour l’époque normande et souabe (XIIᵉ - XIIIᵉ siècles). Ce sera l’occasion de montrer que la continuité entre les deux périodes, notamment pour ce qui relève du domaine privé - droit familial et droits réels - tient, entre autre, à la dialectique entre théorie et praxis, et à la souplesse de cette dernière, ce qui représente un trait fondamental de l’expérience juridique byzantine. Les actes publics dressés en grec au XIIᵉ siècle, émanant d’une autorité qui n’est plus l’autorité impériale, nous intéressent en tant que tradition, héritage d’un modèle byzantin transféré dans un ordre juridique différent; les actes privés, en revanche, peuvent attester non seulement du droit personnel byzantin, mais encore la continuité de formes de la culture juridique de Byzance et de son administration sous une domination autre. Une telle continuité est assurée par ces fonctionnaires qui, au plus haut niveau, constituent l’élite italo-grecque, membres de la cour du comte, puis des rois normands. Notarioi, kritai ton grikon, strategoi - intégrés à l’administration royale tout comme les gastaldi lombards avaient intégrés l’administration de l’empire dans les Pouilles reconquises au IXᵉ siècle - sont les garants d’une pratique juridique qui règle, en grec, les rapport privés des sujets de langue, coutume et rite byzantin en terre latine. Lettrés, ceux-ci jouent par ailleurs un rôle important dans la transmission de ces quelques textes juridiques dont la tradition manuscrite, bien attestée dans l’Italie méridionale byzantine, a continué dans les grandes fondations monastiques italo-grecques du Mezzogiorno et de Sicile. Compte tenu du fait que pour l’époque qui nous occupe la référence à la lettre de la norme dans un acte de pratique est chose assez rare (ce qui peut donner lieu à débattre) et que la plupart de la documentation relève de fonds d’archives monastiques (ce qui conditionne la typologie de nos sources) on focalisera sur les quelques exemples dont la teneur nous semble mieux se prêter à discussion et/ou à une comparaison avec les actes de l’Orient byzantin, à savoir: sentences pour la résolution de conflits patrimoniaux; testaments, des laïcs et des moines; donations d’hommes; affranchissement de douloi.
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Argumentaire

La diplomatie est un domaine de la byzantinologie qui connaît aujourd’hui un grand essor. Nombreuses sont les études – tant de synthèse que sur tel aspect ou événement précis – publiées sur la question. D’une manière générale, les historiens s’entendent pour reconnaître à la diplomatie une importance capitale pour la pérennité de l’empire, voir sa survie, jusqu’en 1453. La thématique des “permanences et/ou changements” nous paraît des plus pertinentes pour appréhender l’activité diplomatique de l’empire byzantin. En mille ans d’histoire, les formes (ambassades, missions, instructions, lettres) et les buts (trêves, traités, alliances) qu’a pu prendre cette diplomatie ont été multiples et ont diversement évolué selon les époques et les cadres géopolitiques. En dépit des constances de l’idéologie impériale dont elle se réclame, elle a aussi fait preuve de pragmatisme, élément qui sera au cœur de nos réflexions. Si la dimension centralisée de la diplomatie byzantine a longtemps été mise en avant, aujourd’hui un effort est porté pour apprécier des relations qui peuvent avoir été menées sur les marges et les frontières de l’empire. Persuasion, négociations et diplomatie durant les campagnes militaires méritent attention en ce sens. En outre, une nouvelle lecture des sources invite à mettre en avant l’initiative individuelle des acteurs de la diplomatie, leur adaptation à des réalités changeantes ou à une géopolitique qui n’est nullement fixe. On étudiera les personnes ayant assuré la conduite même de la diplomatie, émissaires officiels (ambassadeurs, envoyés et messagers), et autres personnes souvent négligées par l’historiographie, tels les otages ou membres de la suite des délégations par exemple. Enfin, les souverains, princes et autres hôtes de marque seront inclus. Le contexte de réception/tractations diplomatiques permet de mettre en exergue la part de gestes, de comportements ou d’attitudes ritualisées, qui entrent dans le cadre d’une réflexion sur la symbolique inhérente à l’activité diplomatique.
La diplomatie byzantine à l’origine de la Kievskaja rus

En Europe orientale, apparaissent entre 850-950 des dizaines de « princes » dont les noms de quelques uns nous sont connus par les sources : ainsi, Rjurik, Askold, Dir, Oleg et Igor. Or ces princes ont une histoire largement légendaire. Pourtant deux d’entre eux, Oleg (882-912) et Igor (912-945) nous sont connus par deux traités conclus avec l’Empire romain, l’un daté de 911, l’autre de 944, transcrits, à partir du grec, dans la *Chronique des temps passés* dite de Nestor. C’est à la lecture de ces traités que nous nous proposons d’analyser la genèse du premier État russe, la Kievskaja Rus’.

La diplomatie byzantine en effet a joué un rôle clé dans le processus de reconnaissance et de validation du premier état russe, comme nous pourrons le mesurer également à travers d’autres sources, le *De administrando imperii* de Constantin VII Porphyrogénète et la correspondance judéo-khazare. C’est dans ce contexte géopolitique d’une région en pleine mutation que la Rus’ de Kiev se voit reconnaître par l’empire romain comme un État légitime dans la mesure où elle maîtrise l’écrit, fondement de la légalité. La Rus’ est un État parce qu’il est capable de respecter une diplomatie.

A partir de 944, au Nord de la mer Noire, la Rus’ est chargée d’assurer la protection de la steppe pontique et la sécurité de Constantinople, dans la mesure où elle s’engage à fournir à Constantinople « autant de soldats » que l’empire en aura besoin. Nous savons l’importance de cette disposition qui sauva la dynastie macédonienne par les deux victoires de Chrysopolis du printemps 988 et d’Abydos du 13 avril 989 ! Sans Vladimir de Rus’ Basile II est inconcevable !!!!
Innovative Features and New Strategies in Byzantine-Seljuk Diplomacy

The emergence of the Great Seljuk Empire in the middle of the eleventh-century brought about an important shift in the diplomatic relations of Byzantium with the Muslim world. From a main axis of communication with Fatimid Cairo and a network of contacts with numerous vassal emirates in the eastern borderland of northern Syria, Upper Mesopotamia, and Armenia, the center of gravity shifted back to Baghdad, the Abbasid caliphate, and a new centralizing power, which claimed to exert supreme authority over Sunni Islam and large parts of the Muslim heartlands. Byzantium became directly involved in this process of reorganization both because of the immediate menace to the Byzantine territories in Asia Minor and because of the Seljuk antagonism with the Shiite Fatimid caliphate. The diplomatic relations between Byzantium and the Great Seljuk Empire extend from a first exchange of embassies in 1049 to a last recorded contact with Sultan Muhammad Tapar in 1111. To the extent that the Seljuk sultanate by virtue of its structural and ideological particularities differed sharply from other political entities in the Muslim world, Byzantium had to cope with numerous unprecedented challenges and had to develop new diplomatic strategies and techniques vis-à-vis this powerful partner and opponent. This paper concentrates on innovative features, which were incorporated into Byzantine diplomatic practices as a result of its contacts with the Seljuk Empire. In particular, Byzantium had to respond to Seljuk claims to exert control over Turkish groups and individuals living on Byzantine territory. A second issue was the idea of establishing relations of kinship and bonds of marriage between the Comnenian and the Seljuk dynasties. Towards the end of this period, we come across the idea of establishing a Byzantine-Seljuk coalition against the crusader states, something that has to be seen in connection with the conflicts with the Normans of Antioch.
L’Arménie cilicienne dans la documentation diplomatique byzantine
du douzième au quatorzième siècle

Dans les documents conservés, les relations diplomatiques entre Byzance et l’Arménie cilicienne
commencent en 1107 et perdurent jusqu’en 1331. Nous connaissons les documents diplomatiques
byzantins des chancelleries impériale et patriarcale de Constantinople (voir les Regestes de Dölger
et de Grumel – Laurent – Darrouzès ). Ce sont des lettres qui furent envoyées aux rois de l’Arménie
cilicienne et aux Catholicoi de Tous les Arméniens. Une grande quantité des documents sont
conservés dans les fonds des manuscrits arméniens (voir les travaux de Zekyan et de Bozoyan).
Des deux côtés, les buts initiaux furent d’atténuer les divergences théologiques demeurant entre les
deux Églises et d’élaborer une doctrine politique commune. Les sources contemporaines parlent des
diverses visites diplomatiques organisées des deux côtés.

Le but de ma conférence est de présenter les sujets diplomatiques discutés dans ces écrits.
L’histoire des rapports arméno-byzantins peut être divisée en deux périodes: la première correspond
au règne des empereurs Comnènes, quand l’État cilicien ne jouissait pas encore de reconnaissance
internationale et était perçu comme un vassal de l’Empire. La seconde période suit la reconnaissance
officielle du royaume de l’Arménie cilicienne de 1197/8 et est marquée par les ambitions
expansionnistes des empereurs byzantins appartenant aux familles des Angeloi, des Lascarides et
des Paléologues. À en juger par le nombre des documents conservés, la première période fut la
plus productive: nous disposons d’une trentaine de lettres en grec ou en arménien écrites pendant
cette période. Quelques-unes des lettres écrites en grecque sont conservées en langue originale et
dans une traduction arménienne. Nous disposons d’une dizaine de lettres qui sont parvenues à
Constantinople rédigées en grec et qui furent conservées dans les chancelleries de Constantinople
du treizième au quatorzième siècle.

Ces documents reflètent les prémisses sur lesquelles furent entreprises des missions
diplomatiques entre les Byzantins et les Arméniens. Ces missions furent dirigées par des hauts
fonctionnaires du palais impérial, par des évêques et par le haut clergé.

Parmi les déléguations qui furent envoyées par les Byzantins en Cilicie, particulièrement
importantes sont: les deux ambassades dirigées par le philosophe Theoríanos, envoyées en 1169/70
et en 1171/2; l’ambassade de Basile Kamateros, datée par 1213/4; la visite diplomatique de Michael
Kallikrinites, en 1331. La documentation byzantine reflète les questions suivantes :

1. L’affirmation d’alliance politique des deux nations;

2. La confirmation d’union entre les sièges et les hiérarchies des deux Églises.
Language Change in West Directed Correspondence of the Constantinopolitan Chancelleries during the Palaiologan Period

The language that the imperial (and patriarchal) chancellery used in their correspondence with the West reveals a development that remarkably differs between emperor and patriarch. Its use is profoundly studied in the correspondence of the emperors in the bilingual (Greek and Latin) originals in the time of crusades (12. c.); a recent analysis by Luca Pieralli on the originals around the Council of Lyon deepened the question of language change in the imperial chancellery from a new double issue, separate for both language, to a unique Latin issue of letters (for contracts, however, the double language version in one document continues in Palaiologan period). The chance in the imperial chancellery was noticed and documented already in the overview that Nicolas Oikonomides wrote in 1985 (La chancellerie impériale de Byzance du 13e au 15e siècle). This development becomes even more significant if compared to the contemporary chancellery of the patriarch in the same city: as far as the scarce transmission of West directed correspondence of this chancellery illustrates, the patriarch obviously did not give up adhering to Greek and conceded a bilingual issue of documents only in particular cases. In contrast, the imperial chancellery “declared” Latin as the “official” correspondence language with the West and slightly renounced the former idea of superiority of Greek. The focus of this contribution will be on that bipolarity and possible intentions of the two power factors in Constantinople (as well as the problematic conclusions from Western monolingual transmission).
Female involvement in Byzantine politics in the context of family strategies was not unusual. Specifically, in Late Byzantium, it carried a certain empowerment which often became apparent in the diplomatic arena. From the late 11th century onwards, Byzantine texts mention negotiations conducted by women, often as part of a conscious strategy: a woman negotiator could purposefully be underestimated in order to gain an advantage, or gain time by asking to consult with a male relative in power. This paper will seek to pinpoint through illustrative examples the strategies employed, how they succeeded or backfired and the social and political conditions and situations that produced them.

Obviously, Byzantine authors writing on the Empire's politics and external relations usually mentioned women in the framework of kinship diplomacy. Women traditionally appeared in supporting roles of the male relatives who negotiated marriage treaties; they were also mentioned as part of the welcome ceremony for an imperial/princely bride or as her entourage. However, they also, gradually, gained central place in negotiations, usually, but not only, in the absence of a male negotiator. They became actors in the negotiations, with or, sometimes, without the complete consent of the men of the ruling family. Furthermore, awareness as to their role and authority was gradually acknowledged by the Byzantine writers, probably viewed within an overall “upgraded” status of women.

This involvement in diplomatic matters became more apparent in periods of turmoil: during the interregnum 1204 – 1261, when powerful ladies of the Nicaean Empire and of the so-called Epiros Despotate gradually acquired a more important role, as well as later on, during the civil conflicts of the 13th and 14th centuries. The lengthy negotiations over the marriage alliance between Nicephorus of Epirus, son of the despot Michael II of Epirus and Maria, daughter of Theodore II Laskaris of Nicaea (which began in 1248-50 and finished only in 1256 when the marriage was celebrated in Thessalonica), involved Theodora the wife of the Despot as negotiator and included the fate of important fortresses such as Servia or Durrachium constitute a most characteristic example. Whatever the comparative advantages of that marriage treaty for the two sides, the fact remains that negotiations pertaining to important military matters were entrusted to a leading female figure.

Was this kind of diplomacy a product of times, forced by weakened governments and barely tolerated because of the Empire's difficult circumstances or the outcome of a societal evolution?

La parole est aux auteurs byzantins.
Freedom of Conscience by Treaty:
The Return of the Seven Philosophers and the Protection Clause (Agathias 2.31)

The talk will discuss the famous evidence by Agathias describing migration to Persia and then back to the Roman Empire of seven Hellenic philosophers from the Athenian Academy (Agath. 2.30-31). In particular, it will scrutinise a clause included in a Persian-Roman treaty of 532 by insistence of the shah Chosroes that protected the philosophers on their return back home. This clause guaranteeing the freedom of conscience and belief for the returnees seems quite unique for the history of Roman-Persian diplomacy and international relations.

The aim of this communication is to put the collision described by Agathias in a broad diplomatic and legal context. Would the framework of postliminium be applicable for this case of return? How can the clause in question be compared to numerous clauses regarding deserters and refugees in Roman-Persian treaties? Would protection of religious groups agreed in diplomatic accords provide a correct background or even a parallel for the protection clause in favour of the philosophers? A reflection on the possible answers to these question would contribute to a better understanding of the reality behind Agathias’ evidence.
Permanence and Change in Serbian Medieval Diplomacy

The diplomacy of medieval Serbia, a country on the fringe of the Byzantine commonwealth towards the Latin West, offers an attractive case for research. Available sources present some difficulties, but at least from the 12th century onwards it is possible to follow both of the main aspects of diplomatic activity – diplomatic relations and diplomatic practice – and to note permanence and change in their various features. At first glance, permanence in diplomatic relations may seem largely absent – during the Nemanjid dynasty period (c.1170–1371), Serbia passed through successive phases of friendship and hostility with all of its neighbors, and it was only the advent of the Ottoman threat that brought about a more permanent “balancing act” between the Ottomans and Hungary. Yet, even in the Nemanjid period one can notice several obvious long-term decisions, while closer examination also reveals some committed attempts to foster permanent relationships. But perhaps the most important form of permanence in this aspect of Serbian medieval diplomacy can be found in the general ideas which guided foreign policy, bringing a sense of higher purpose to the apparent opportunism. By making use of certain keywords that appear in available domestic texts, mainly rulers’ biographies, we may distinguish three successive ideas – the early Nemanjids are primarily concerned with consolidation (reflected in terms like “restoration”, “strengthening”, and “self-ruling”), their successors from the second half of the 13th century onwards with expansion (highlighted by the motif of “wealth and glory”), and the generations facing the Ottoman conquest with preservation or survival (the keywords here being “wonder” and “wisdom”). As regards diplomatic practice, the aspect of medieval diplomacy which generally displays more permanence, it is interesting to note that in the Serbian case it seems to have been significantly influenced by changes in the geopolitical environment. In negotiations, Nemanjid diplomacy relied chiefly on embassies, with envoys being chosen according to destination – nobles from Serbia’s Catholic maritime cities were sent on missions to the West, while Athonite monks went to Byzantium. However, in post-Nemanjid times, when the diplomatic horizon was being increasingly narrowed down by the Turkish advance, a more active role was assumed by the rulers who, as vassals of the neighboring powers, personally went to negotiate at their courts. Changes in the international status of Serbian rulers also influenced the frequency and nature of another important diplomatic tool – dynastic marriages, which provide a particularly good indication of the changing fortunes and forms of medieval Serbian diplomacy.
Jonathan Shepard  
University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom; nshepard@easynet.co.uk

The Emperor’s Long Reach: Imperial Alertness to ‘Barbarian’ Resources and Force Majeure, from the Fifth to the Fifteenth Centuries

A recurrent, if not wholly continuous, feature of Byzantine statecraft was its alertness to the military potential of external groupings and powers. This was accompanied by a fair degree of interest in harnessing them to imperial interests. These facts of Byzantine diplomacy may appear too obvious to be worthy of further discussion. But a number of facets invite closer attention. Thus one might consider a possible distinction between, on the one hand, the ceremonial flaunting of the emperor’s employment of exotic ‘barbarian’ manpower in his bodyguard and, on the other, the unacknowledged and deniable incitement of distant peoples against enemies far beyond the frontiers. Also worth considering is the fairly steady ‘pulse’ which the need for such manpower gave to Byzantine diplomacy – a standing supplementary reason for sending envoys, besides the exchange of courtesies and such specific business as the negotiation of alliances. Examples will be cited from the sixth to the fifteenth centuries. Attention will also be drawn to a rather less obvious aspect of imperial interest in the military potential of other peoples as allies or foes. One corollary was a quest for detailed knowledge about their material resources and towns, and about the general lie of the land. The geographical data at the disposal of at least some imperial decision-makers should not be underestimated.
Une mention de l’ambassade « assyrienne » de Photius dans un manuscrit arabe ?

Photius note qu’il a écrit sa « Bibliothèque » lorsque l’empereur l’a sommé de partir en mission en « Assyrie ». Cette vague mention a occasionné des nombreuses hypothèses qui allait de l’assertion qu’il aurait rédigé ce célèbre ouvrage dans les bibliothèques de Bagdad, jusqu’à l’éventualité que « l’Assyrie » ne serait que métaphore sarcastique de son excommunication et exil. Étant donné l’importance de cet ouvrage, les byzantinistes ont exploré toutes les pistes dans les sources grecques afin de pénétrer la réalité derrière l’assertion de Photius. À une exception près, les chercheurs n’ont pas regardé de côté des probables destinataires de la mission diplomatique du savant, les Arabes. Or, il paraît qu’un manuscrit arabe récemment découvert pourrait potentiellement donner la réponse à la question qui hante les byzantinistes depuis un siècle. La tâche que je m’assigne dans cette communication est d’apprécier, sur la base des outils paléographiques et de la chronologie, si l’ambassadeur mentionné par l’historien arabe pourrait bien être notre Photius, ainsi qu’évaluer la possibilité d’avoir exercé lors de cette mission des recherches littéraires. Au dernier lieu, je compte envisager quelle pourrait être la signification de mon interprétation de « l’ambassade en Assyrie » pour notre compréhension de l’œuvre de Photius et des phénomènes culturels du IXᵉ siècle.
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Introduction

This round table aims to study the changes in the organisation and uses of poetry collections during the Byzantine period, placing individual poets, collectors and collections of poetry in a wider context. It also provides an excellent opportunity to discuss some current practical issues in the field, such as: what is the kind of editions, commentaries, translations and studies available or being prepared at the moment? Which texts are most urgently in need of research? What can digital technologies, such as the recently inaugurated Database of Byzantine Book Epigrams, offer?

Topics to be discussed are the following: the socio-historical and material context of poetry collections; their organisation (criteria to select, weave and juxtapose); contemporary preoccupations and tastes; creative reception of e.g. the Palatine Anthology; reader response in different circles (court, education, private use, etc.); relation to other genres and use in non-literary documents.
Book Epigrams on Ancient Poets

Only very recently has the University of Ghent inaugurated the Database of Byzantine Book Epigrams (DBBE), a formidable source of information and fantastic instrument for research in the field of Byzantine studies. In this paper we use the DBBE in order to investigate a specific type of book epigrams: book epigrams on ancient poets.

Our initial idea was to look for book epigrams on anthologies of poetry, for example poems enumerating various poets of an anthology, a sort of miniatures of the proem of Menander’s Stephanos in the Palatine Anthology. However, our search in approximately 1160 “author-related” book epigrams (d.d. 10.04.2016) gave no result of such poems.

Since book epigrams on ancient poets can reveal interesting information relevant to Byzantine poetry and the reception of the ancient poets in general, we decided to continue our research with a slightly different approach. Instead of searching in vain for lost book epigrams on lost anthologies, we intend to present an investigation and interpretation of Byzantine book epigrams on ancient poets. The habit of attaching book epigrams or metrical summaries to ancient texts has a long tradition going back to Hellenistic times (e.g. hypotheses on tragedies, metrical titles for Homeric epics), and has not yet been sufficiently explored.

In our analysis, we will present book epigrams on several ancient poets (e.g. Homer, Hesiod, Tragedians, Oppian, Lycophron etc.), addressing questions of function, reception and authorship. By doing so, we aim to give a clearer image of Byzantine literary culture and its attitude towards the literary heritage of the classical past.

Our research has shown so far that the book epigrams on ancient poets are usually laudatory epigrams praising the literary virtues of the poets, epitaphs from the Palatine Anthology, hypotheses summarizing the content of their poetic works, scholia, metrical titles and short colophons at the end of their works.

These epigrams contain interesting characterizations, word play and remarks about the ancient authors and their works. As such, they can be an important source of information of their perception in Byzantium. For instance, Homer is characterized as “source of words” (“πηγὴ τῶν λόγων”), Sophocles “wise” (“σοφὸς”), Euripides “clever” (“εὐφήης”) and “the glory of poetry” (“κλέος τῆς ποιητικῆς”), while (Pseudo-) Phocylides –due to the moral content of his verses– is called “disciple of Christ” (“Χριστομύστης”) and “great teacher” (“μέγας διδάσκαλος!”).

Another interesting topic that needs further examination is the creative reception of ancient poets by the Byzantines. Frequently, book epigrams on ancient poets not only talk about poets but also imitate their style, reproducing similar themes, vocabulary and meter. Many of the epigrams on
ancient authors are related to the literary, didactic, philological activity of Byzantine authors or their patrons, as is the case with John Geometres, John Tzetzes, Isaac Tzetzes, Bessarion. They reveal what kind of poetry the Byzantines collected, read, used as models and appreciated.

In short, they give a glimpse of contemporary Byzantine taste. Along with the manuscripts of ancient texts that have been preserved, they are witnesses to the transmission and diffusion of the ancient poetry in Byzantium.

As a case study, we will examine the book epigrams on Sophocles. At the moment (d.d. 11.04.2016), 25 occurrences on Sophocles can be found in DBBE. There are certainly more: since the Database is a work in progress, their number is expected to increase. Among them there are hypotheses on the tragedy *Oedipus the King*, epitaphs/tomb epigrams on Sophocles written in elegiacs, which can be also found in the *Palatine Anthology*, monostichs announcing the end of a series of tragedies in a manuscript, a hypothesis on the *Ajax*, and several other short epigrams in dodecasyllables praising Sophocles.

One of these epigrams was composed by John Geometres. We know for certain that he was the author, since it can be found in his poetic collection in codex Paris. Suppl. gr. 352. The function of the epigram varies in accordance with its context (cf. recent work by F. Bernard, and K. Demoen). As an actual book epigram, it accompanies the tragedy *Oedipus the King* in the codices Laur. Plut. 32. 40 (s. XIV, fol. 49r, at the beginning of the play) and Laur. Conv. Soppr. 66 (s. XIV at the end of the play, which is also the end of the codex) (see Radt 1971 and Lauxtermann 2003, Bandini 1961, Tomadaki 2014, van Opstall 2008):

\begin{quote}
Εἰς τὸν Σοφοκλῆν
Δηλών τὰ πικρὰ τῷ γλυκεῖ τῶν ῥημάτων
ἀψίνθιον μέλικι κιρνάς, Σοφόκλεις.
\end{quote}

On Sophocles
By expressing bitterness with the sweetness of eloquence,
you mix, Sophocles, absinthe with honey.

The honey-metaphor, a traditional topos for the sweetness of eloquence (see RAC s.v. ‘Bienen’), is also explicitly mentioned in the biographical tradition of Sophocles, who was called a ‘bee’ on account of his style (see Tyrrell 2006). In addition, the bittersweet flavor as a result of honey mixed with absinthe, is already present in a saying attributed to Thales “ἀψινθίῳ δέδευκας Ἀττικὸν μέλι” (“you mixed Attic honey with absinthe”), but also in the *Comparatio Menandri et Philistionis* and in John’s favourite literary model, Gregory of Nazianzus (see Tziatzi-Papagianni 1998 and Tomadaki 2014) In codex Paris. suppl. gr. 352, the main collection of poems by John Geometres from the 13th century, it does not announce or conclude a collection, but is an aesthetical statement to be found among a mix of epigrams and poems on various themes. The “bitterness” of the subject in Sophocles’ tragedies is also expressed in the following anonymous book epigram, which is preserved at the end of the *Oedipus at Colonus* in cod. Laur. 32, 9 (10th or 11th c.; see http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occ/8001):

\begin{quote}
Εὔρες, Σοφόκλεις, ἐν σοφοίς μέγα κλέος·
ἀλλοτρίας γὰρ συμπλέκουσι θηρινόν
ἀπαντας ἡμᾶς πενθίμους ἀπειργάσω.
\end{quote}

You reaped great fame among the wise, Sophocles,
for intertwining the lamentations of others
you made us all feel sad.
Most interestingly, contrary to the stylistic appreciation in the previous poem, in these dodecasyllables the effect of the subject matter of Sophocles’ plays is also expressed -- particularly the deep sorrow it evokes in the Byzantine audience.

Some epigrams concern more than one author and seem to be written for anthologies with multiple poets. This is the case with codex Praha Národní Knihovna České republiky XXV C 26 (1300 – 1400). It presents on ff. 41-102v two tragedies by Euripides (Orestes and Phoenissae) and on ff. 105-246v four tragedies by Sophocles (Ajax, Electra, Oedipous the King and Antigone, incomplete). In between, we find on ff. 103-104 the Vita of Sophocles by Aristophanes of Byzantium, on f. 104r an hypothesis and a scholium, and on f. 104v the following epigram in dodecasyllables (see http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occ/5518):

Σοφός Σοφοκλῆς, εὐφυῆς δ᾽ Ευρυπίδης,
Τὸν δ᾽ Αισχύλον τέθησα καὶ τοῦτον πλέον.
Σοφοκλέους ποίησις ἡδὴ καλλίων.
Αἴας Τελαμώνιος μαστιγοφόρος.

Sophocles is wise and Euripides clever,
but I am amazed at Aeschylus even more than at them.
Sophocles’ poetry up to this time is (LSJ I.5) the most beautiful:
scourge-bearing Ajax, son of Telamon.

In the first two lines, the Big Three of classical theatre are compared. The poet indicates Aeschylus as the winner, suggesting that his works were included in the same manuscript. The lines contain a word play on the first letters of the Sophocles and Euripides and their respective epithets, while the verb “τέθησα” has an epic flavor. The tone is similar to a (potential) book epigram by John Geometres on three philosophers -- Archytas, Plato and Aristotle (see Van Opstall 2008). The two verses could very well form a little poem by themselves, however, there is no other example of such a poem in the database.

On the other hand, a preference for Sophocles’ beauty is expressed in lines 3 and 4. They seem to come as an afterthought, a positive note on Sophocles, a correction on the (usual?) comparison between the Big Three in favour of Aischylus. They suggest that the epigram is meant as an appetizing introduction in Sophocles Ajax alone. The epithet “μαστιγοφόρος” does not occur in the play, but the tragedy is often referred to as “Αἴας μαστιγοφόρος” by others, for example by Athenaeus (7.5.20-21: “Σοφοκλέους εἰπόντος ἐν Λιάντι μαστιγοφόρο”) in commentaries and scholia. Apparently this was done to distinguish it from other extant versions lost to us now. Whether or not this is so, the epigram offers a clear aesthetic judgment. If ἡδὴ is interpreted correctly, Sophocles is considered to be the best in style: his poetry is honey (“γλυκύτης”, sweetness -- the rhetorical term used by Hermogenes and others).

This short discussion of three different Byzantine book epigrams on Sophocles gives a taste of what will be discussed more thoroughly during the Round Table in Belgrade.
The Four Non-Epigrammatic *Ekphraseis* of the Palatine Anthology

It is something of a paradox that the most famous of all anthologies in Byzantium is also the more complex to characterize as such. In many ways, the *Palatine Anthology* (*AP*) is a *unicum* which does not fit any criteria. The state of fame that it has been enjoying since it appeared in the West at the dawn of the XVIIth c. stressed – yet with reason – the idea that here was the most complete and ‘Ur’ collection of Greek poetry ever retrieved, through what can be seen as a miracle among the hazards of text transmission. However, this trend has conducted to neglect the fact that, if one equates *AP* to the manuscript *P* (Palatinus 23 + *Suppl.* gr. 384), not only the epigram books should be considered. Four poems in particular, of which each holds a claim to be named ‘*ekphrasis*’, are of crucial interest. One cannot airily discard them as they all together represent a fifth of the total verses of *AP*. The question is double, regarding the milieu which selected and transmitted these texts and how they found their way to the final arrangement of *AP*.

They are, by order of apparition in *P*:

Nonnus of Panopolis, *Paraphrase of the Gospel of Saint John*

Paul the Silentiary, *Descriptions of Hagia Sophia and its ambôn*

Christodoros of Coptos, *Description of the Statues of the Zeuxippos*

John of Gaza, *Description of the Cosmic Panel*

Among those, only the three last ones survive in the actual codex. Nonnus’ *Paraphrase* is now missing, but we know of its existence by the *Index vetus*. Furthermore, it is worth underlining that only *P* transmitted the three *Descriptions*; none of the other *syllogai* contains them. Those four poems share several common features. The most striking is their length, several hundreds if not thousands of lines. At first, they seem incompatible with the books of epigrams, where each piece usually ranks from one to a dozen of verses. But if we approach them in the perspective of the ‘*epigramma longum*’, such as it was developed in recent studies, we accept that the short or lengthy aspect of a poem is all relative. As an example, a *lemma* written in the margin of the last folio of John of Gaza’s poem refers to the 732 verses poem as a ‘little poem’ (ποιήματον). So it is, indeed, if one compares it to the 48 books, counting some 20.000 hexameters, of Nonnus of Panopolis’ *Dionysiaca*. Although John’s *Description* remains longer than a standard epigram, the two types of poems are not radically different.

One can even suggest that *AP*’ alleged ‘non-epigrammatic’ poems were perceived and read as a succession of smaller sequences. In the case of Nonnus’ *Paraphrase*, the 21 chapters corresponding to the same amount of sections in the original text, are in fact each of a much more reasonable length (200-300 verses in average), which breaks apart the impression of a continuous flood of words. Christodoros may be the most significant example of a fragmented reading, for his *Description* is nothing that a collection of short poems of a few lines on many different works of art. What makes
the whole coherent is that those statues were located in the same place – the Zeuxippos bath. As for John of Gaza, one can argue that each of the *Cosmic Panel's* 60 allegorical figures he describes in his poem is the subject of an ‘epigram’. In a kind of an impressionistic manner, they read as separate *vignettes*, somehow independent from one other. The poems of Paul the Silentiary can also be interpreted that way, as successive descriptions of different parts of the church, with the *ambôn* receiving a greater attention on its own, due to its artistic and symbolic importance. Moreover, the tendency to multiply the number of prologues and to break the main text into smaller sections seems to go in the same direction. Thus, the relation with the *ekphrastic* epigrams of *AP* should be examined at depth according to this perspective of ‘epigrammatic’ reading of P's longer poems; we mention it for further reference, even though it is not here the right place to do so.

Another connection between those texts is that they are all named *ekphraseis*. This is not obvious, for we are used to refer to Nonnus’ poem on the Gospel of John as being a ‘paraphrase’. It is true that the titles of the extant manuscripts mention the word παράφρασις, but P's *Index vetus* has ἔκφρασις. In our opinion, this is not a mistake on the scribe’s part. It is all about understanding the meaning *ekphrasis* had at the time when *AP* was composed, in relation with the three other texts which bear the same designation. Also, one sees how the idea of *ekphrasis* means more than a mere ‘ecphrase’. For ‘description’ in its full extension is a text which conveys *enargeia*, i. e. ‘efficacy, vividness’. One could propose the comparison with a picture snapped with a camera (*ekphrase*), as opposed to a portrait drawn by a painter (*ekphrasis*). In the mind of the scribe who wrote the *Index vetus*, it is clear that description meant interpretation, to such extend that it comes to characterize in an appropriate way Nonnus rewriting of the Gospel.

Moreover, such a definition seems to imply poetry rather than prose. In addition to being just poems, all four *ekphraseis* are written in Nonnian hexameters. Due to metric and prosody as well as syntax and lexicon practically identical to the *Dionysiaca*, the poem on the *Gospel of John* has been attributed to Nonnus himself, or at the least to authors directly connected to him. John of Gaza’s *Cosmic panel* is the closest example of Nonnian influence, for he takes the poetical manner of the Panopolitan master to apply it to his own purpose. In turn, Paul the Silentiary composes in the ‘Egyptian’ way, however drawing the structure and meaning of his entire composition from John of Gaza. As for Christodoros, numerous are the *loci paralleli* with both Nonnus’ poems, as well as, in a much lesser part, with John of Gaza’s *Description*.

The use of Nonnus’ ‘easy-making’ technique – a kind of a Greek Poetry composition manual – seems to have resulted in a greater flexibility regarding the subject matters. The two poems attributed to Nonnus were already opposite in terms of topic: an epic about Dionysus in contrast with a rephrasing of the Scriptures. His three epigones present in *AP* apparently narrowed it down on description of works of art: painting for John, statues for Christodoros, an entire building for the Silentiary. Nevertheless, the parallel might also be only superficial. For more than the subject as defining a straightforward ‘genre’, what matters here is the different *milieux* and occasions for which those poems were composed. Nonnus’ *Paraphrase* only makes sense after Chalcedon in 451 AD. As a *grammatikos* appointed by the city council to deliver a speech in an official occasion, John of Gaza stands as a representative of the local, provincial elite, of Palestine. Christodoros is part of two worlds: Egyptian by birth, he picks a subject matter of interest for the inhabitants of the capital city, the statues of the Zeuxippos bath, nearby the imperial palace. But it is only with Paul the Silentiary
that the conversion of Egyptian poetry into a Constantinopolitan fashion gets completed. His high position, as a dignitary at the imperial service, is confirmed by the fact that he addresses both the Patriarch and the Emperor themselves in the prologues of his *Descriptions*, which he delivered in the most solemn occasion, the re-consecration of Hagia Sophia, during the celebration of the 562/563 AD Christmas and Epiphany.

Those considerations henceforth allow us to tackle the main challenge of our research, so to say the status of *AP* as an anthology of anthologies. After Alan Cameron’ book on the making of *AP*, Barry Baldwin’s articles on the *Cycle* of Agathias and the views of Marc Lauxtermann on poetic trends in Byzantium, to quote only those scholars, one may wonder what is left to research. That is precisely why a slightly different perspective is needed here. The focus on the so-called ‘non-epigrammatic’ *ekphraseis* as being an intrinsic part of *AP* provides such a shift.

Our work hypothesis is that the *ekphraseis* have been transmitted together. One could qualify this group of poems as a *syllogè*, in the sense that texts presenting common features were collected. However, this does not necessarily mean that they were initially copied in a single, same codex. In fact, it might be more interesting to think as the departure point of a collection of several manuscripts in a common archive. The content of those poems is in fact as coherent as to point toward a precise milieu, if not to the identity of the person who put them together. In a previous research, I was able to demonstrate that Paul the Silentiary had taken John of Gaza’s *ekphrasis* as a model for his own descriptions. Thus, it appears as highly probable that the material he used (his personal copy of John of Gaza’s poem, but also other texts, such as Nonnus’ *Paraphrase*) was kept together with the final written version of his composition. The case gets stronger with the question of the epigram *AP* XV, 1. Those three verses refer to John of Gaza’s *ekphrasis*. They provide a moral judgment on the value of art, blaming the painter who dared to compose the Cosmic panel but celebrating the poet whose words came closer to the divine truth. Who is the author of this epigram? Both Paul the Silentiary and Agathias Scholastikos are serious, potential candidates. The first knew John of Gaza’s poem very well and worked on it on first hand. On the other part, the writing of an epigram on a longer poem enters the logic of anthology which might be more convincingly ascribed to Agathias. The important point for us is that they were both part of the same milieu which produced the *Cycle* of Agathias. We are not quite saying that the *ekphraseis* were originally part of that anthology, but it is worth emphasizing that they belong to the same group of poems which were influent as to shape the Zeitgeist of the poetic circles in the 560–570ties.

If our views are correct, we must now try to understand how this original set of *ekphraseis* got dismantled and put in the present arrangement of *AP*. The key is given by the location of those texts in the global structure of P. A quick codicological survey reveals that each of the four *ekphraseis* started a new quire. Although Nonnus’ *Paraphrase* is missing, one can logically state that it began with the original quire <1>. Paul the Silentiary starts at the actual <1>, Christodoros at the beginning of <5> and John of Gaza with quire <41>. This fact underlines the independent aspect of those poems: in the general perspective of *AP*, they seem to have been considered as books on their own, equivalent to the books of epigrams. This last material is divided in two main bulks based on the handwriting. The passage from hands A to B takes place on Book IX, therefore framing two halves of more or less the same length. As signaled by Cameron, the role of scribe J is predominant. In the main body of epigram books, he works at the junction between blocs A and B: he takes the following of A at
quire <27> and ends <28>, just before the sequence <29>-<40> copied by the three B hands. That J intervenes at the crucial moment that is the end of a quire – preparing for the beginning of the next one – is fundamental for our purpose. This technique is visible in particular for what regards John of Gaza’s ekphrasis. J starts copying the poem at the beginning of a new quire (<41>); after five pages or so (pp. 643-648.9), he leaves to the care of A² the task of writing most of the poem, to the end (pp. 648.10-664.19); but J comes back (p. 664 = fol. 25v of the Supplementum) to write the final title of John's Description, followed by ‘AP XV, 1’ which was in fact already copied in the marginalia of the first page of the poem (p. 643 = fol. 15v). Then he finishes the quire (<43>).

The same applies at the beginning of P, albeit in a more complex way. J copies Paul the Silentiary's ekphrasis, followed by Gregory of Nazianzus’ Carmina dogmatica which have been added to use the space until the end of quire <3>. Then, for the collection of Christian epigrams, J operates exactly like for John of Gaza’s ekphrasis, copying the beginning and the end and leaving the middle to A. The case is unique in P, as this syllogē is contained in a single quire. Then, the location of Christodoros of Coptos’ ekphrasis raises the main issue. This Description is traditionally considered as AP's second book, since it follows the Christian syllogē (AP 1). We already mentioned in which way this ekphrasis could be perceived as a collection of various epigrams, one per statue. However, two main differences with the other ekphraseis can be singled out. First, there is a continuum with the following texts in terms of copy, since no break of quires occurs until the division between hands A and B in AP IX. Secondly, Christodoros’ poem was integrally copied by A. If we accept the idea that J was acting as a maître d’œuvre, he might have given his oral instruction to A, judging that the situation did not present any particular complexity and therefore did not intervene himself at the end of Christodoros’ ekphrasis. One could suggest that the model of P already contained that very succession of texts, of which Christodoros’ was the first. If such is the case, we might have a hint that the anthology of ekphraseis we hypothesized had already been used in a state prior than AP. The transmission of such an anthology together with the model of epigrams books used by J appears therefore as a strong potentiality.

For all these reasons, Christodoros’ case as a separate ekphrasis is less strong than the tandem Paul the Silentiary/ John of Gaza, established by the strong relation model/imitation we mentioned previously. Clearly, J chose to put in regard of each other those two ekphraseis at the beginning and at the end of his composition. By doing so, he gave an even greater weight also in terms of volume to poetry of the V/VIth C., so to say to the authors who were representative of Agathias’ culture and taste. Paul the Silentiary is everywhere present in AP, first by his poems (the ekphrasis and some 80 epigrams, a lot of them erotic therefore in book V), but very probably also through his archive. We have no proof that Agathias would have inherited the Silentiary’s library; however, the possibility of such an event exists, and would explain how and why the four non-epigrammatic ekphraseis were already gathered together in the VIth c. and then reused for the Palatine Anthology.
Monastic Wisdom Versified.
The Paradeisos as an Anthologizing and an Anthologized Collection

This contribution is a side result of a current project: the transformation of the PhD thesis by Björn Isebaert (Ghent 2004) into a book.

The Paradeisos is a collection of 99 classicizing tetrastichs in elegiacs, mainly based on the Apophthegmata Patrum. The date, the author and the title itself are uncertain: the manuscripts (44 are known today, only a small number of which are important for the constitution of the text) provide contradictory information. Moreover, the titles of the individual poems, as well as their order within the collection and even their number vary. All this somehow reflects the fluctuating transmission of the source material, which is, moreover, sometimes impossible to trace back. The collection is still accessible only in out-dated and unreliable editions (Morel 1595 ~ PG; Werfer 1820), despite several editorial plans in the 20th century. Björn Isebaert has prepared a full critical text (as announced at the Paris AIEB conference back in 2001), which will be the core of the monograph under construction. In his thesis, he accepted the attribution of the Paradeisos to John Geometres (the other author to which it is ascribed in the manuscripts is Nilus of Ancyra, yet this attribution is certainly erroneous). In the book, we will present it as the work of an anonymous poet, most probably from the tenth century.

The collection of monastic epigrams has several links to the theme of this round table. I would like to present and discuss three items.

1. The Paradeisos as an anthology of monastic anecdotes

Most of the epigrams are based on earlier texts: more than half of them can be retraced to one or several Apophthegmata Patrum (AP), of which they may be considered as metrical paraphrases. At the same time, the epigrams clearly draw formal and generic inspiration from the Anthologia Palatina (AP) – at least two “axes of reflection” proposed by the conveners thus converge in this corpus: “relation of byzantine poetry to other types/functions of literature” (notably hagiography/monastic wisdom literature) and “specific focus on Palatine and Planudean anthologies”.

Point of attention: is it possible to detect a rationale behind the selection made by the author of the Paradeisos (AP)? We surely can tell something about the metaphrastic technique (which will not be the focus of this contribution) and the construction and function of the collection as a whole. As a start, we will discuss the opening epigram, where the reader is incited to read the work “in order to pluck flowers”, ἄνθεα δρεψόμενος – as an anthologist.

2. The Paradeisos and its fluctuating transmission

The two AP’s have notoriously been transmitted in ever changing and extremely flexible collections: the Palatine Anthology is based on but far from identical to its Cephalan model, which
has been the source of numerous shorter and longer new anthologies or *syllogae*, the Planudean being the most famous. Similarly, the sayings of the desert fathers are transmitted basically in two collections, the alphabetical/anonymous one and the thematic one, but these are far from stable: ranging from small selections as part of general monastic material to large accumulations of up to 1,500 anecdotes, almost every single manuscript offer a collection of its own.

Since the *Paradeisos* is a collection of epigrams like the *Anthologia* and has similar contents as the *Apophthegmata*, one might expect a similar fluidity in its transmission – regardless of the question whether the collection was anonymous or (allegedly) ascribed to an author: authorship does not warrant a stable tradition (Nilus’ monastic works and Geometres’ poems are not transmitted as a consistent whole). Yet, it appears that the *Paradeisos* has not been used as a source for new anthologies, and that there have been no additions of new poems, as far as we can see. Although some manuscripts offer incomplete cycles, and although the order of the epigrams is not the same in all branches of the manuscript tradition, the work has apparently been treated as an unalterable whole. Readers and scribes have not really picked flowers from this garden to arrange them in new bouquets.

3. The *Paradeisos* and its place in the manuscripts

Of course, manuscripts as a whole are a kind of anthologies themselves: (mostly unique) collections of texts that have been selected and arranged in a specific context and with a particular function. The place of the *Paradeisos* within the manuscripts is revealing for its perception and reception in the late and post-Byzantine culture. Attention will be given to the date and the origin of the surviving manuscripts (remarkably late), to their overall contents and the works that tend to surround the *Paradeisos* (no *AP*s there, but a lot of Gregory of Nazianzus, for instance), and to the material presentation of the *Paradeisos* (heading, layout, presence of glosses and the like).
Arnaldo Momigliano famously claimed that Greek historians wrote because they were in exile, while Roman historians were exiled because they wrote histories (Momigliano 1980, 371). The link between history/opinion and exile does not seem to apply in the Byzantine Empire, where writers often appear in imperial service. Moreover, poetry seems to be a medium closely associated with bureaucracy. Such a situation is not exclusive, but gives rise to an important category of writing, namely the poetry of bureaucracy.

Civil service is not the only source of literature in the eleventh century, though there is a surprising connection between both official service and writing. The first example one may mention is the silver coin (miliaresion) of Romanos III Argyros, which has a hexameter poem inscribed on it: Παρθένε οι πολύανεν / δε ήλπικε πάντα κατορθοί (“Glorious Virgin, whoever trusts in you always succeeds”). The poem appears to be in Nonnian hexameters (Lauritzen 2009), but the main interest is that it was the urban prefect (eparch of the city) who was in charge of coin design. That a former urban prefect became emperor (Romanos III) and a poem was produced on his coinage is quite surprising. In coins this is a rare occurrence, but when one turns to lead seals, many of them bear metrical inscriptions (Wassiliou Seibt 2011). Indeed lead seals were attached to letters and official documents to prove and certify the identity of the person who had produced and signed the document. That such an element of proof should be connected with poetry is quite telling.

One of the most important poets of the eleventh century is Christopher Mitylenaios. His collection of occasional poems has the following title: Στίχοι διάφοροι Χριστοφόρου πατρικίου ἀνθυπάτου, γεγονότος Κριτοῦ τῆς Παφλαγονίας καὶ τῶν Ἀρμενικῶν, τοῦ Μητυληναίου (“Christopher Mitylenaios patrician, proconsul, formerly judge of Paphlagonia and of the Armenian Themes”) (De Groote 2013). His metrical renderings of religious calendars also bear similar titles. Moreover Christopher writes a poem for his brother John who is also a bureaucrat (44). Basil Kekaumenos, also writing at this time, have a poem whose title is revealing: Στίχοι ἔπταφιοι εἰς τὸν βέσταρχον Ἀναστάσιον ὑπατον καὶ κριτῆν τὸν Λίζικα τὸν διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ μεγάλου σχήματος Ἀθανάσιον μετονομασθέντα γενόμενοι παρὰ Βασιλείου πρωτοσπαθαρίου ἀσηκρῆτι καὶ κριτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵπποδρομίου τοῦ Κεκαυμένου. (“Funerary verses for the vestarch Anastasios Lizix, hypatos and judge, who changed his name to Anastasios through the holy great habit. The verses were written by Basil Kekaumenos, protospatharios, a secretis, judge of the hippodrome”) (Mercati 1970, I.132-142). Thus the poet Basil, who served in the imperial bureaucracy, wrote for his friend who had also served in the imperial bureaucracy. Moreover, instead of referring exclusively to the death of his friend the monk, he pointed out that the friend had been a civil servant beforehand. The very same Anastasios Lizix was the dedicatee of one of Psellos’ funerary speeches. (Polemis 2013 speech 8). Thus the dedicatee gives a link between Basil Kekaumenos and Psellos. However the connection between the two is likely to be deeper in that Basil’s poem seems to have literary echoes of the funerary poem written by Psellos for the mistress of the Emperor.
Constantine IX Monomachos, Maria Skleraina (Westerink 1992 poem 17 and Dora Spadaro 1984). Such a network of bureaucrats with some sort of connections though poetry is confirmed by the network shown by the letters. If one employs the example of Psellos’ correspondence, more than half his letters are written to kritai, judges, or better provincial/civilian governors. Thus one sees that lead seals often have inscriptions in metre, i.e. in poetry, that some of the poets have bureaucratic titles and that some of the poems are connected. Moreover the letters reveals an important association between high-brow writing (hochsprachliche literatur) and judges. Such complimentary evidence does not seem to be a quirk of transmission but rather to reveal a direct link between poetry and bureaucracy in the eleventh century.

At this point the question is about bureaucracy. Indeed one has seen from these few examples the different types of bureaucrats. In Constantinople itself there were at least three different major public servants: the imperial bureaucrat (such as the judge of the velum – Christophoros Mitylenaios) the city bureaucrat (Romanos III had been urban prefect in charge of minting coins) and the church bureaucrat. Of the latter type one may simply indicate the case of John Mauropous who later became metropolitan of Euchaita and who wrote poems apparently throughout his life. Such a list of three major and often competing groups of civil servants excludes the category of monks (Symeon the New Theologian was also a poet and his disciple Niketas Stethatos dealt with the poetry and his corpus also has poems) and teachers. Therefore it is possible and natural to imagine numerous and varied groups interested in poetry.

This opens a series of questions concerning poetic anthologies. Who are they copied by and who are they composed for? One may first turn to the Palatine Anthology. According to Cameron it may be associated specifically with tenth century Constantine the Rhodian (Cameron 1993, 299-307). Interestingly, he says the most information we can gather about him derives from an ‘autobiographical’ poem, AP 15.15 where Constantine claims he is the καὶ πιστὸν θεράπαντα σκηπτούχοιο Λέοντος ("faithful servant of the emperor Leo") (AP 15.15.4). Rather than focusing on authorship of the AP, one may here turn to the fact that Constantine the Rhodian, who wrote the latest poems present in AP, is known also for his invectives against Samonas, the minister of the emperor Leo, and Leo Choerosphactes, also known for his involvement in politics. Constantine the Rhodian also exchanged invective poems with Theodore the Paphlagonian. Stepping back, one may say that Constantine the Rhodian defines himself according to the service of the emperor Leo VI and uses poetry to communicate with his peers. Moreover, some of his poems are present in the Palatine Anthology. This is problematic if one wishes to reduce higher learning to higher education. On the contrary this is evidence of poetry not connected with an educational system, but rather with bureaucracy.

Some of the topics covered in the Palatine Anthology are in tune with later compositions of the eleventh century. Book 1 has Christian poems which appear similar to the interest of both Mitylenaios and Mauropous and Book 8 is a collection of Gregory of Nazianzus’ poems which were a model for Psellos among others. Book 7 is dedicated to tomb inscriptions, something which Christopher Mitylenaios is interested in as well. Book 13 are different metres, which is curious, given that Mitylenaios has an interest in experimenting writing metres other than iambics. Book 14 are riddles of which Psellos also writes (Westerink Poemata 35-52). This could reduce the reader of the AP as someone who simply wanted poetic models for his or her compositions. This is not possible because of the presence of book 5, the erotic poems, and book 12, the erotic poems devoted to children what is politely referred to as the paidike mousa. These two books do not seem to be suitable teaching material. However they were read, at least when they were copied, in the tenth century.
Thus we have bureaucrats interested in poetry. We have bureaucrats whose poetry is transmitted in the *Palatine Anthology*. Finally a large section of the *Palatine Anthology* is not suited for children or teaching. Combining the three elements it would not appear that the AP was simply copied for the use of a person for a specific occasion from another manuscript or series of manuscripts. Thus personal use and reuse seems to be paramount. Moreover it appears to be interesting especially if one turns to the poetry collection of Symeon the New Theologian. His disciple says that he edited the poems in 1035 and it appears he not only collected them but tried to improve them as well, at least from the point of view of their form. The model for the reemployment and reediting of the poems may be the collection of Theodore the Studites’ poems whose prologue was written by Dionysius Studites. Again, it appears that the collection was a reedition. Thus the specific connection to contemporary circumstances seems important and decisive. The idea that something was done for posterity since the present was hostile seems quite foreign. Thus the ‘κτήμα εἰς ἅ σ’ (“an eternal gain”) of Thucydides or the *otium cum dignitate* (“dignified free time”) of Cicero, which attempt to explain why their contemporaries do not agree with them or why they held back from public office appears quite strange in Byzantium. One could turn to the eleventh century *Strategikon* of Kekaumenos which says Ἄναγίνωσκε πολλά καὶ μαθήσῃ πολλά. Καὶ εἰ ὦ νοεῖς, θάρσει· πολλάς γὰρ διελθόντι σου τὴν βίβλον παρὰ Θεοῦ γνώσθη καὶ νοήσεις αὐτὴν. (“Read much and you will learn much. And if you do not understand, be brave: for often understanding will be given to you by God when you go through the book and you will understand it”). (Kekaumenos 46). Such advice given by someone connected with provincial administration fits well with the idea that precisely during a civil servant’s career there are free moments to read and write. Political service is thus connected with writing and one of the results is the production of a poetry of bureaucracy.
Nicholas Kallikles’ Poetry and the Place of Ekphrasis

Nicholas Kallikles was foremost known as a physician, who attended Alexios I Komnenos during his last illness, according to Anna Komnena’s account. His proximity to the court and possible influence on administrative matters is also attested by four letters addressed to him by Theophylact of Bulgaria. He would nevertheless remain a very shadowy figure, if we could not read some thirty iambic epigrams and short pieces from his pen, which give us a more complete idea of the people with whom he was connected and of his talents and interests in literature.

This small collection is mainly transmitted by an important manuscript, Marcianus gr. Z 524 (=432), which is the only source for many pieces, but which does not include all that has been transmitted. One of the questions that I intend to address is thus that of the composition of the diverse collections that have been transmitted in the manuscript tradition, and that of the place of Kallikles’ works in them. Among the possible criteria for selection and inclusion in a collection figure obvious formal characteristics like the length of an epigram, as well as the subject-matter (funerary pieces, nature of the described objects, etc.) and the people mentioned (linked or not to the imperial family, etc.).

In parallel with the study of the transmission of the individual pieces and groups of poems composed by Kallikles, which belong to the reflection on Anthologies that is one side of this Round Table, it is worth looking at the whole of Kallikles’ conserved production and to investigate his preferred themes and means of expression.

I shall concentrate my attention on the ecphrastic elements, in a broad sense as well as in a few poems that can be considered as primarily of descriptive nature. The systematic use of metaphors by Kallikles gives indeed a strong visual impact to his poetry, in narrative pieces or sections as well as in depictions of material elements. His verse combine different kinds of allusions and images, and the resulting complex poetics must be compared to the production of the contemporary poets that are linked with the same circle of patrons in order to assess the rules and the trends in taste that he follows, or breaches. The importance of vegetal imagery, with flowers, trees, graceful landscapes, is striking and contrasts with a vision of the Palace and the City that is not as peaceful and positive as could be expected in a poetry of generally laudatory tone. The origin, often Scriptural, of the images used, has to be carefully assessed in order to establish what could be attributed to the particular literary sensibility of the author.

The close analysis of this limited but varied corpus under the privileged aspect of the ecphrastic elements and visual metaphors should finally allow us some broader considerations on the formal criteria for studying and classifying the epigrammatic production of the Komnenian era.
The Circulation of Theodore Prodromos’ Poetry in the Twelfth Century and beyond: Between Poetic Circles and Anthologies

The twelfth-century Byzantine literary culture witnessed a number of innovations and shifts; to name but a few: the resurgence of ancient genres (e.g. the satire and novel), the first appearance of works in vernacular, and the unprecedented boom of rhetoric for both the public and private spheres of Byzantine society. However, another major piece of the Komnenian literary puzzle is the vast production of poetry. As Elizabeth Jeffreys has pointed out, the verse production is enormously larger than any other period of Byzantium. Whereas the lion’s share is Constantinopolitan, there is a good deal of poetry written in the periphery of the empire (e.g. Sicily and Athens).

The vast production of poetry during this period overlaps with another very interesting development: the growing “self-assertiveness” on behalf of the poets after the year 1000 that reaches its peak in the twelfth century with the works of Theodore Prodromos and other poets. Many authors started to be more self-conscious about their works and make even programmatic statements about their literary productions from the eleventh century onwards. In order to shape their self-representation and foster their literary persona, we can safely assume that many of them would have created collections of their poetic works. To give but an example, we know that Isaac Komnenos bequeathed to the Kosmoteira Monastery a book that among other works included poems composed in heroic, iambic and political verse.

Unfortunately, neither Isaac Komnenos’ book nor any other anthologies/collections of contemporary poets produced in the twelfth century survive. However, thanks to the recapture of Constantinople in 1261 that brought about another rhetoric blossom and made the Byzantines to shape their “kulturelles Gedächtnis” (to use Jan Assmann’s term) by appropriating and imitating their literary and ceremonial past, a substantial number of anthologies and collections was produced. And yet, they do not always afford us a full insight into the circulation of their poetry in the twelfth century and the original function of their works. There are, however, a few Komnenian poets, whose popularity and influence on fellow poets can be documented; the first name that springs to mind is Theodore Prodromos, the towering Komnenian poet with a corpus that amounts to over 17,000 verses. In this paper I will discuss two media of the circulation of his poetic work: firstly, through its manuscript transmission in Palaiologan anthologies and collections (mainly in Vaticanus gr. 305); and, secondly, through the poetic works of authors who were contemporary to Prodromos or wrote their works after his time. In doing so, I will attempt to demonstrate the continuous popularity of his poetry from the twelfth to the fifteenth century and show that the absence of contemporary anthologies does not always prevent us to gain an insightful glimpse into their wide circulation. More importantly, there are some links between the high number of anthologies and the appropriation of a Komnenian model poet by later authors.

Though no twelfth-century collection of Prodromos’ poetry survives, there are some indications that his works circulated both in and outside the capital during his lifetime. The deluxe
manuscript Panaghiou Taphou 52, which contains Prodromos grammatical treatise dedicated to Irene the Sebastatorissa, was probably produced in the mid twelfth century, when he was still alive. Similarly, a surviving hexametric book epigram for his novel Rodanthese&Dosicles explicitly determines that a copy of this work was presented to Nikephoros Bryennios. Moreover, Prodromos' network of friends included among others Ioannikios the monk, a very active scribe who most probably copied manuscripts with twelfth-century works. Indeed, Prodromos has written a book epigram, which was used as preface to a book with schede of Ioannikios. One cycle of five epigrams under the title ἐπὶ τῷ κήπῳ could have potentially been used as a book epigram that precedes the reading of a poetic collection of Prodromos.

There is even more tangible evidence for the circulation of Prodromos' poetry during his lifetime. In a letter of Michael Italikos to Prodromos, the former says that a certain priest with the name Michael recited some verses by Prodromos in Philippoupolis; it is very likely that this priest had a book with Prodromos' poetry at his disposal. Despite the fact that this particular Michael does not seem to be a poet himself, we know that Prodromos' corpus had a great influence on many contemporary and late twelfth-century authors. The first name that comes to mind is that of Manganeios Prodromos who produced poetry for the court of Manuel Komnenos; undoubtedly, his ceremonial poems owe a great deal to that by Theodore Prodromos.

Additionally, it seems that a poetic circle had been formed around Prodromos including at least three poets: Niketas Eugenianos and the less known poets Ioannikios the Monk, and Peter the Monk. They borrowed verses from Prodromos' works and, more importantly, composed poetic works with the same literary features. In following the paradigm of his teacher, Eugenianos composed his novel Drosilla & Charicles in 3628 verses. He also composed diptychs, namely works that consist of two linked halves: one in prose and one in verse. As an example, we may note that Prodromos commemorated the death of his teacher Stephanos Skylitzes and Sevastokrator Andronikos in triptychs. Similarly, Eugenianos produced a diptych on the occasion of the death of Prodromos. The otherwise unknown Peter the monk composed a monody in hexameters for Prodromos' death, but also a still unedited poem on a bath. Prodromos had also written a poem with exactly the same subject-matter, preserved together with Photios' lexicon in the famous manuscript no. 98 from the Zavorda monastery.

But while these poets were members of Prodromos' inner intellectual circle, there are some others who could have known Prodromos' poems only from manuscripts that circulated in Constantinople upon his death. In the second half of the twelfth century, Haploucheir, in his verse dramation, borrowed a great number of verses from two works of Prodromos. In particular, the opening verse of Dramation is a verse from the Poem “Against a lustful old woman”, while halfway through the same work we find another fifteen verses taken from the neglected work “verses of complaint against Providence”. Since Haploucheir copied two poems that were never inscribed, it is very likely that he had a manuscript with Prodromos' work in his library. In addition to Haploucheir, two other late Komnenian poets, who belonged to the same intellectual milieu, seem to have a copy of Prodromos poetry on their desks: that is, Niketas Choniates and Euthymios Tornikios. The former was familiar with the court poetry of Prodromos (especially the epithalamia) and the twined works, while the latter, except for the borrowing of entire verses, composed twined works and polymetric poems just like Prodromos.
Thus, the circulation of Prodromos’ poetry until the beginning of the thirteenth century can only be delineated through the imitation of his works by other poets. This changes in 1231 with the production of Parisinus gr. 997. This is earliest datable manuscript with Prodromic poetry, while it was copied by a certain monk named Germanos Lignos in Nicaea. Although most of the book is occupied with Niketas of Heraclea’s commentary on the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus, the scribe added a small sylloge of five prodromic poems. The fact that a scribe who was active in Nicaea was interested in Prodromic poetry should not come as a surprise. Although the poetic production during this period is not that rich (especially when it is compared with the late thirteenth century), there is a handful of poets in the exiled empire, who would be interested in poetic production of the Komnenian period. A telling example is George Akropolites who composed in 1139 a verse epitaph for Irene the daughter of Theodore I Laskaris. In this poem Akropolites borrows verses from three funerary poems by Theodore Prodromos (nos. VII, XXIII, XLV).

Parisinus gr. 997 may be the single witness of Prodromic poetry that can safely be dated before the recapture of Constantinople in 1261. By contrast, in the last decades of the thirteenth century approximately twenty-five manuscripts were produced with poetry ascribed to Prodromos. By far the most important one for the Prodromic oeuvre is Vaticanus gr. 305 written in the late thirteenth century by Theophylaktos Saponopoulos, most probably in Constantinople. It contains no less than seventy-five works (both in prose and verse), all of which are included in the second codicological unit, which initially was a separate book. This can be corroborated by the pinax of the manuscript that reads: πίναξ ἀκριβὴς τῆς παρούσης πυξίδος τοῦ σοφοῦ Προδρόμου (pinax of the present book by the wise Prodromos), which was explicitly meant to describe the contents of the second codicological unit before its bounding with other codicological units.

The question that arises is whether the arrangement of Prodromos’ poetry in this collection follows a pattern or not. At first glance, there seems to be no pattern (in terms of genre, theme and chronology), but after a closer look, some exceptions are to be noted: first of all, the two cycles of iambic and hexametric tetrasichs on the Old and New Testaments and the lives of Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil of Caesarea and John Chrysostom are placed together at the very beginning of the codex (fol. 1–27), while the greatest portion of Prodromic poetry is to be found on fol. 88v–129r. On the other hand, the prose works of Prodromos are to be found on fol. 27v–88v and 129r–137v. But again there are two divergences from this norm: a hexametric poem on crucifixion (no. 10) and the “historical poem” no. LVI to be found on fol. 30r and fol. 39v–40r, respectively. Whereas there is no plausible explanation for placing the first poem among the Prodromic letters, the second poem addressed to Alexios Aristenos is placed after prose orations and letters directed to Alexios Aristenos. If, in fact, there is a pattern for the arrangement of the Prodromic works, it could be argued that this was the reason behind the placing of this poem on this particular folio.

Focusing on folios 88v–129r of the manuscript, there are more than 50 poems (some of them are cycles of more than one poems) with diverse functions and purposes. However, it is noticeable that folio 88r–91v—with a single exception—contain seven poems for funerary ceremonies for various addressees. Moreover, some poems that are inscribed to the same genre are occasionally grouped together. For instance, the two satiric poems “Against a lustful woman” and “Against an old man with a long beard”, which built upon Lucianic satire and the 11th book of Greek Anthology with similar scoptic poems, were copied together on folios 99r–101v. The same goes for two verse ethopoiiae entitled “Hypothetical verses about a corpse without hands tossed by the sea” and “Hypothetical
verses about Pausanias who was petrified due to the death of his son Peter” on fol. 103v-104r. On fol. 121v-123r there are two ceremonial poems sung by the Deme hymns on Christmas and Epiphany, respectively.

However, Saponopoulos’ interest surpasses the chronological boundaries of the twelfth century and extends to classical poetry. This is demonstrated emphatically by the fact that he copied the Theriaka, a long hexametric poem on the nature of poisonous animals and the wounds which they inflict of the 2nd century B.C., together with a yet unpublished commentary produced by Saponopoulos himself. Saponopoulos’ interest in poetry and his literary background is further illustrated on fol. 171r where Porphyrios’ work on the Homeric question is to be found. In the margin of this particular folio, next to the rubricated title, Theophylaktos added an epigram of the ninth-century poet Leo the Philosopher on Porphyrios from the Greek Anthology (IX 214):

Τῇ τῶν λόγου σου κογχύλῃ, Πορφύριε, ἐΒάπτεις τὰ χείλη, καὶ στολίζεις τὰς φρένας.

Porphyry, with the purple of your discourse you dye the lips and clothe the mind in splendour.

On the one hand, it is a good example of the re-use of poems from the Greek Anthology as poetic paratexts; on the other one, Saponopoulos’ acquaintance with the Greek Anthology indicates his genuine fondness for poetry. Yet, it should not come as a surprise; it fits well into the literary context of the late thirteenth century when the quasi-contemporary Planudean Anthology was compiled. Moreover, at this point we should remember that the codicological unit preserving Prodromos’ poetry was an individual codex. Thus, by putting these two codicological units together, Saponopoulos paired Komnenian poetry together with classical creating an anthology that is a mixture of “Classizing” and “Byzantine” poetic material.

Theophylaktos Saponopoulos does not seem to have been a poet, but as I have argued elsewhere the codex was part of his personal library. On the last folio of the codex he copied four dodecasyllabic poems written by a certain Nikephoros Saponopoulos, most probably a member of his close family entourage. In doing so, Theophylaktos was seeking to safeguard the poetic work of his kinsman. Interestingly enough, after a first look at Nikephoros Saponopoulos’ four poems, it becomes obvious that he was well-acquainted with the poetic corpus of Prodromos. In particular, his fourth work preserved on the last folio of vaticanus gr. 305, which is a self-referential poem, resembles the wording of the Prodromic poem “Verses of complaint against the Providence” copied on fol. 97v-99r of the manuscript. If the codicological unit with Prodromos’ work was indeed copied by Theophylaktos Saponopoulos before that one of Nikephoros Saponopoulos’ poetry, it is likely that Nikephoros knew Prodromos’ poem from the very same manuscript that contains his own works.

The collection of Prodromos’ works in Vaticanus gr. 305, the high number of anthologies and collections with his works, and the use of his work by Nikephoros Saponopoulos and other thirteenth-century poets is an outcome of his immense popularity and his elevation as model poet in the late thirteenth century. For instance, the contemporary rhetorical anonymous treatise “on the four parts of the perfect speech” prompts aspiring rhetoricians of the thirteenth century to use Prodromos’ poetry as model (together with that of Sophocles, Lycophron, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Kallikles).

In addition to Nikephoros Saponopoulos, we can assume that the well-known poets Manuel Holobolos and Manuel Philes consulted such collections and anthologies with poetry of Prodromos. Besides, the fact that Prodromos entered the world of manuscripts is partly associated with the
early Palaiologan re-use of poetry for various ceremonial occasions by these two poets and the reappearance of the “rhetoric of poverty” in the poetry by Philes. Yet, the exact connections between Holobolos and Philes, and, on the other hand, Prodromos remain to be studied. That said, we know, for example, that Holobolos wrote metrical replies to some riddles by Prodromos’ contemporary author Eustathios Makrembolites interacting with works of Komnenian authors.

Moving to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Prodromos’ popularity was further enhanced, since no less than fifty codices transmit works of his as part of anthologies, collections and small syllogae. A very interesting case is Vaticanus gr. 1126, a pocket size manuscript of parchment with beautiful decorations and tetragrams produced in Constantinople sometime in the mid-fourteenth century. This deluxe manuscript of personal use transmits about 15 poems by Prodromos together with a vast portion of poetry by Manuel Philes, some poems by George Pisides, Prosouch, Manuel Melissenos and even a treatise on meter. Thus, the owner of the manuscript had a strong interest in poetry ranging from the seventh to the contemporary times of its production. But the circulation of Prodromos’ poetry transcended the borderlines of the Capital. Many scribes in southern Italy started copying Prodromos’ poetry already in the thirteenth century (e.g. Laurent. Plut. V, 10), but in the fourteenth century we have a vast production of manuscripts in this region. The most well-known example is Vatic. Gr. 1276, produced sometime between 1310 and 1318. Apart from poems of various authors of the poetical circle of Otranto (e.g. Nikolaos of Otranto, abbot, Nikolaos/ Nektarios, John Grassos, and Marcus Monachos), there are poems by Prodromos and other famous Byzantine poets (e.g. Christopher Mitylenaios and Michael Psellos).

Once again the broad circulation of Prodromos’ poetry in manuscripts copied in and outside of Constantinople coincides with the appropriation of his work by some late Palaiologan authors. John Chortasmenos and Joseph Bryennios used and imitated works of Prodromos. As with Theodore Prodromos, John Chortasmenos penned a funerary work, which is mixture of prose and verse, on the occasion of the death of Andreas Asan and his son Manuel Asan. As Wolfram Hörandner has noted, a substantial number of verses (78 out of 131) of this work are borrowed from a funerary poem for Irene Sevastokratorissa’s husband Andronikos, different books of his verse novel Rodanthe & Dosikles and Christos Paschon (probably written by Prodromos). Joseph Bryennios, who was in the same intellectual circle with Chortasmenos, is the author of Ἐκφρασις παραδείσου. The sentiment and the wording of this neglected work strongly resembles Prodromos’ cycle of epigrams “ἐπὶ τὸ κήπῳ” epigrams ‘on the garden’ before composing his own. Finally, the less known fifteenth-century author Andronikos Doukas Sgouros composed two hexametric poems that are yet unedited. The first is dedicated to the Holy Trinity, while the second to Gregory of Nazianzus. The last verse of the poem on Gregory is actually a borrowing from the present poem.

In sum, Vaticanus gr. 305 and many other manuscripts provide significant insights into the reading and reception of Prodromos’ poetry in the Palaiologan period. Prodromos’ poems were preserved and read along with poetry of other famous Byzantine poets elevating him as a model poet. As a result, some of these Palaiologan poets used these collections and anthologies to compose their own poems (like in the case of Nikephoros Saponopoulos, Manuel Philes, John Chortasmenos and Joseph Bryennios). However, it seems that Prodromos works started circulating in poetic collections and anthologies already in the twelfth century. Hence, the continuity of Prodromos’ popularity allows us to build a bridge between the circulation of his works between the Komnenian and Palaiologan periods.
Manuel Philes’ Poetry Collections

Anthologies teach us a lot about the literary taste of the Byzantines. They show which authors and texts were held in high esteem. Their principles of composition bear witness to the Byzantine understanding of genres, of topics belonging together and so on. As a collection, they show a creative drive and can be understood as works of art on their own. Collective manuscripts are different. Their aim is simply to collect poems rather than to interpret and evaluate them by creatively composing a collection. Collective manuscripts can be seen as objects of everyday life to a greater extent than anthologies can. They are especially interesting in the context of the so-called Gebrauchsliteratur, as they can show traces of the original context of use of poems, especially when they are (nearly) contemporary to their composition. Previous research has usually studied these manuscripts only with regard to the process of editing, but not for their own sake. However, studying collective manuscripts in the way anthologies are studied in respect of their composition, one can not only find out more about single manuscripts, but also about the oeuvre of an author. Manuel Philes, the most important poet of the early Palaiologan period, is known almost exclusively from his own writing. In order to contextualise his work and find out more about how his contemporaries read his poems, one is thus forced to analyse more indirect evidence. This includes the study of collective manuscripts. The following considerations are mainly, but not exclusively, based on the analysis of two codices, namely Athens, ΜΠ 351 and Vienna, Hist. gr. 112. Both of them are dated to the first half of the 14th century and contain only poems by Manuel Philes. Even without studying all manuscripts containing Philes’ oeuvre (more than 150!) in depth, one can extract some general tendencies in the composition of these collective manuscripts and the possible relevance to the study of Philes’ sociocultural context. My main interest is the principles of the composition of the manuscripts: are there any? Are they different in different manuscripts? Can we find traces of the transformation of the poems from ephemeral texts to literary pieces in the process of including them in a manuscript? Answers to these questions may be fruitful not only for a possible new edition of Philes’ poems, but also for the understanding of their literary character and sociocultural context.

The study of collective manuscripts can provide us with information about the context of a poem that cannot be gained by looking at a modern edition. The most obvious source for this is the headings, which can offer richer information in one manuscript than another or even different information. While in recent critical editions it should be a matter of course that all extant headings are listed in the apparatus criticus, this is not the case with Philes, as the old editions did not use all manuscripts. Less straightforward is the analysis of how poems were grouped. Although many collective manuscripts do not show an overall plan of composition, one can detect certain clusters of texts belonging to each other in one way or another. Sometimes text groups can be identified by looking at the layout of the codex as well as the rubrics. Mostly, however, groups are not that easily identifiable and can only be understood through internal markers in the text. Principles of order in the Philes manuscripts can be subsumed under the following categories: the object or type of object on or for which an epigram was written; genre; topic; addressee. Finally, there are sequels, which form a narrative.
The manuscript Metochion tou Panagiou Tafou 351 is mutilated at its beginning and its end. Hence, possible information about the donor, scribe or exact date is not extant. If seen as a whole, there is no overall plan or coherent composition recognisable, yet there are interesting clusters.

The first completely extant poem is an epigram on the annunciation. Before its beginning, there is a blank space in the manuscript signalling that what follows is independent from what preceded it. It is followed by 11 other epigrams following the life of Christ (ff. 1r–2v). The evidence suggests that this epigram cycle belonged to the same object, possibly a manuscript, the illustrations of which were accompanied by these epigrams. The impression of their unity is further enhanced by the fact that one line is left blank after the last epigram, before another cycle begins. It is only through the study of MPT 351 that the modern reader can, with some plausibility, reconstruct these epigrams as belonging to the same object as in the edition which is based on the codex El Escorial, R.III.17 it is not evident that the epigrams form a single group. Similarly, a group of book epigrams for a New Testament manuscript follows (ff. 2v–5r). In what follows one finds several pairs or groups of epigrams that are connected by their topic, especially by a scene in an image or an image type, as, for example, the beheading of John the Baptist (f. 8v). The headings leave open the question of whether the epigrams were written for the same object or only the same type of scene, as εἰκόν in the phrase εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα can mean both. Another example of how poems were grouped according to their use on an object is a sequence of poems on John the Baptist and other Johns, such as John Chrysostomos etc. One has to imagine an icon depicting John the Baptist in the centre and the others around him, as the heading to this group in Cod. Esc. R.III.17 suggests: Εἰς τὴν γέννησιν τοῦ Προδρόμου ἔχουσαν περὶ αὐτῆς ἔξωγραφημένους τοὺς συνωνύμους αὐτοῦ (ff. 204r–205r in ΜΠΤ 351). Furthermore, that the first 118 texts in ΜΠΤ 351 are all epigrams shows an awareness of the genre. Unfortunately, it is impossible to state whether there was a clear indication in the manuscript that one section had ended and a new one begun, because after epigram 118 one or several folios are missing (between f. 25 and 26).

ΜΠΤ 351 also helps us to understand the chronology of Philes’ poems better. Several poems form a narrative. Of special interest is a sequence of 25 poems either directed or connected to the emperor (ff. 154r–172r). The order differs greatly from the one in the edition and makes much more sense in the manuscript. In several verse letters the poetic persona asks the emperor for help. They begin with a rather neutral plea for a cloak and then go on to reflect on the ‘mistake’ of the I. Which mistake this was does not become clear (neither in ΜΠΤ 351 nor in Philes’ whole oeuvre), but the effect was that the emperor ceased to administer help to the I. In several poems the I stresses that he was slandered and had done nothing wrong. Two poems which follow each other are especially closely connected: the first is addressed to a friend or acquaintance of the I asking him to intercede on behalf of the I, because he had done nothing wrong and was slandered. The second is a letter to the emperor himself, stating the same and asking for just treatment. The poems of the sequence also include pleas for help including several pleas to support the I’s baby. ΜΠΤ 351 includes two tetrasticha on this topic. They are strongly connected, both by their content and their language. One of them was written in the margin after the main text was already finished (f. 162r). Obviously, the scribe or editor of the manuscript showed an interest in grouping these poems in the way they belonged together. That the poems of the whole sequence are also to be read in a chronological order is proven by the topic of the death of the poetic I’s wife. Whereas in an earlier poem, which is concerned with a sickness of the son of the I, there is a passage stating that all the care given by
his mother cannot help him, a later poem tells the emperor that the wife of the I has died and that his family is thus in severe misery. This sequence of poems may have originally been written and sent in this order. Be this the case or be it that it was the scribe who put the poems in this order, the example show how deliberately poems were chosen and grouped in MIT 351 according to addressee and topic, thus forming a coherent narrative. The composition shows a strong interest in the story behind the single texts. Additionally, at the end of this sequence of letters to the emperor there are eleven epigrams concerned with the imperial palace, the first one on the roof, the others on pictures of the four cardinal virtues. This makes sense in the context of Philes’ pleas, where he frequently stresses that he had written a lot for the emperor and was thus hoping to get some help in return. Here, the text group is established not only following a narrative, but independently from the genre according to the addressees.

There are many more examples of groups of poems (especially verse letters), which are grouped according to their addressee. However, not only the rubrics including the name of the addressee are interesting. Some manuscripts bear headings such as εἰς νέον τινά or εἰς σώφρονα γυναίκα in one manuscript, whereas in others information about a specific addressee or praised person is provided in the heading (cf. e.g. ed. Miller, P 131 with the heading Ἐπιτάφιοι εἰς γυναίκα σώφρονα in the edition and Ἐπιτάφιοι εἰς τὴν συζύγην τοῦ Γαβρᾶ in Vienna, hist. gr. 112, f. 104v). In scholarship poems with indefinite headings were understood as poems written by Philes on storage, which could be sold to anybody who needed a certain type of text (e.g. an epitaph for a young woman). This may be the case. However, from the perspective of the reception of these poems, it is more important to note that they were valued and copied in collective manuscripts, no matter whether the specific information about their first context of use was known or not. This shows how the poems were no longer mainly read as Gebrauchsliteratur, strongly tied to a specific usage, but valued for their literary merits alone.

In spite of the findings presented above, one should not overestimate the value of the information to be gained from collective manuscripts. The study of some can be rather disappointing. The codex Vienna, Hist. gr. 112, for example, offers very little information (if at all) which helps to understand and contextualise single poems. Only rarely are more than two poems that resemble each other with regard to their genre, content, addressee or subject grouped together. It seems that the scribe of this manuscript copied Philes’ poems without any sense of composition. He adds two poems after finishing the main text (ff. 108v–109r and 138v), yet, again, there does not seem to be any reason for the concrete position of these.

As shown above, a detailed study of collective manuscripts can help to understand the reception of Philes’ poetry. In the case of epigrams, it is possible to reconstruct specific objects for which the texts were used. Furthermore, we are informed about the addressees or laudandi/-ae of single texts. Other groups of texts form a narrative. None of the examples shown above can be understood by the use of the editions alone. It is only by comparing the edition with (an)other manuscript(s) that this information is to be gained. In order to completely assess the evidence, one has to study all of the collective manuscripts of Philes’ oeuvre. The only way to do this seems to be to create a database. It should include information about the sequence of the poems in each manuscript and their genre, subject, addressee and content, as well as the respective heading. Hence, one can examine the order of each specific codex. Additionally, using a database provides one with the possibility to easily find out the place and context of single poems in the manuscripts. One could
also extract information about which addressees are found in which manuscript, which genres prevail in different manuscripts etc. In this way, a complex analysis of the collective manuscripts and their value for the interpretation of Philes’ poems would be possible.

The question one should ask is: is this worth the effort? The answer is twofold. On the one hand, as argued above, the study of the composition of collective manuscripts can lead to a better understanding of single poems and their context. On the other hand, it does not necessarily do so. For the time being, one can only guess how many manuscripts are as telling as MITT 351 and how many as disappointing as Hist. gr. 112. It is thus highly uncertain whether a large study of the collective manuscripts would result in a significant outcome. However, in the course of producing a new Philes edition, a detailed study of the composition of the collective manuscripts would certainly be a worthwhile task. As long as no one does so – and I am not aware of any such endeavour – one will probably work with accidental findings about single pieces, depending on particular interests that lead to the consultation of a manuscript as well as on the availability of good manuscript copies and/or access to study them in situ. However, collective manuscripts are not only of interest for the editor, but for everybody who wants to understand the context of single poems. Although collective manuscripts are not as coherently composed as anthologies, their study can thus lead to a much better understanding of the reception of poetry by the Byzantines.
Bessarione poeta

Il codice Marc. Gr. 533 (= 778), chartaceus di piccolo taglio, fu completato da Bessarione poco dopo la fine del 1444, quando la catastrofe crociata a Varna vanificò le speranze in quel “salvataggio occidentale di Bisanzio” da parte delle potenze europee che l’unione di Firenze, cinque anni prima, aveva avuto il preciso intento politico di garantire, a prezzo di una resa dogmatica, di cui Bessarione era stato l’artefice, unicamente funzionale alla ragion di stato e capace di sacrificare, in suo nome, la buona fede teologica ortodossa e la millenaria competenza trinitaria dei bizantini.

Che proprio in quel momento Bessarione abbia deciso di “pubblicare” (ἐκθεῖναι) i suoi scritti giovanili, copiandoli personalmente e dichiarando nei loro confronti un “amore paterno” (ὡς οἰκεία γεννήματα φιλούντες), potrebbe celare, fra le altre cose, un intento di riaffermazione di identità, al di là dell’almeno apparente scelta filoccidentale, del bilinguismo rapidamente acquisito, dell’ambiguo rapporto con la ragion politica e religiosa della prima Roma.

Fra i testi, originariamente raccolti in nove manoscritti parziali, rilegati poi in un singolo volume, compaiono sei poesie funebri (ff. 38v-38bis, 39, 48v-49v). Riesaminerò brevemente, alla luce di alcuni nuovi dati, tre dei sei componimenti, di cui ho avuto modo di scrivere molti anni fa, su richiesta di Gian Franco Fiaccadori, alla cui memoria questo mio breve intervento è oggi, con tristezza, dedicato.

Versi in morte di Michele Amirutza

Nei primi anni del regno di Giovanni VIII Paleologo, tra il 1426 e il 1427, Bessarione aveva maturato una buona esperienza diplomatica. Prima del concilio di Ferrara, ancora giovanissimo era stato più volte inviato dal basileus alla città natale, Trebisonda, in ambasceria presso Alessio IV Comneno.

La destinazione di queste prime missioni diplomatiche acquista una nuova rilevanza alla luce dell’ipotesi, recentemente avanzata e corroborata da più dati, che Bessarione fosse lui stesso un Gran Comneno di Trebisonda. Fino a poco tempo fa ritenuto di estrazione oscura e modesta, l’enfant prodige che a soli quindici anni aveva fatto “invaghire della sua bellissima indole, della bontà di costumi, della nobiltà del sangue e dell’eminenza dell’ingegno” i suoi maestri e “innamorare delle sue virtù singolari” i sovrani Paleologhi, stando alla documentazione presa in esame da Tommaso Braccini nel 2006, e in particolare a quanto riportato nella Verità essaminata di Benedetto Orsini, la cui fonte è dichiaratamente costituita dai perduti Annotamenti Historici di Giano Lascaris, apparteneva per parte di madre all’antica stirpe dei Comneni e la sua famiglia, anche se forse economicamente decaduta, faceva parte del clan della nobiltà imperiale di Trebisonda: era infatti figlio di Eudocia Comnena, figlia dell’imperatore Giovanni III (1342-1344).

La biografia di Orsini ci fornisce su Basilio/Bessarione altri dati preziosi e peraltro molto attendibili, poiché concordano con quelli che, nella generale penuria di informazioni biografiche
sul niceno, gli studi scientifici più recenti sono arrivati a ricostruire per vie completamente diverse, in particolare per quanto riguarda il nome di battesimo e la data di nascita. Se quanto ricostruito da Braccini è, come riteniamo, corretto, Bessarione e Alessio erano cugini di quarto grado e il giovane inviato di Costantinopoli doveva godere, nonostante la giovane età, di un’influenza speciale e di uno statuto di insider.

Doveva essere dunque stata quella peculiare combinazione fra nobiltà di nascita e abilità dialettica, che avrebbe sembrato contraddistinto Bessarione, a farlo scegliere dai Paleologhi per condurre personalmente la cruciale trattativa diplomatica coi Comneni che regnavano allora su Trebisonda per il matrimonio della giovane principessa Maria con Giovanni VIII, ormai basileus di Costantinopoli con pieni poteri.

Le date delle missioni di Bessarione a Trebisonda non sono menzionate dagli storici, ma risultano comunque comprese tra l’agosto del 1425, quando Sofia di Monferrato, “sposa occidentale” di Giovanni VIII, fuggì dal palazzo imperiale, e l’agosto del 1427, quando Maria Comnena di Trebisonda, figlia di Alessio, arrivò a Costantinopoli come promessa terza sposa dell’imperatore. I patteggiamenti per le nozze con Maria Comnena erano con ogni probabilità l’obiettivo principale del viaggio di Bessarione presso l’imperatore Comneno: completavano il mosaico di alleanze dinastiche degli ultimi Paleologi e sancivano l’unione tra l’impero di Costantinopoli e quello di Trebisonda. Alla trattativa matrimoniale alludono fra l’altro vari accenni del Discorso ad Alessio IV Grande-Comneno, che Bessarione compose e pronunciò per l’occasione.

A questo periodo risale la composizione della poesia riguardante un alto dignitario della corte di Trebisonda, concepita per essere, come le altre del codice Marciano, un’iscrizione tombale. Dalla lettura di questi “giambi” funebri, che occupano il nono posto nel pinax stilato dalla mano di Bessarione all’inizio del codice, il defunto appare incaricato, a somiglianza e nei medesimi anni dell’autore, di mansioni diplomatiche che lo inducivano a continui viaggi fra Trebisonda e Costantinopoli. A bordo della nave che lo riportava in patria venne colpito dal “contagio” — dobbiamo considerarlo realmente accidentale? — che ne causò la morte.

La seconda parte della poesia, più oscura, fa allusione a eventi luttuosi che in tempi diversi sembrano avere colpito la sua casa. Il capofamiglia si era fatto ritrarre tra la moglie e i figli da anni scomparsi, e in particolare accanto al figlio prediletto, forse il più giovane, certo morto pre�ocemente. Non sappiamo da chi o in che luogo, ma certamente il gruppo era raffigurato, secondo un modello ellenistico non insolito all’uso arcaizzante della pittura paleologa, in un mosaico o più probabilmente in un affresco sopra la tomba dell’ambasciatore. Questa doveva all’epoca trovarsi dentro il recinto se non, comiera consuetudine dell’epoca, nel corpo stesso di una delle chiese imperiali di Trebisonda.

**Versi giambici sulla tomba di Michele Amirutza**

Marc. Gr. 533, f. 39 (ed. pr. Tomadakis 1948, Ετούρκεσεν ο Γεώργιος Αμιρούτζης, pp. 245-246; Id. 1953, Αμιρούτζεια, pp. 60-61).

Πόρον τ’, ἔφευρεν ἐν πέλουσιν ἀπόροις
tmáta prósophys káptéstaltp polláicas
πρὸς τὴν μεγάλην τοῦ κράτους ὄντως πόλιν,
ἄγαν δ’ ἀρίστως καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἐλλήδας
χαῖρων ἐκείθεν ἐνθάδε προσώριμεν,
della famiglia nel dipinto tombale che Bessarione descrive, Amirutza “si era inscritto in questa scena”.

∂ποὺ γε καὶ νῦν ἀπάρας αὕθες πάλιν πάσι τ’ ἐπιθεῖς λίαν ἀριστον τέλος οὐς τοὺς κρατοῦσιν ἠν ἀνατεθειμένοις ἐφή οὐν οἰκον οὐδόλως ἰδεῖν ἔτι, μέσων δὲ τοῦ πλοῦ τανατηφόρῳ νόσῳ 10 ἄπνουν τὸ σῶμα καὶ ψυχῆς λιπῶν δίχα φθάνει μετάστας τῶν ἐπιγείων ἄνω, ὅπου περ ἀπόχοντο τὰ φιλτατά οὖ, ἄλλος κατ᾽ ἄλλην τοῦ χρόνου περιδομο- σοῦς περ ὑμνάντας ζῶν ἔτι καὶ φῶς βλέπων γράφας εαυτὸν προσπαρέγγαμεν πάλαι, ἄλλη μὲν ἄλλους, σὺν εαυτῷ δ᾽ ἐνθάδε τοῦτον τὸν φαϊδρόν καὶ καλὸν νεανίαν, ἄμα μὲν δηλῶν τοῦ βίου τὸ ἀστατον, ἄμα δὲ γ᾽ ἡμᾶς παρακαλῶν ἰκέτας 15 θεὼ γενέσθαι, ως τύχος τῆς ἄνω δόξης καὶ χαρᾶς καὶ αἰδίου βίου.

Per aprire vie di trattativa, per farsi largo tra le aporie della politica e la sua “impraticabilità” (πέλουσιν ἀποροῖς), Michele Amirutza è stato eletto ambasciatore (vv. 1-2). La diplomazia di questi anni è degnamente interpretata e servita (vv. 4-5), perfino coronata da occasionali successi (vv. 6-7). Ma Amirutza ora è morto in mare: di morte naturale? Certamente in maniera improrvvisa, quando era ancora a metà rotta di una traversata reale e metaforica dei frangenti dell’impero (vv. 3-10), “lasciando senza anima e senza fiato il corpo” (ἄπνουν καὶ ψυχῆς δίχα). (L’immagine, usuale, di ascendenza ancora a metà rotta di una traversata reale e metaforica dei frangenti dell’impero (vv. 3-10), “lasciando senza anima e senza fiato il corpo” (ἄπνουν καὶ ψυχῆς δίχα).) Dal corpo corrotto e abbandonato “senza soffio” sulla nave lo spirito dell’ambasciatore vola via e “trasvolta al di sopra dei terrestri”: φθάνει μεταστάς τῶν ἐπιγείων ἄνω, con metafora impiegata anche nella monodia in morte di Cleopa Paleologina, che come un uccello morendo “vola via dalle mani” del despota per raggiungere “quel preciso luogo” (ὁποὺ περ’) al quale i suoi cari sono già “migrati”, ciascuno, come gli uccelli, “in una diversa stagione”.

(οὕς [...] γράφας ἐαυτὸν προσπαρέγραψεν πάλαι, vv. 14-15) accanto al figlio minore, il νεανίας del v. 17, che irradiia (φαιδρόν) una bellezza e mitezza (καλόν) precocemente dissipate nella morte. Se nell’uso dimesso di καλόν si coglie la colorazione del parlato, φαιδρόν, con l’accento avanzato sull’ultima sillaba prima della pausa interna, rima con l’ἑαυτόν del v. 15 e con il δῆλων del v. 18, che ne ripete identica la struttura ritmica, così come fa anche il verso successivo. Il susseguirsi dell’ossitona e delle due perispomene in cesura pentemimere produce un effetto di cadenza, con cui contrasta l’irregolarità della clausola al v. 18 (τοῦ βίου τὸ ἀστάτον, una rara proparossitona), a segnare il momento più propriamente “funebre” della poesia, che cita qui una formula tipica dell’epigrammistica tombale greca (Kaibel, Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta, Berlin 1878, nr. 699, vv. 5-6, p. 282).

Disseminati nel dipinto (ἄλλῃ μὲν ἄλλους, nel v. 16, che fa da riscontro all’ἄλλος κατ’ ἄλλην del v. 14), i familiari defunti dell’ambasciatore Amirutza fissano lo spettatore-uditore: “mostrano l’instabilità della vita” e sollecitano i terrestri a farsi a propria volta ambasciatori, per impetrare da dio come da un monarca straniero (παρακάλουκτας, con espressione del gergo diplomatico regolarmente usata per le suppliche imperiali) una “gloria” (δόξα) non più solo espressa nello sfoggiio cerimoniale della gerarchia palatina, ma identificata con la “gioia e vita infinita” (καὶ χαρᾶς καὶ ἀιδίου βίου, formula biblica che si ritrova fin dai primi padri) della corte divina, archetipo celeste di ogni monarchia terrena.

La Grande Capitale

Al momento della stesura della poesia, Bessarione era dunque personalmente impegnato in un ruolo diplomatico, in missione tra Costantinopoli e l’impero di Trebisonda. Si può supporre che fosse il diretto interlocutore di Michele Amirutza. Nel secondo verso della poesia è scritto che Amirutza veniva spesso inviato πρὸς τὴν μεγάλην τοῦ κράτους πόλιν: “alla Gran Capitale dell’impero”, il che equivale a dire, usualmente, Costantinopoli. Ma in questo caso la designazione può forse essere più precisamente interpretata. Costantinopoli, del cui sovrano Bessarione è emissario, non si considera soltanto “una” delle capitali, ma è la capitale “veramente (ὀντως) grande” e imperante non solo sui territori in sua diretta giurisdizione, ma sull’intero appannaggio dinastico greco. Questo anche se Trebisonda, della cui dinastia regnante Bessarione è erede, seguita a fare impero a sé. Ma Bessarione riserva al sovrano di Costantinopoli il diritto all’universalità.

Alla fine del 1424 Manuele II Paleologo aveva lasciato definitivamente la politica e aveva preso i voti insieme alla moglie, Elena Dagraš, nel monastero costantinopolitano del Pantokrator, oggi Zeyrek Cami, dove’ra morto ed era stato seppellito. Proprio allora Bessarione era arrivato nella capitale e aveva dedicato all’imperatore una orazione funebre: una monodia (Marc. Gr. 533, ff. 12-15v [nr. 2]). In questo suo primo componimento secolare, pronunciato da un Bessarione appena sedicenne — come rivelato dalla cronologia di John Monfasani, confermata dalle fonti addotte da Braccini —, apparivano recenti le tracce degli studi retorici e frequenti le memorie classiche, in particolare le citazioni omeriche. Dalla lingua del βασιλεὺς “il discorso fluiva più dolce del miele” (cfr. II. I 249). Come potrà tollerare un così lungo silenzio colui il cui parlare “ammaliante come un canto di Sirene attirava ciascuno a sé, come un magnete il ferro”? Manuele “era il re più buono e il guerriero più forte”, un “occhio sempre vigile, indomito al sonno che tutto doma”.

Nel suo contemperare suggestione figurale e idealizzazione politica, nel suo tessuto di allusioni e reimpieghi, la monodia in morte di Manuele, pur essendo scritta in prosa, sta alle origini della poesia di Bessarione. La continua iperbole, le serie iterate di esclamazioni e d’interrogazioni, l’uso di
arcaismi e qualche abuso della congerie e della prosopopea tradiscono l’esordio di una ricerca stilistica
cupamente raffinata. Ma, nella migliore tradizione bizantina, i momenti di maggiore drammaticità
sono dei trompe-l’oeil: degli echeggiamenti e delle citazioni. L’imperatore rimasto confinato sotto
terra, il cadavere silenzioso nella città in pianto (“Muto e senza fiato lo trasportavano, un cadavere
inerte, quasi che mai nel mondo fosse nato, che mai avesse regnato...”), il salire dal mondo intero di
una musica funebre (“Che intoni la terra un flebile canto...”), e soprattutto l’invocazione “O Bisanzio,
Bisanzio, di tutte le città occhio abbagliante, meraviglia del mondo, porto salvo di naufraghi, rifugio
di profughi...”, che riecheggia quasi letteralmente il celebre passo di Niceta Coniata (7, 1: Ὡς πόλις,
pόλις, πόλεων πασῶν ὅφθαλμε, ἄκουσμα παγκόσμιον, θέαμα ὑπερκόσμιον κτλ.), compongono il
quadro solenne di un impero in lutto nelle sue antiche istituzioni: “Si affligge il senato, singhiozzano
i principi, tutte le province si lamentano, gemono le città, piangono i municìpi, sono addobbate a
nero le colonie... Leggi, giudici, foro, scanni, banchi dei tribunali: piangete...”, dove si richiamano,
intenzionalmente, i famosi versi di Michele Coniata sulle rovine d’Atene (10, 19-22 Lampros Ποῦ
νῦν τὰ σεμνὰ τλημονεστάτη πόλις; Ὡς φρούδα πάντα καὶ κατάλληλα μύθοις, δίκαι,
δικασταί, βήματα, ψῆφοι, νόμοι, | δημηγορίαι).

In quanto rispecchiamento dell’impero celeste, l’impero terreno non può che essere infinito.
Questo è il dogma che traspare non solo dalla monodia in morte di Manuele II, ma anche dalle
due poesie “giambiche” tramandate dal Marc. Gr. 533, di poco successive: i versi per gli arazzi
raffiguranti Manuele II ed Elena Paleologhi in abito imperiale e monastico, commissionati dal loro
secondogenito Teodoro despota di Mistrà.

Sia l’occasione ecfrastica, sia la confezione poetica forniscono a questi versi di genere una
non banale suggestione visiva. Ma lasciano in particolare comprendere l’ideologia sottesa a tutti gli
epitaffi del piccolo corpus Marciano.

Nei versi dedicati alla prima veste, la gloria imperiale “procede da dentro” (πᾶσα γὰρ πρόεισιν ἡ
βασιλείαν | ἔσωθε δόξα, vv. 9-10) come da un absиде illuminato “dal corteo di fiaccole di una
discendenza di sovrani” (ἀνάκτων καὶ γένους δαδουχίᾳ, vv. 3-4); riflette la gloria eterna e ne è la
promessa (vv. 11-14). Dio stesso è ἀρωγὸς καὶ θέμελις καὶ κράτος, “difesa e legittimità e forza”
dell’universo orbitante attorno a questi ἦλιοι μακροί, a ciascun grande imperatore-sole custodito
dalla Sua mano protesa.

Per due arazzi raffiguranti i Paleologhi Manuele ed Elena
in veste duplice, imperiale e monastica
Marc. Gr. 533, f. 49v (ed. Lampros, PP III, pp. 281-282)

Εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν σχήμα.
.chompBuEncime oύς νομίζεται σέβειν
timán te touς φύσαντας oίá per têmis
ένταυθα γράφω χρυσέοις ώς χρυσόν
ύμαις ἀνάκτων καὶ γένους δαδουχίᾳ,
tinívς τὸ πρεσβύτατον γονεύση χρέος 5
καὶ οίς ἄν ἔξη χαρίτων μεμνημένος,
ῥίζης ἀγαστῆς πορφυρώνυμος πρέμνος
ὁποιουσοῦν Θεόδωρος ἐκφύς δεσπότης.
Κάν πάσα γὰρ πρόεισιν ἡ βασιλέων ἐσωθε δόξα, χρυσός δ’ οὖν ἡ θέμις ἐχρῆν πεποικίθαι κροσσωτοῖς, ὡς ἔχῃ πλοῦτον τὸν ἐνδὸν ταῦτα δὴ παριστάναι καὶ δόξαν οὐράνιον, ἢν ἐν εἰλήφατον ἐναίως μὲν ἄμφω δ’ ἀρτίως ἴσχεις τελείως περθακώς σύ, γεννάδα, 15 θεῷ παραστάς, βασιλεὺς ὀν τῇ θέσει, φύσει βασιλεύοντι τῶν βασιλέων. Ἐντεύθεν ἡμᾶς, οὓς τεκὼν ἐξοσφύος κέρκικα δράχειν Λυσόνων κληρουχίας, ἄλλου μὲν ἄλλοις, ἀσμένως δ’ ἐμοῦ πλοίοις καὶ τοῖσδε τιμῶς σε τοῖς δαιδαλοῖς, χεῖρα προτείνων υψωθεν, καθ’ ἡλίους μακρύς φυλάττοις τοῦ βασιλείου κράτους, φανεὶς ἀρωγὸς καὶ θέμεθλος καὶ κράτος.

'Εντεύθεν ἡμᾶς, οὓς τεκὼν ἐξοσφύος κέρκικα δράχειν Λυσόνων κληρουχίας, ἄλλου μὲν ἄλλοις, ἀσμένως δ’ ἐμοῦ πλοίοις καὶ τοῖσδε τιμῶς σε τοῖς δαιδαλοῖς, χεῖρα προτείνων υψωθεν, καθ’ ἡλίους μακρύς φυλάττοις τοῦ βασιλείου κράτους, φανεὶς ἀρωγὸς καὶ θέμεθλος καὶ κράτος.

Ἀριστὰ δ’ ἰθύνατες οίκας κράτους ἀρχῆς βασιλείου τε τὸ πρίν καὶ χρόνους δεδειχτες κάλλιστα τῆς εὐξείας, 10 παθῶν ἐδουλώσατε ἐκμιν τῷ λόγῳ ἂφ’ ἑστια, ὀ φασίν’, ἀρχεῖν ἠργοʊµένης. Καὶ μαρτυρεῖ μοι τῷ λόγῳ ἢ καινότης τοῦ σχήματος, μάκαρες, ἐξηλαγµένη. Πλούτου χύσιν γὰρ καὶ μέγα δόξης πλάτος.
ὑπέρτατον κράτος τε καὶ ὅρους ἀκροὺς εὐδαιμονίας ὡς τέφραν τε καὶ κόνιν καὶ χοῦν καταπτύσαντες γενναοφρόνως, σχήματος ἡλλάξασθε τοῦ ἐπηρμένου σχῆμα μοναστῶν ἀμφίων ἂν βυσσίνων 20 τάμαιρα καὶ κελαινά, δεικνύντες ὅσου τιμᾶσθε ταπείνωσιν ἢς Χριστός τύπος. Οὕκοιν θεὶς μάλιστα δή πεφιλιμένοι. ἐγγύθεν ἢ μὲν παρακλήσεως λόγοις, αὐτὸς δὲ λιταῖς ὑπόθεν τοὺς φιλτάτους 25 ἡμᾶς ποδηγοίητε οἵπερ ἀκτέον.

*Cfr. Aristofane, Vesp. 846; Plat., Euthyphr. 3 ἀπ᾽ ἔστιας ἄρχεσθαι, “cominciare da capo”; la citazione ricorre anche nel Discorso ad Alessio IV Comneno, p. 128, 293 Chrysanthos.

Questi versi d’occasione esprimono il tratto dominante, una contraddizione di fondo, nell’atteggiamento letterario e politico di Bessarione alla corte degli ultimi Paleologi. Da un lato il senso della fine del mondo bizantino accomuna tutti i suoi scritti giovanili, e non solo perché il soggetto funebre è presente nella loro maggior parte (o nella migliore, selezionata nell’autografo Marciano), ma per una sensibilità “apocalittica” che sembra affiorare. D’altro lato, in Bessarione sono affermati con insistenza e chiarezza i principî teorici, neoplatonico-cristiani, della monarchia bizantina, sui quali per undici secoli, dal primo Costantino in poi, Bisanzio si era retta.
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Introduction:
Philosophers and Philosophical Books in Byzantium

It has often been remarked that the modern study of philosophy in Byzantium has suffered substantial delay; and yet the study of philosophical manuscripts produced in Byzantium between the 9th and 15th c. has already produced many interesting contributions on individual mss. The mss. of the so-called “philosophical collection”, for example, have been studied thoroughly; the same holds true for several 13th / 14th c. mss. containing works by Plato and Aristotle. Moreover, over the course of the last years several paleographical and codicological studies on individual mss. have highlighted the way late Byzantine scholars collaborated, and have helped us reconstruct the libraries of these scholars to some extent. Nonetheless, the great historical importance of these studies notwithstanding, we are still lacking the general picture, if there is one, of the history of philosophical books in Byzantium.

Byzantine mss. pose a threefold set of questions: 1) that of their models; 2) that of the milieux in which they were produced and later read; 3) that of the importance of a ms. from the point of view of the text-tradition of the transmitted texts. Yet, while reviewing literature on individual Byzantine philosophical mss. one cannot help but notice that the way we answer these questions changes over time and so changes the way we discuss all possible issues concerning philosophical manuscripts in Byzantium. In particular we are interested in the following issues:

- Collections of manuscripts and the constitution of libraries, either public or private;
- The existence in every period in Byzantine history of manuscripts of “reference” exhibiting multiple layers of scholia written at different times, and the meaning of their presence in Byzantine libraries;
- The way Byzantine copysts and scholars worked, the creation of “editions” of ancient philosophical texts through collation of different exemplars present in a library, the interpolations in the texts by notable Byzantine scholars;
- The nature of the autographs (stricto sensu) of Byzantine philosophers;
- The specific textual problems arising from the copying of earlier material such as commentaries, in particular the relation between text(s) and diagrams;
- The connection between the production of manuscripts and the study of philosophy under a didaskalos: the reflection in mss. of oral teachings; the collective enterprises of learning and working together on philosophical texts; aspects of the collaboration between didaskalos and students and their reflection in mss.
- The reflections in mss. of the different “authorial practices” apparent in the Byzantine scholars’ way of organizing, arranging, copying, commenting and excerpting earlier material.
We are well aware that such an agenda is not novel. Indeed, in our own way, we are all convinced of the importance of these aspects for scholarship. However, we would like to put an emphasis on the changes of these aspects through time; we would like to understand more deeply the extent to which the alteration of these practices and problems in the making of philosophical books is reflected differently over time, and eventually discover to what extent we can track down these mutations to changes in Byzantine society and the way scholarship and literature was conceived. We are also interested in understanding how the study of these problems in the different periods of Byzantine intellectual history might aid us when approaching and editing these texts. Thus we propose to approach the three aforementioned questions (the models of mss, the milieux in which they were produced, their afterlife) according to a social and cultural perspective, in order to link changes in the production and circulation of philosophical mss. to changes and innovation in the way Byzantine scholars conceived and constructed *paideia* in Byzantium.
A Byzantine “Portal” for Scholia on the Organon
or the Use of Reference Signs and Numbers in Princeton MS. 173

Manuscripts transmitting the Organon are usually known as copious pools of information not only with regard to commenting or teaching methods (interlinear glosses, diagrams, marginal commentaries or individual scholia etc.), but also with regard to the bulk of exegetical material at the disposal of a scholar or circle of scholars. Such manuscripts not infrequently imply the existence of one or more codices that were put to use to provide a rigorous and exact interpretation of the Aristotelian text. In this respect, technical conventions such as reference signs or Greek numerals serve as a means to attach exegetical material to the Aristotelian treatises as well as to organize marginal/interlinear text layout. Even more interesting, however, is the fact that these tools occasionally offer important clues regarding the method employed by a medieval scholar to access his notes or books; thus, they might point towards their direct manuscript sources. Princeton MS. 173 offers an excellent example of such a case or the opportunity to study how a Byzantine scholiast would bring together, organize, display and finally refer to the content of different manuscripts. [For Princeton MS. 173 see S. Kotzabassi, “Aristotle’s Organon and Its Byzantine Commentators”, Princeton University Library Chronicle 64.1 (Autumn 2002) 61 – 62; S. Kotzabassi - N. P. Ševčenko, Greek Manuscripts at Princeton, Sixth to Nineteenth Century: A Descriptive Catalogue, Princeton NJ, Princeton University Press, 2010, pp. 147–149; an online digitized copy of the manuscript can be accessed at http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/tb09j565d. A register of scholia and diagrams on Analytica posteriora I.1-2 in Princeton MS 173 as well as other codices is being prepared by us and Dr. Vito Lorusso (Universität Hamburg).]

On the 164 bombycine folios of Princeton MS. 173 an anonymous scribe of the late 13th century has copied most of the treatises comprising the Organon: De interpretatione (ff. 1 – 15v), Analytica priora (ff. 15v – 78), Analytica posteriora (ff. 78 – 118; with lost text between f. 81v, I 4, 73b39 ὃντων and f. 82, I 6, 74b18 σημεῖον) and Topica (ff. 118 – 164v des. mut. VI 10, 148a29 ὑπάρχει). In the margins the same copyist as well as later scribes added exegetical material deriving from various sources (Alexander of Aphrodisias, Themistios, Ioannes Philoponos, Michael Psellos, Leon Magentenos, Nikephoros Gregoras). Numerous scholia, glosses, diagrams, annotations regarding commentators and corrections of the Aristotelian text are attributable to Ioannes Chortasmenos (ca. 1370 – 1436/37). Based on the historical context of Chortasmenos’ autograph notes on ff. 78r and 118v, Sophia Kotzabassi has pointed out that these editorial interventions possibly occurred between the years 1397 and 1410, or even before that [Kotzabassi 2002, pp. 58 – 59]. There is, however, another interesting feature: a large number of reference signs as well as Greek reference numbers in the codex (mostly in red ink) must have been added by the Byzantine scholar (or someone who had access to his library or notes). We may distinguish two groups of these tools in Princeton MS. 173: (a) those connecting glosses/scholia/diagrams with either the Aristotelian text, or other scholiast material; (b) those signs or numbers deriving in all probability from the same hand and which – upon initial examination – seem to adhere to no text.
Before its conservation treatment in 2001, Princeton MS. 173 included between ff. 115 and 116 a loose folio, which, on the basis of its watermark, should be dated to around 1425 or thereafter; all texts and diagrams on it were copied by Ioannes Chortasmenos [Kotzabassi 2002, p. 59]. This leaf is today preserved separately as Princeton MS. 173A [Kotzabassi 2010, p. 150] and transmits alternately ten passages deriving from:

- the commentary of Ioannes Philoponos on Analytica posteriora I (seven excerpts bearing i. the reference numbers ρϟ΄ – ρϟγ΄ = Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca XIII.3, pp. 186.30 – 187.6, 9 – des. 188.7 ἑπιθήσει; 189.7 – 20; ii. the reference numbers ρϛε’ – ρϛζ’ = CAG XIII.3, pp. 195.5 – 16; 198.6 – 25; 201.29 – 202.5 des. mut. οἷόν τε);
- the Analytica posteriora (one excerpt with the reference number ρϟδ΄ = I 16, 79b23 – 32 συλλογισμοῦ);
- the respective paraphrasis of Themistios (two excerpts without any reference numbers or signs = CAG V.1, pp. 29.31 – 31.17).

Numbers, lemmata, diagrams, references concerning Themistios and Philoponos and annotations were copied in red ink, whereas the text of the scholia in dark brown. Reference numbers ρϟ΄ – ρϛζ΄ are to be found again over the respective passages of the Analytica posteriora in Princeton MS. 173, ff. 88–89v not connecting prima facie any of the marginal/interlinear scholiast material to the Aristotelian text. The similar ductus and the red ink, however, indicate that Chortasmenos himself was the one who in all probability added the reference numbers between the lines of the Aristotelian treatise in order to link the content of the folio with the respective Aristotelian passages in the manuscript of Princeton. But, since there are more reference numbers concerning the sequence of scholia on Analytica posteriora before ρϟ΄ and after ρϛζ΄, where is the rest of this material today?

The answer may lie in Leuven MS. FDWM 1, a group of fifty–two loose folios containing scholia and diagrams, which towards the end of the 19th c. were organized into seven dossiers. The first six dossiers contain comments on sections of the Analytica priora I, both books of Analytica posteriora and Topica I; the exegetical material commenting on Analytica priora until I 26, 42b28 is preceded by reference signs in red ink, whereas the rest of the scholia and diagrams are introduced by means of (Greek) reference numbers; all texts in this “scrapbook” were copied by Ioannes Chortasmenos [for a thorough description of the content in the first six dossiers see M. Cacouros, “Un manuel de logique organisé par Jean Chortasménos et destiné à l’enseignement (catalogage du manuscrit)”, Revue des Études Byzantines 54 (1996) 67 – 106. An online digitized copy of the manuscript under the title “Logica graeca” is accessible at http://resolver.lias.be/get_pid?view=VIEW_MAIN,VIEW&pid=2568573]. Of particular significance for our investigation is the second section of the third dossier transmitting comments of Themistios and Philoponos on Analytica posteriora I and having exactly the same text layout as Princeton MS. 173A. This part of the “Logica graeca” includes ff. 1–2v and 4–5v containing excerpts from the commentary of Philoponos; the passages are numbered from ροη΄ to ρπθ΄ and from ρϛη΄ to ρσβ΄ respectively (excerpts deriving from the paraphrasis of Themistios bear no reference sign or number). The lost f. 3 of the dossier is in fact the loose folio in the Princeton manuscript, because (a) it transmits the missing text of the dossier and (b) the scholia ροη΄ – ρςθ΄, ρϛη΄ – ρσβ΄ correspond to the reference numbers over the text of the Analytica posteriora in Princeton MS. 173, ff. 86v–88 and 89v–91. The same relevance is to be confirmed also for scholia of the “Logica graeca”, which are preceded by a reference sign; e.g. the scholia in Leuven MS. FDWM 1, dossier I, 1v(=r) – r(=v) are connected.
by means of reference signs with the text of the *Analytica priora* I in Princeton MS. 173, ff. 22v – 23r. It should be noted that these designating-scholia symbols are copied in the Princeton MS. 173 in a somewhat larger size than the reference signs connecting marginal scholia to the Aristotelian text.

It seems that M. Wallies must have used “Logica graeca” for his edition of Philoponos’ commentary on *Analytica posteriora* [Cacouros 1996, pp. 86 – 87. The manuscript was given the siglum S (= “Fragmenta Senensia”); see CAG XIII.3, pp. xiii – xiv]. The examination of the Philoponian scholion ρε’ in the loose folio of the Princeton manuscript makes it quite clear that by 1909 Princeton MS. 173A was still in its proper place as part of Leuven MS. FDWM 1 [for the text of the scholion ρε’ cf. CAG XIII.3, pp. 195.5 – 16; then see the apparatus criticus for the ll. 11 – 16]. Moreover, the seventh and last dossier of the “Logica graeca” contains half of the missing folio of the *Analytica posteriora* in Princeton MS. 173 [between ff. 81 – 82; see also above; the recto of the mutilated folio contains *Analytica posteriora* I 4, 73b39 τὸ τυχὸν – 74a17 ἢν ἐλ[κ, whereas the verso of the folio transmits I 5, 74a28 – 6, 74b6 οὐ δυνατόν]. This “exchange” may be explained by the fact that both Leuven MS. FDWM 1 and Princeton MS. 173 belonged to the Library of the Seminario Arcivescovile in Siena at the time G. Rabehl was examining the first manuscript on behalf of M. Wallies [for the provenance of “Logica graeca” see Cacouros 1996, pp. 86 – 87; for the provenance of Princeton MS. 173 see Kotzabassi 2010, p. 149]; the two dislocations, therefore, must have occurred while Wallies’ co-worker was collating the text after his task came to an end.

Finally, it is the information given by Chortasmenos himself that seems to confirm a parallel use of the two manuscripts. In “Logica graeca”, dossier IIIa, f. 14v the Byzantine scholar quotes a passage from the *Analytica posteriora* with regard to the paraphrasis of Themistios; the excerpt of the paraphrasis should correspond to “thirty-seven verses of Aristotelian text in the old book” (Θεμιστίου φιλοσόφου εἰς τὰ αὐτά, ἦγουν ἀπὸ τοῦ «εἰ οὖν ἔστιν ό ἀποδεικτική ἐπιστήμη εξ ἀναγκαίων ἀρχῶν» [I 6, 74b5] μέχρι τοῦ «τῶν δὲ συμβεβηκότων μὴ καθ’ αὐτά» [I 6, 75a18] καὶ τὰ ἔξης. στίχοι εἰς τὸ παλαιὸν τὸ βιβλίον λζ’). If one added the – in all probability – eight missing verses from the half folio (verso) mentioned above (Chortasmenos’ quote begins just one verse before the point where the folio gets mutilated) to the twenty-nine verses of f. 82r and 82v (until v. 8), one would then indeed get a total of thirty-seven verses.

The aforementioned f. 3 of dossier IIIb is not the only case of missing text from Leuven MS. FDWM 1 [for a list of the lost passages see Cacouros 1996, p. 98]. Would the reference signs in Princeton MS. 173 be of any help in indicating manuscripts that include material missing from Chortasmenos’ “scrapbook”? In this respect, Vat. Barb. gr. 164 may contain some of the lost scholia of the “Logica graeca” [for the Vatican manuscript see A. Turyn, Codices Graeci Vaticani saeculis XIII e XIV scripti annorumque notis instructi, Vatican Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1964, pp. 86 – 87. An online digitized copy of the manuscript can be accessed at http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Barb.gr.164 ]. The manuscript was copied by the scribe Alexios, who finished his task in 1294. It contains the *Organon* as well scholia written by the student of Chortasmenos, Georgios Gennadios Scholarios (ca. 1400 – after 1472) [PLP, n. 27304]. The Vaticanus transmits on the margins of f. 63r scholia on *Analytica priora* I 10, 30b7–37, which were copied by an anonymous scribe (perhaps of the 14th c.); the four out of six reference signs designated to these scholia (the last of them is drawn slightly different), are to be found again in the same sequence and over exactly the same passages in the Princeton manuscript, f. 24rv; three of them refer to Aristotelian text not commented in Leuven MS. FDWM 1 [30b7 – 31], whereas the fourth one, besides designating a scholion of Magentenos’ commentary on the *Analytica priora* Ἰωάννου Ἰραμματικοῦ τοῦ Φιλοπόνου
eis tα Πρότερα ἀναλυτικά τοῦ Αριστοτέλους υπόμνημα. Μαγεντηνοῦ σχόλια eis tα αὐτά. Σύνοψις περί τῶν συλλογισμῶν, Venice 1536, XIr: καὶ διὰ τῶν ὅρων … κυρίως ἀναγκαῖον] to the respective Aristotelian passage [30b31 – 32], is anonymously copied in both Vat. Barb. gr. 164 and Leuven MS. FDWM 1, dossier VI, f. 5v. Furthermore, one of the two diagrams sketched by the anonymous scribe in the Vaticanus is also drawn by Chortasmenos in the “Logica graeca”.

Besides Leuven MS. FDWM 1 and its “lost” folio, there might be another group of Organon manuscripts also related to the Princeton manuscript due to editorial annotations of Chortasmenos: Par. gr. 1846 (14th c., 2nd half), Vat. gr. 209 (14th c., end) and Vat. gr. 1018 (15th c.) [M. Cacouros, “Jean Chortasménos, Katholikos didaskalos, annotateur du Corpus logicum dû à Néophyto Prodroménos”, in S. Luca - L. Perria (eds.), Ὀπώρα. Studi in onore di mgr Paul Canart per il LXX compleanno, vol. II, Rome 1998, pp. 185 – 225; B. Mondrain, “La constitution de corpus d’Aristote et de ses commentateurs aux XIIIᵉ – XIVᵉ siècles”, Codices Manuscripti 29 (January 2000) 11 – 33; digitized copy of Par. gr. 1846 at http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b107228898 ]. In this case, the Aristotelian texts at issue are the second and third part of Analytica priora I (Περὶ εὐπορίας προτάσεων, chapters 27–31; Περὶ ἀναλύσεως συλλογισμῶν, chapters 32–45); Greek numbers introducing scholia of Leon Magentenos and Ioannes Philoponos in all three manuscripts seem to correspond (with some exceptions) to the position of respective reference numbers in Princeton MS. 173, which otherwise would be copied between the lines of the Aristotelian treatise without any obvious connection to marginal and interlinear scholia. Beside reference numbers, however, the text layout of some scholia, decorative elements and glosses in both Par. gr. 1846 and its apograph Vat. gr. 209 [for the dependence of the the Vaticanus on the Parisinus see the detailed description of D. Reinsch in the online database of Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca et Byzantina (CAGB) at http://cagb-db.bbaw.de/index.xql] provide indications that either one of the two manuscripts, or the exemplar of the Parisinus, is related with the Princeton manuscript [see for instance Princeton MS. 173, ff. 46v – 47r and Par. gr. 1846, ff. 117 – 118].

Finally, there is an interesting feature concerning the text history of scholia attributed in the codex of Paris (and in Vat. gr. 209) to its scribe Neophyto Prodromenos. On ff. 53v, 63, 68v, 101v, 104, 105, 121, 129, 130, 137v, 138, 175v, 177 the copyist added his name next to scholia on Analytica priora; in five of these cases it seems that the text is the same or nearly the same as marginal scholias or interlinear glosses of Princeton MS. 173.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytica priora</th>
<th>Par. gr. 1846</th>
<th>Princeton MS. 173</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 14, 33b25 – 40</td>
<td>f. 68v in marg. inf. scholion (inc. ἤγουν ἐνδέχεται πάντα, des. ἀποφατικὸν τοῦ ἐναντίου) and two diagrams</td>
<td>f. 28v in marg. ext. only the diagrams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 33, 47b29 – 34</td>
<td>f. 121r in marg. ext. scholion (inc. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ φθείρεσθαι, des. καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Μίκκαλος)</td>
<td>f. 48r two glosses supra lines 11 – 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 1, 52b39</td>
<td>f. 137v in marg. ext. scholion (inc. ὅταν δήλοντί, des. σχήματος αὐθῆ)</td>
<td>f. 54v glossa supra lineam 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 1, 52b40</td>
<td>f. 137v in marg. ext. scholion (inc. ἐτὶ δὲ εἰς ποῖους ταυτισμοὺς βλεπτέον, des. συναγαγεῖν συμπέρασμα)</td>
<td>f. 54v glossa supra lineam 16 et in marg. ext.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The possibility that Neophytos had access to Princeton MS. 173 (in the possession of Chortasmenos probably after 1397), cannot be ruled out; this hypothesis, of course, is in need of further investigation. In any case, the documentation strategies provided by the different layers of reference methods in the Princeton manuscript give us a hint concerning not only the network of scholars involved in the circulation of texts commenting on the Aristotelian Logic during the Late Byzantine period, but also the extent and complexity of the exegetical material that a Byzantine scholiast was willing to employ while using his library.
Achieving and Displaying Polymathy in Palaiologan Byzantium
Nikephoros Gregoras and Vaticanus Graecus 116

The present paper starts by making the claim that in the early Palaiologan period *polymatheia* is construed as an essential characteristic of the Byzantine philosopher’s public persona. It also argues that the polymathic imperative is reflected both in the philosophical education (how one learns philosophy) and in the portrayal of the acquired philosophical expertise, as evidenced by ‘editions’ of one’s collected works, a wide-spread practice among late Byzantine *pepaideumenoi*. In other words, one used ‘polymathic’ manuscripts to learn philosophy and, then, once a philosopher, one produced ‘polymathic’ codices in order to demonstrate his or her erudition.

To substantiate its initial claim, the inquiry starts by surveying the learned early Palaiologan discourse of *polymatheia* and the related *philomatheia* and *polypragmosyne*, or love for learning and curiosity. Next, it proceeds by investigating two case studies, namely two Palaiologan manuscripts—BAR, *MS Gr.* 10 and *Vat. gr.* 116—, the former intended for instruction, while the latter represents, in my view, its concever’s idea of portraying a philosophical persona.

**Polymathy and intellectual curiosity**

As he addressed his students, the philosopher and rhetorician Michael Psellos (1018–78) wrote that “[t]he philosopher must be a man of all sorts (παντοδαπὸν) and strive not only to know sciences and arts whose natural product is wisdom and understanding, but also to study history, to be keen on geography, and to have some expertise in the rest of ‘music,’ by which I mean not just music making with physical instrument but all word-based history and culture and, in a word, the whole complex of deep and broad learning (καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἁπλῶς εὐμαθείαν τε καὶ πολυμάθειαν)” (Tr. John Duffy). Thus, Psellos related philosophy, *eumatheia* or ‘deep learning’ and *polymatheia* or mastery of wide-ranging knowledge. One finds a similar understanding of philosophy in the letters of Michael Italikos (ca. 1090?–before 1157) who employed the concept of *to philomathes* in order to justify the wide range of his own intellectual pursuits.

The idea of the philosopher as a lover of learning and master of knowledge persisted in the early Palaiologan period as well. Theodore Metochites (1270–1332), for instance, envisaged his collection of philosophical essays, the so-called *Semeioseis gnomikai*, as a witness to his erudition (πολυμαθία) and styled them after Plutarch’s *Moralia*, the latter being a model of *polymatheia* themselves, according to Metochites. Among the next generation of scholars, Metochites’s disciple Nikephoros Gregoras commented on the relation between *philomatheia* and philosophy in at least three of his philosophical texts and noted that, in addition to polymathy, the philosopher is marked also by an inquisitive mind and curiosity, as (s)he ambitiously examines all things.
The Byzantine discourse of polymathy, as the intellectual backdrop against which a philosophical persona is constructed, relates to the discourses of intellectual curiosity (polypragmosyne) and innovation. While polymathy stresses the multiplicity of knowledge or its profundity, both curiosity and innovation refer to its ‘limits.’ The classical tradition defined polypragmosyne as unhealthy curiosity, nosiness and meddlesomeness. It also, however, related polypragmosyne with scholarly inquiry and this connection becomes more prominent from the Hellenistic period onwards. In Byzantium, some philosophers, such as Psellos and Italikos, justified their interest in transgressing certain epistemic boundaries, like studying the Chaldean Oracles, for instance, by appealing to polymatheia.

Acquiring polymathy: Blemmydes’s Aristotelian compendium and BAR, MS Graecus 10

While Byzantine scholars claim to be versed in all sciences by calling themselves polymaths or, alternatively, justify being versed in too many sciences appealing to the same ideal, their modern students also argue that a Byzantine philosopher inevitably left traces in all disciplines of the trivium and quadrivium. Thus, the present paper is interested in illustrating the polymathy of Byzantine philosophers, especially during the early Palaiologan period, as it manifests itself in the manuscript evidence. In other words, the present inquiry aims to offer a preliminary sketch of the early Palaiologan polymathic horizon of the philosopher, that is what the so-called polymath in late Byzantium learned and knew and how (s)he used polymathy to construct their social and political persona.

The paper offers two case studies, the first being a thirteenth-century codex, BAR, MS Gr. 10, which is kept today in the Library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences. The manuscript transmits an incomplete copy of Nikephoros Blemmydes’s Aristotelian compendium.

Among the works of the renowned philosopher of the empire in Nicaea Nikephoros Blemmydes (d. after 1269), a prominent place occupy his so-called Epitome logica and Epitome physica. The use of these two titles for the sake of convenience is in fact misleading as we shall see, since what we have in fact is a single work, a compendium of Aristotelian philosophy, including logic, physics, astronomy and meteorology. A recognized authority already in his lifetime, Blemmydes became a point of reference for the Palaiologan scholars as of the end of the thirteenth century. Chunks of Blemmydes’s works were incorporated into other similar compendia, such as Joseph Rhakendytes’s Encyclopedia and, in general, received a wide reception reaching up to the nineteenth century. Rhakendytes, in turn, was the one Metochites’s disciple Gregoras addressed with an appeal to the former to develop further the scientific and philosophical project started by the latter. According to Gregoras’s Letter 22, Metochites’s scholarly enterprise needed two additions in order to be brought to perfection, namely a treatment of the logical treatises of Aristotle, i.e. the Organon, and of the Metaphysics. Metochites had omitted them and Gregoras urged Joseph not to do the same in order to be able to demonstrate ultimately that Aristotle’s cosmological assumptions were in agreement with the postulates of Ptolemy.

Thus, it is reasonable to suppose that Blemmydes’s Aristotelian compendium, on its own, and through its reception in Rhakendytes’s Encyclopedia, was a study tool an early Palaiologan scholar could have used or had in mind as an example of a knowledge corpus containing the basics of Aristotle’s philosophy. What I propose here is to see Blemmydes’s compendium as an example of a coherent corpus of knowledge which illustrates the polymathic ideal.
Displaying polymathy: Nikephoros Gregoras in Vat. gr. 116

A note on f. 62r of Vat. gr. 116 labels it as a collection of Gregoras’s ἐπιστολαι καὶ προσφωνήματα καὶ λόγοι. Vat. gr. 116 dates to the first half of the fourteenth century and it is one of the most important codices preserving Gregoras’s epistolary corpus. It also transmits his orations, progymnasmata, the Platonising dialogue Philomathes, his Antiogia and the Life of John of Hērakleia. The Vaticanus, however, also preserves Maximos Planoudes’s translation into Greek of Cicero’s Somnium Scipionis (ff. 1r-4r) and Macrobius’s commentary of the latter (ff. 4r-54r, 57r-61r). The second case study surveys the marginal signs accompanying the translation of Macrobius’s Commentary and uses them as a key in interpreting the Vaticanus as the result of Gregoras’s attempt to display his ‘polymathic’ philosophical persona.
Editing Byzantine Philosophical Texts, a Proposal

Karl Krumbacher (1856–1909) is rightly considered to be the founder of Byzantine Studies as a university discipline. After his Habilitation in 1884, he began giving lectures at the University of Munich on a regular basis, but was still earning his living as a teacher at the Ludwigsgymnasium in Munich. In the winter semester of 1886/87 he lectured on “The History of Byzantine Literature from Justinian to the Conquest of Constantinople in 1453”. In 1890 he became an extraordinarius and in 1895 an ordinarius member of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences. It was in 1895 that he first filed a request with the Bavarian Ministry of Education to establish an institute (Universitätseminar) for Medieval and Modern Greek Philology at the University of Munich. This request was unfortunately rejected by the Bavarian Parliament in 1896. In 1897 he became a professor ordinarius at the University of Munich, but it was not until 1898 that the Bavarian Ministry of Culture finally approved the creation of the Institute of Medieval and Modern Greek Philology at the University of Munich, which was the first of its kind in western Europe. The establishment of the Institute gave the young discipline of Byzantine Studies its institutional foundation. However, what further contributed to the general acceptance of this discipline in the scholarly world was without doubt the publication of Krumbacher’s monumental history of Byzantine Literature, which is still read today in its second edition (1897). Less well known is the much slimmer first edition of this work that had appeared in print six years earlier in 1891. I would like to quote a short passage from the introduction to this first edition inasmuch as it vividly describes the difficulties that Krumbacher was facing in the process of establishing the new discipline.

“If a natural scientist declared that he is interested only in lions and eagles, in fir trees and roses, in pearls and precious stones, but not in such revolting or ugly objects as a spider, a burdock or sulphuric acid, he would earn nothing but scorn. In the field of literary studies, so it seems, this kind of gourmet is omnipresent. […] Recently one of the brightest stars in the historical-philological firmament of Europe has warned me with emphatic words against the study of these ghastly centuries and their spiritual products. According to him, the attitude of sincere admiration for antiquity and its pedagogical force would dwindle if philology went astray on this dangerous path. I should repent and turn back to the to the aesthetic nourishment of classical antiquity.”

This expressive statement captures the atmosphere of disinterest, mistrust and even suspicion that many of Krumbacher’s contemporaries felt towards the study of Byzantine literature. From these lines we glean what kind of prejudices they nurtured: Byzantine texts are as revolting as spiders, as thorny as burdocks and even, metaphorically speaking, as corrosive as sulphuric acid. Moreover, they are devoid of content to the point that texts from classical antiquity must appear to the aesthetic nourishment in comparison. In short, Krumbacher was apparently facing an audience that was at once unaware of the richness of the Byzantine literary heritage and suspicious about its value.
Today, almost one and a half centuries later, the position of Byzantine Studies as a whole has radically changed. Hardly anyone in the scholarly world is unaware of the richness of the Byzantine literary heritage and it would now seem absurd not to recognize the value of studying it. And yet, incredible as it may seem, there is still one area within the realm of Byzantine Studies where the situation is, or has been until just a few years ago, comparable to that Krumbacher faced during his lifetime, in terms of both the diffusion of texts and, sadly enough, also an appreciation of the value of studying them. I am referring to the relatively new discipline of the history of Byzantine philosophy. Let me provide some examples. At the end of the 1960s Klaus Oehler remarked, as later quoted on the first page of the first volume of Herbert Hunger’s *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (p. 3),

“The investigation of the history of the reception of ancient philosophy in the Byzantine world is, in comparison with other aspects of Byzantine Studies, merely at an initial stage. The decades of neglect significantly impair today the examination of the intellectual foundations of the Byzantine Middle Ages. In spite of a number of singular achievements that are worthy of admiration, the field of Byzantine philosophy as a whole still remains a terra incognita. There are but a very few areas of research within the field of humanities today that have been so scarcely investigated.”

Let me add another example. During the last decades of the twentieth century, as I have recently learned from my senior colleagues, papers on the history of Byzantine philosophy were still regularly returned to their respective authors by the editor of the major scholarly organ of Byzantine Studies in Europe, Byzantinische Zeitschrift, with an explicit remark that there is no such discipline as “History of Byzantine Philosophy”!

Much has changed since the late 1960s when Oehler considered the history of Byzantine philosophy a terra incognita. Nowadays we possess some important critical editions that have appeared in the Bibliotheca Teubneriana, Corpus philosophorum medii aevi - philosophi byzantini and elsewhere. In the near future we can expect further editions of Byzantine philosophical texts in the recently founded series Byzantinisches Archiv - Series Philosophica, and we can even hope that still more new series will be established. Hardly a single issue of Byzantinische Zeitschrift comes out without a contribution on an aspect of Byzantine philosophy. And yet, in my opinion, this particular area within the realm of Byzantine Studies has not yet fully unfolded its potential. One of the main reasons for this situation is the simple fact that there are still not enough reliable critical editions and translations that would make texts of Byzantine philosophers accessible to the wider circles of the scholarly community and provide a solid foundation for their investigation. While researchers into the historical literature of the Byzantines can securely rely on the many volumes of the Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, there is only a comparatively small number of high-quality editions of Byzantine philosophical texts. There are many reasons for this unfortunate state of affairs, and I shall briefly enumerate just a few of them. To produce a “good” critical edition, which presupposes competence in both the history of philosophy and Byzantine textual criticism, and requires dedication and time from the prospective editors, does not always yield a return in terms of career advancement or success in funding applications. Many funding schemes tend to reward “unprecedented innovation” and “frontier research” and have nothing but scorn for projects that promise to produce a critical edition of an unknown Byzantine philosopher.

While in some cases it may be useless to “kick against the pricks” of our times and try to convince research foundations that what leads to true paradigm shifts in the field of Byzantine
Studies at the moment are not adventurous hypotheses, but a dependable critical edition of a hitherto unknown author, I would like to use the opportunity offered by this round table to discuss what, in my opinion, a “good” critical edition of a Byzantine philosophical text is.

In doing so, I shall rely on the guidelines for the publication of texts in the renowned Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae (Règles pour la publication des textes dans le corpus fontium historiae byzantinae) that appeared in the Bulletin d’information et de coordination of the Association Internationale des Études Byzantines in 1968. I shall rehearse some of the most obvious features of “good” critical editions that are independent of whether or not the edited text is on the subject of philosophy, but my main objective is to underline some features that need to be present in every “good” edition of a Byzantine philosophical text in order to provide future generations of historians of Byzantine philosophy with firm foundations for their work. I based my recent edition of Bessarion’s De Natura et Arte (Hamburg, Meiner 2015) on similar principles and I hope to implement these rules in other editions of Byzantine philosophical texts that I may undertake in the future. In making the following proposal, I do not want to prescribe any rules, but to open up a discussion that will eventually lead to the formulation of commonly accepted rules and recommendations.

What follows is in part a translation, in part an adaptation and in part an enhancement of the Règles from the Bulletin of 1968.

I. Each edition should contain at least 1) an introduction, 2) text and its translation 3) a number of indices

1) The introduction should contain:

a) brief information about the author and his work;

b) a detailed description of the manuscripts and detailed observations on their interrelationships; if possible or appropriate, depending on the type of transmission, viz. ‘open’ or ‘closed’, it should present a stemma or several stemmata; observations on the particular features of the script of each of the copyists and their errors;

c) an exhaustive list of all preceding translations and editions of the text and a bibliography concerning not only the critical and linguistic features of the text but also its content and its role for our understanding of the history of Byzantine philosophy.

2) At the beginning of the text one should place a list of the sigla used to indicate the manuscripts, their meaning and, if one employs abbreviations, their explanations.

The text and corresponding translation should be placed on opposite pages.

At the bottom of the page one should place the apparatuses, which should comprise at least Fontes - Testimonia - Parallela in one apparatus and Variae lectiones in another. It is preferable, however, to dedicate a single apparatus to each of the following categories: Fontes, Testimonia, Parallela and Variae lectiones. The Fontes should at least identify all the sources that are explicitly referred to in the text. In compiling this apparatus, the editor should make an effort to distinguish between those sources a given author explicitly cites and those he actually uses (e.g., a rather common case, where Aristotle is explicitly cited as an authority, but later commentaries on Aristotle are in fact the direct sources of the citations from Aristotle). In addition, the Fontes should also identify the sources the author of text has consulted in the process of composition and indicate the sources used by the author as the basis
or a point of departure of his arguments. In no case should a mechanical search for similar passages in Corpus Databases such as Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG) be considered sufficient to make a reference in the apparatus fontium. Instead, each correspondence should be investigated with regard to the likelihood of an actual textual relationship. The same holds true for the Testimonia and Parallela.

The translation should be accompanied by Annotations and Comments, which are to be placed at the end of the volume. Annotations and comments should concentrate on both historical and philological aspects of the text and its philosophical content.

3) Each edition should be accompanied by at least three indices:

a) Index nominum. This index should assemble all instances of proper and geographical names that appear in the text and identify less well-known names by references to prosopographical lexica of the classical, late antique and Byzantine periods.

b) Index verborum ad res philosophicas spectantium (corresponding to the Index verborum ad res byzantinas spectantium of the CFHB). This index should contain a list of the most important philosophical technical terms used in the edited text. It should inform readers about the significance of each philosophical term within the context of the given text. Under no circumstances should this part of a critical edition be neglected or considered superfluous. We should bear in mind that Byzantine philosophical terminology is a largely unexplored field. While the Index verborum ad res byzantinas spectantium in critical editions of Byzantine historical texts has contributed significantly to such an important endeavour as the creation of the Lexikon byzantinischer Gräzitätä, there are at present no lexica of byzantine philosophical terminology. The time is not ripe to produce such a work. The provision of an Index verborum ad res philosophicas spectantium in every edition of a Byzantine philosophical text will lay the foundations of such a lexicographical project in the future. Each editor of a Byzantine philosophical text should bear in mind that working on a given text places him/her in a position to gather valuable information about the terminology a particular text employs. This results should be made available to subsequent generations of scholars, even if the creation of such an index is a time-consuming operation. Particular care should be taken in the creation of such an index. Its content should reflect an understanding and interpretation of the text in the process of working on a critical edition; it should not be a mere product of “mechanical” matching of identical expressions achieved by implementing various search algorithms.

c) Index graecitatis. This index should contain all instances of grammatical and lexical peculiarities in the given text, similar to the editions of CFHB, cf. p. 25 of the Bulletin d’Information.


1) The critical apparatus should be clear and precise. It should not contain any references to readings that are due to the phenomena of iotacism, psilosis, accentuation, the use of the iota-adscriptum, the nu-ephelkystikon, etc, unless these readings give reason to suspect a possible alternative meaning. These phenomena should in general be discussed in the preface to the edition. The language of the apparatus criticus should be Latin.
2) As far as possible, one should try to preserve the subdivision into books, chapters and paragraphs employed in preceding editions, in order to facilitate the use of the new edition together with previous scholarship on this text.

3) A negative apparatus criticus should be preferred to a positive one. Exceptions are at the discretion of the editor.

For minor questions of format and punctuation of the critical apparatus I suggest adopting the rules proposed by the Bulletin d’Information, which should be consulted along with this proposal.

In formulating this proposal, my main concern is not to reform the art of preparing critical editions per se, but to emphasize that the practice of editing Byzantine philosophical texts should be better adapted, on the one hand, to the peculiarity of these texts and, on the other hand, to the particular stage of development of the relatively young discipline of the “History of Byzantine Philosophy”. With regard to the first point (the peculiar nature of Byzantine philosophical texts), it is important to concentrate on their use of sources. Every Byzantine philosopher had excellent command and made generous use of the preceding tradition. Byzantine literati were in general fond of speaking with the “words” of their predecessors. Therefore, as the proposal I have formulated above makes clear, it is of the utmost importance that critical editions of Byzantine philosophical texts make transparent and easily understandable the particular relationship of a given text to its ancient sources, i.e. the particular use it makes of them. The work on the index fontium of each newly edited text should be considered a priority, equal only to the constitutio textus itself. With regard to the second point (the particular stage of development of our discipline), I would like to emphasize the importance of the investigation of Byzantine philosophical terminology. The index verborum ad res philosophicas spectantium that should always be part of a “good” edition of a Byzantine philosophical text should be considered a sine qua non, given that research on Byzantine philosophy is still at an initial stage. Work on an index of this kind is an investment for the future of our research and should be gladly undertaken by anyone who hopes with his or her edition to make a lasting contribution to the field.

To conclude I would like, first, to express my hope that I have provided a point of departure for a debate that will eventually lead to the formulation of a new standard for editing critical editions of Byzantine philosophical texts. At the same time I would like to express my confidence that, as more reliable critical editions of Byzantine philosophical texts appear in the near future, the relatively young field of research into Byzantine philosophy will become an established area of research within Byzantine Studies, just as Byzantine Studies itself after more than one hundred years of development has become an integral part of Humanities throughout the entire world. Thank you for your attention.
Il rotolo di Patmos del commento di Proclo al Timeo platonico,  
il Chigi R VIII 58 e Psello lettore del Timeo e del Commento al Timeo  
(con note sul Tub. Mb 14 e i manoscritti del dialogo platonico)

A paper scroll which is now in the Library of the Monastery of St John Theologian  
in Patmos (Patm. Eileton 897) contains two large parts of the third book of Proclus'  
Commentary on Plato's Timaeum (Diehl, vol. II, pp. 24-73, pp. 200-279), copied, therefore,  
not only in some important manuscripts in the form of codex, from the 9th to the 16th  
centuries, but also in a different form of book, attested until now only for documents and  
for the liturgy: the discovery of the scroll raises new questions in the history of books  
and of writing, transmission and reading of 'authorial' texts in Byzantium. The Patmos  
scroll is datable to the second half of the 11th century, and the context of its transcription  
can be identified in the learned individuals and elite circles of Constantinople connected  
with the chancery and the court. A century and a context marked by the personality  
of Michael Psellus, who might be, together with his milieu and his pupils, the most  
authoritative candidate for internal and external reasons: the present article provides  
a new examination of them, focusing on some writings of the corpus Psellianum and  
their tradition, and on Michael Psellus as a reader of Plato's Timaeus and of Proclus'  
commentary on it, with a new examination of the scroll and of the codices of the middle  
bizantine period containing Plato's Timaeus and/or Proclus' commentary on it.

In alcune lettere del suo epistolario (Laur. San Marco 356), Giorgio Oinaiotes ricerca codici di  
Platone contenenti il Timeo, per il quale registra esplicitamente la lettura, alle lezioni di Xanthopoulos,  
unita al Commento al Timeo di Proclo (cf. Vie per Bisanzio).

Una pratica che Michele Psello, protagonista, secondo le sue stesse assai note parole della  
Chronographia, nella riscoperta del neoplatonismo e lettore di Proclo (nel quale si trovò ad approdare  
‘come in un ampio golfo’), aveva diffusamente impiegato, citando brani dal Timeo e l’esegesi correlata  
di Proclo (e. g. Moore PHI 73, 74, 75 = 4, 5, 6 dei Philosophica minora, II).

Il periodo mediobizantino restituisce esemplari conservati del Timeo (ma soltanto Tub. Mb 14, del secolo XI) e del commento di Proclo al Timeo, presente in un manoscritto recentemente retrodatato alla prima metà del sec. XII, il Chigi R VIII 58.

Ma soprattutto, per la seconda metà del sec. XI, il commento di Proclo al Timeo risulta  
conservato in un manufatto eccezionale, il rotolo di Patmos, contenente ampie sezioni del terzo  
libro del commento.

Il rotolo di Patmos è il solo esempio superstite della adozione di un rotolo medievale, scritto  
transversa charta, per la copia di un testo d’autore, e la datazione alta, oltre che indizi interni ed  
esterni, sembrano ricondurre all’ambiente di Michele Psello.
Alcuni decenni prima, l’anonimo copista I della cosiddetta ‘collezione filosofica’ aveva trascritto, oltre a diversi altri autori, sia il *Timeo*, nel secondo tomo del Platone completo rappresentato dal Par. gr. 1807 (A), sia il commento di Proclo al *Timeo*, ora superstite in pochi lacerti nella scriptio inferior del Par. suppl. gr. 921, secondo una pratica scrittoria che è documentata a più riprese in età paleologa (Gregorio di Cipro scrive il *Timeo* nel Par. gr. 2998 e il commento nel Marc. gr. 194; Catrario scrive il *Timeo* nel Laur. Plut. 80.19 e il commento nel Neap. III.D.28; l’Anonimo arcaizzante scrive il *Timeo* nel Vat. gr. 226 e il commento nel Coisl. 322; Niceforo Gregora ha diversi codici platonici e un lungo brano del commento nel Laur. Plut. 28.20, cfr. Pérez Martín).

Il ruolo di Psello lettore di Platone è stato parzialmente indagato, e, ancora, il Psello lettore del commento al *Timeo* era già stato preso in considerazione da Diehl, che avanzò alcune preziose indicazioni nel terzo volume della edizione critica.

Secondo le analisi dello studioso, per il commento al *Timeo* Psello avrebbe avuto a disposizione due testimoni del commento di Proclo, l’uno affine al Marc. gr. 195, il codice più ricco di scoli, l’altro alla cosiddetta vulgata.

Al Marc. gr. 195 risulta affine lo stesso rotolo di Patmos. Più spinoso il problema della vulgata, che si è proposto di porre in relazione con il citato codice del fondo Chigi (Menchelli 2015).

Ma spinoso è anche il problema delle opere del corpus pselliano considerate da Diehl.

Il presente contributo si propone di prendere in esame i manufatti mediobizantini superstiti del *Timeo* e del commento di Proclo al dialogo, in particolare il rotolo di Patmos (I), e, anche attraverso lo studio dei vettori tradizionali e di alcune opere del *Corpus Psellianum* (II), di delineare le possibili (o meno) relazioni del rotolo di Patmos con l’ambiente di Michele Psello (III).

I. Il rotolo di Patmos e gli esemplari su codice

Sia la pratica scrittoria sia la tradizione indiretta attestano chiaramente la continuità di lettura del *Timeo*, per quanto nel periodo mediobizantino il dialogo risulti superstite soltanto nel già citato Tubingensis, sul quale si tornerà più avanti.

D’altro canto, se la gran parte dei commenti neoplatonici della ‘collezione filosofica’ cadono nell’oblio (con gli altri anche i commenti di Proclo alla *Repubblica*) Psello cita e. g. Damascio (Maltese) e, soprattutto, il commento di Proclo al *Timeo* in particolare è superstite, come si è osservato, anche in manoscritti mediobizantini, ovvero negli ambienti che nel periodo mediobizantino hanno decretato la fortuna di Proclo: ne sono testimoni il codice Chigi per gli inizi del secolo XII, e, per la seconda metà del secolo XI, il rotolo di Patmos.

Per la descrizione del rotolo e il contesto della sua produzione si rimanda agli studi già apparsi (SGA 2015) e in corso di stampa (Roma 2015, S e T 2016). Gli studi recenti sul rotolo sono approdati ad una datazione alla seconda metà del secolo XI e ad una localizzazione a Costantinopoli, negli ambienti legati alla cancelleria imperiale, come lascia supporre l’uso assai precoce della carta; il rotolo appare in relazione con il rotolo documentario sotto l’aspetto bibliologico, ma, come si è detto, contiene testo d’autore. Accomuna d’altro canto il rotolo anche agli esemplari liturgici conservati il suo carattere opistografo.

La scrittura del rotolo è un’informale con stilemi propri delle documentarie coeve, che si è proposto di porre a confronto con le informali di codici del terzo quarto/seconda metà del secolo
XI, come per esempio il Vat. gr. 65 di Isocrate (soprattutto mano b), e/o il Par. gr. 1808 di Platone. La datazione alta del rotolo (retrodatato rispetto alla prima ipotesi) porta a considerare la possibilità della relazione con l’ambiente di Michele Psello, lettore di Proclo influente peraltro su tutta la generazione successiva degli allievi (Trizio).

II. Opere del Corpus Psellianum e Psello lettore del Timeo e del commento di Proclo

Le citazioni di Psello dall’opera platonica sono molteplici: se per Psello lettore di Platone gli studi storico-tradizionali hanno evidenziato una relazione, in particolare nel caso del Fedro, con la terza famiglia, con la linea tradizionale del Vind. Suppl. gr. 7 (W) di Platone (Carlini), attribuito al secolo XI nella sua parte più antica, che si limita tuttavia, come è noto, ai dialoghi delle prime sette tetralogie (ad esclusione dell’Alcibiade II), le citazioni in Psello dallo stesso Timeo non sono ancora state investigate, né sono state prese in esame nella loro relazione con la tradizione diretta dell’opera le altrettanto numerose citazioni dal commento di Proclo al dialogo, a più riprese impiegato da Psello. Come ha osservato D. O’Meara, gli scritti pselliani più significativi sono a questo proposito le opere 4, 5, 6 dei Philosophica minora (II), e insieme ad essi alcuni capitoli della De omnifaria doctrina (ma non mancano citazioni sparse in diverse altre opere), mentre sempre all’interno del Corpus Psellianum figura il commento In Psychogoniam Platonicam (PHI 72 Moore), da più parti considerato spurious anche in virtù della presenza della attribuzione a Sosicrate dei primi capitoli dell’opera, che si leggono in alcuni codici di Nicomaco Geraseno (ancora PHI 72 Moore). La discussione sull’autenticità ha indotto ad escludere l’In Psychogoniam Platonicam, peraltro assai significativo per la lettura a Bisanzio del Commento al Timeo di Proclo, dalle recenti imprese di edizione delle opere di Michele Psello: l’edizione di riferimento è ancora quella di Linder (confluita in PG 122, 1078-1102); il testo ha una circolazione consolidata con le opere di Psello e compare nel capostipite di una delle famiglie della tradizione pselliana, il Laur. Plut. 58.29 (f1), del 1300 ca. (ora collazionato), e in numerosi altri codici assai significativi, poiché parzialmente trascritto con Nicomaco, tra i quali il manoscritto Paris BN 2479 appare a mio avviso da retrodatare al sec. XII (cfr. infra).

Gli scritti 4, 5, 6, dei Philosophica minora (II) sono stati accuratamente editi e rispondono, pur nella comune brevità, a diverse tipologie testuali. Se si considerano per esempio gli scritti 4 e 5 dei Philosophica minora II (D. O’Meara), rivolti ad un anonimo interlocutore, è possibile osservare come ad un lungo passo tratto dal Timeo seguia il corredo esegetico procliano, in particolare per Philosophica minora II 5 una selezione di passi riorganizzati tratti dal Commento al Timeo di Proclo (diverso il caso di Ph M II 6).

Ancor più, per quanto il commento di Proclo al Timeo presenti i lemmi del dialogo in forma estesa (la originaria secondo l’analisi di Diehl) in particolare nella seconda famiglia (cf. anche Menchelli 2015), il ricorso al testo platonico risulta comunque necessario e di fatto la struttura degli scritti 4 e 5 di Psello presuppone, come è possibile sostenere sulla base dell’esame delle varianti (e come è accaduto anche del caso del Fedro, con ricorso al testo del dialogo e di seguito all’esegesi neoplatonica), il ricorso ad un codice di Platone per i brani del dialogo, e il ricorso ad un codice di Proclo soltanto per le sezioni esegetiche.

II.1. Psello PHI 73 e PHI 74 (4 e 5 in Ph M II) e la tradizione del Timeo

Se si esaminano i lunghi passi del Timeo citati da Psello a confronto con la tradizione medievale platonica dalla quale egli attinge, è possibile osservare che lezioni del Par. gr. 1807 (A, compresa la mano correttrice A2) e del Vind. Suppl. gr. 39 (F, del XIII-XIV secolo, portatore di una tradizione
assai antica) sono separate rispetto al testo utilizzato da Psello. Le varianti al *Timeo* in PHI 73 e PHI 74 (Psello Ph M II 4 e 5) inducono ad individuare il testo letto da Psello in un esemplare vicino al ramo tradizionale rappresentato dalla fonte di YThetaPsi (=g Jonkers), e vicino anche al codice C di Platone, il solo manoscritto conservato, come si è detto, per il secolo XI (in Perlschrift come peraltro il Laur. 28.34, sul quale cfr. Pérez Martín 2014).

Il codice C è stato diffusamente annotato nel secolo XI (come peraltro anche W, in particolare nel *Filebo*), soprattutto nel *Parmenide* e nel *Timeo*. Di particolare interesse è anche il restauro di XIII secolo, che proprio di attribuire a Costantino Acropolita sulla base del confronto con la mano di Costantino studiata da P. Golitzis: C attinge qui dal Laur. Plut. 85.6 (Manfrin; per gli interventi successivi sul codice cfr. E. Berti), copia di codici dell’ambiente di Gregorio di Cipro. Allo stesso clima grafico se non alla stessa mano corrisponde uno degli scribi del Vat.gr. 1028, altra copia di Laur. 85.6. Il passaggio di C al Patriarcato è documentato dalla nota finale.

Nella relazione di Psello con C è possibile rilevare tuttavia una lezione separativa di C rispetto a Psello: una lunga omissione in C dalla quale il testo del *Timeo* in Psello è immune e che induce a ritenere Psello più vicino alla fonte g perduta che a C per il testo platonico.

II.2. Psello PHI 74 (5 in Ph M II) e la tradizione del commento nel rotolo di Patmos

Se si esaminano i passi dell’esegesi di Proclo in PHI 74, in particolare alla luce della nuova testimonianza del rotolo di Patmos, sembra possibile confermare che il rotolo di Patmos e Psello attingono alla stessa linea tradizionale, e in particolare una variante testuale significativa sembra rimandare per il rotolo di Patmos alla fonte utilizzata da Psello.

Significativa appare inoltre la presenza nel rotolo di Patmos di una lunga omissione dalla quale il testo di Psello è immune, e che mostra che il rotolo non è la fonte diretta utilizzata da Psello per il lavoro di redazione dello scritto PHI 74, peraltro composto, come si è detto, con l’aiuto di un codice platonico e di un manoscritto di Proclo.

II.3. Psello e PHI 72 del Corpus Psellianum

Psello PHI 72 viene da più parti considerato, come si è detto, un’opera spuria. Anche nel caso di PHI 72, dedicata ad una anonima destinataria della corte (*despoina*), la circolazione libraria ne prevede la presenza, come si è osservato, in codici significativi di Psello. Il manufatto più antico portatore di parte del testo è tuttavia il Par. gr. 2479 di Nicomaco di Gerasa. Il confronto tra i codici di Nicomaco e i codici portatori di opere pselliane induce a ritenere la tradizione del tutto unitaria (e corredata anche degli stessi apparati esegetici, per esempio di una medesima serie di scoli figurati iniziali); come osserva Moore compare nel Par. gr. 2731 anche l’indicazione, riferita a Psello e che riporterebbe comunque alla sua cerchia, *apo phvnhs*. Nel testo viene citato in particolare un brano del *Timeo* ancora una volta compatibile sotto il profilo delle varianti con lo stesso ramo tradizionale sopra investigato; anche per questa citazione si sarebbe fatto necessariamente ricorso al dialogo.

III. Il rotolo di Patmos e l’ambiente di Michele Psello: alcune osservazioni

Vale forse la pena richiamare gli elementi che appaiono più significativi raccolti per lo studio del rotolo di Patmos fermo restando che la stessa relazione tra stesura e fruizione del rotolo merita di essere approfondita (in prima persona o su commissione?).
A favore di una relazione con Psello e/o il suo ambiente appaiono in ogni caso sia considerazioni di ordine più generale:

1) il rotolo è sotto il profilo bibliologico (supporto e misure del foglio) da porre in relazione con la cancelleria, e anche Psello è frequentatore assiduo della corte, nonché, come è noto, il primo console dei filosofi;

2) la scrittura è una informale non da educazione burocratica centrale ma piuttosto da pratica negli uffici periferici, dove peraltro anche Psello iniziò la propria carriera;

3) la forma rotolo, di impiego soprattutto documentario e liturgico, doveva essere nota al copista nelle sue molteplici funzionalità, e anche Psello conosce sia la pratica dei documenti sia la pratica liturgica;

sia considerazioni a mio avviso più stringenti:

4) la forma rotolo viene impiegata per testo d’autore e l’ambiente di Psello conosce esplicitamente l’impiego della forma rotolo per la confezione dei propri scritti (PAPAIOANNOU);

5) il secolo XI segna una ripresa nello studio del neoplatonismo, ma Psello si presenta come innovatore nella ‘riscoperta’ dei neoplatonici e, come è noto, amante di Proclo nella Chronographia: questo ne fa in ogni caso un buon candidato;

6) il copista del rotolo non rinuncia all’apparato esegetico, che trascrive contestualmente prevedendo appositi spazi per l’apparato scolastico: l’esegesi a Proclo è posta quasi sullo stesso piano del testo principale e si tratta dunque del lavoro di uno studioso del commento che non può rinunciare all’apparato scolastico (spesso necessario); Psello è uno studioso assiduo di Proclo;

7) lo stralcio del testo presentato corrisponde al terzo libro; il III è il libro più citato da Psello;

8) le sezioni del terzo libro presuppongono, come è noto, una adeguata preparazione matematica, ovvero la conoscenza del quadrivio, che non è diffusa a Bisanzio, come sembra, se non tranne figure di spicco (cfr. Bianconi); la stessa circolazione di PHI 72 del Corpus Psellianum con Nicomaco, così come la circolazione di scritti di Psello in codici di età paleologa del quadrivio, possono essere significativi al riguardo; Psello domina tutte le discipline del quadrivio e i suoi studi sono legati anche alla pratica didattica, aspetto particolarmente significativo in presenza di un manufatto la cui destinazione non è, a mio avviso, necessariamente privata;

9) l’analisi della tradizione condotta da Diehl suggerisce, come si è detto, che Psello avesse per il commento di Proclo al Timeo anche un esemplare affine al Marc. gr. 195, al quale è assai vicino il rotolo di Patmos. Quest’ultimo aspetto richiede appunto ulteriori indagini, che si è inteso avviare qui con un primo confronto con PHI 74 e PHI 73; può essere interessante anche lo studio di PHI 72, di cui si è intrapresa la collazione.

Le stesse modalità di stesura del rotolo in rapporto al testo dell’autore, ovvero gli eventuali interventi di aggiunta e/o abbreviazione e parafrasi sarebbero assai significativi per stabilire la libertà di intervento sul testo, comprensibile maggiormente se autore e destinatario del rotolo vengono a coincidere. Un aspetto che potrebbe suggerire uno studioso anonimo del quale occorre valutare ancora la relazione e/o identità con la figura di Michele Psello. Il codice di Psello è apparentato con il rotolo di Patmos, che non è tuttavia la fonte diretta di Psello per esempio per la composizione di PHI 74. D’altro
canto il rotolo di Patmos ha forse una destinazione anche pubblica, che potrebbe richiamare alla mente Psello lettore e maestro: maneggevole come un rotolo liturgico, sarebbe stato particolarmente adatto per la lettura in pubblico, per la lettura per esempio nella pratica didattica. Questo ancor più forse che per la stesura, nel corso della quale era agevole anche documentarsi sui codici.
Philosophic Manuscripts at Mystra: The Ideal of Virtue

1. Ancient and Byzantine Philosophy

In the last 40 years or so we have seen ancient philosophy expanding progressively its range of interests and texts. Important studies have been produced on Hellenistic Philosophy, Roman Imperial Thought has been thoroughly investigated and the world of Late Antique commentators has been studied to an unprecedented level. Studies such as the book by Christian Wildberg on Philophonus, and, even more so, Richard Sorabji’s major synthesis *Aristotle Transformed: the Ancient Commentators and their Influence* have by now been canonized as classic texts of the field. However, the impression is sometimes that Greek speaking philosophy, in the way it is studied today, came to an end around 600 a.D. After that, many think that the time started of manuscripts, epitomes and *scholia* -- the time of copying and reproducing, not the time of thinking. On the other hand, in Byzantine studies there has been a remarkable tendency in the last few years to take a greater interest in intellectual history and in philosophical literature. So much so that a general handbook on Byzantine philosophy has been produced, in 2012 the German Academy of Science in Berlin has opened the project *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca et Byzantina* in which I myself happen to be employed, and in 2014 the Société Internationale pour l’Etude de la Philosophie Médiéval has opened a section on Byzantine Philosophy (coordinator is Prof. Ierodiakonou) and more articles and books in this field are produced.

Against this background, what I am doing is showing some of the way this new field can interact with ancient philosophy and with the history of the classical tradition. Since I am not going to be able to draw a full picture of what is largely still today an unexplored field, I shall focus on one particular case study, i.e. Gemistos Pletho and the school of Mystra, and devote the majority of my time to the one I am currently working on.

By doing this, I hope to be able to show in what sense there is a *continuity* between classical and byzantine philosophy, not only in the sense that the latter continues the former, but also in the sense that the latter impacts on our understanding of the former.

2. Gemistos Pletho and Mystra

A crucial case study is provided by Mistra and by the circle of Gemistos Pletho. Much work has been done in the last 25 years to focus the history of Platonism, in the way this philosophy was understood at Mistra. By going through the progressive identifications of Pletho’s platonic autographs, I shall at first draw a general picture of the material that has recently been made available to scholars.

A decisive change came about in 1992, however, when Christian Brockmann, in the course of research into the manuscript tradition of the *Symposium*, identified Pletho’s own handwriting in some of the annotations made in the margins of Marc. gr. Z 189 (Plato S). The aim of Brockmann's
work, however, was to reconstruct the manuscript tradition of the Symposium, and when he had established that the annotations (which were often banal insertions of certain portions of text that for one reason or another had been omitted) were of interest exclusively to dialogues other than the Symposium, he went no further than pointing out what he had identified and transcribing one of the more significant comments exempli gratia.

Returning to the matter with the intention of examining Pletho's philological contribution to Plato's text, Stefano Martinelli Tempesta was able to identify the same hand in a series of corrections made – both in the margins and in the body of the text - in Laur. PL 80.19 (Plato β). This manuscript also contains the text of the Republic, a work absent from S.

Subsequently, I myself worked on the fate of the Laws in the fifteenth century. By piecing together the contents of the two codices containing annotations made by Pletho, I noticed that they covered almost the entirety of the corpus platicum, with the single exception of the ninth tetralogy. This detail gave rise to a curious paradox: of all Plato's great dialogues, the only one that apparently escaped the scholar from Mistra was the Laws – precisely the work explicitly recalled by Pletho's main work, the Nómoi. Yet in carrying out further research into the Platonic manuscripts containing the ninth tetralogy, I did in fact discover yet another codex, Marc. gr. Z 188 (Plato K), with annotations in Pletho's hand.

Secondly, I shall go into a more detailed analysis of some of the crucial features linking together this group of manuscripts (and those that have been copied by them). The most interesting feature has already been described in an article I have published in 2009, i.e. the significant number of erased passages that are present in all three manuscripts.

Astonishing though this might seem, this is by no means the only interesting feature this material offers to modern scholars. A second point of attention will be the interesting textual corrections that all these manuscripts carries, surely of interest for classical philologists working on the manuscript transmission of Plato.

A third point for attention will be the so called anthologies of Mistra, i.e. a group of manuscripts closely related to Mistra and to Gemistos Pletho, more often than not showing stemmatic relationship with Pletho's autographs. It has been pointed out that these manuscripts tend to contain a set of similar texts. However, no clear explanation has ever been provided for the selection of this set of texts.

By looking at cases such as Isocrates, Pros Demonikon, but also Lucian, Pseudologista and the excerpts from Strabo, Appian and Plutarch I shall draw a general picture of what virtue was according to Gemistos Pletho.

3. Conclusions

Finally, I shall draw some general conclusion from the case study of Mistra.

First, the study of excerpts and teaching materials closely compared with Gemistos’ own philosophical writings shed some light on the relationship between philosophical speculation and teaching activities at Mistra.

Secondly, in terms of classical philology, this case-study shows that byzantine editions have been usually used for their lectiones, but have not always been understood as having an internal logic. More precisely, Byzantine editions can sometimes be not simply mere acts of transmission, but constructive acts of philosophical interpretation of the text.
Building on this, scholars of Byzantine philosophy should bear in mind that not only commentaries, but also editions of ancient texts might have philosophical relevance. And, on a more general historical level, the potential interest of manuscript studies in order to uncover the way Byzantine philosophy worked turns out to be largely confirmed.
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Copying Aristotle and Nikephoros Blemmydes from Nicaea to Constantinople: The case of Laur. Plut. 87.16

It is sometimes possible to state that a Byzantine manuscript was not copied on demand but to be used by its scribe or his circle. This usually happens from the first Palaiologan century, when we detect increasing numbers of manuscripts, due both to material and cultural reasons. Basically, the material reason is the generalized use of good-quality paper or, at least, consistent enough not to perish in a few centuries. The cultural reason is the spreading of reading habits propelled beyond the usual elite circles by a new consciousness of the past and of the Greek heritage.

In Textual history, the resultant scenario has been traditionally explained with the distinction between veters and recentiores. From the Byzantine perspective, the distinction must be done between Macedonian and Palaiologan culture – leaving aside the Comnenian period as the apory resulting from comparing an outstanding literary production with a strange shortage of preserved written materials. While the long-lasting Macedonian parchment codices preserve the organized corpus of Aristotle and his commentators, the more perishable Palaiologan paper manuscripts transfer an incredible, difficult-to-handle amount of materials related to their writings. If we approach with criteria of originality or accuracy these texts belonging to the mainstream of traditional (ancient) knowledge, the materials we find will have little to offer. Instead, if we approach them looking for the historical and cultural context of their production, we may be satisfied with the results. This is not an easy task, since non-professional scribes may lack of the organicity we need to distinguish their handwritings, while professional scribes do not usually keep for themselves the books they copy. Exceptions are here scholars who wrote books because they could not pay for them or because they were control freak and preferred to stay close to the copying process or because they liked to copy even long texts (Planudes is a case in point). But at least once I have found the book of a professional scribe, Chariton, probably a monk of Hodegon who copied many liturgical books in 14th-century Constantinople. The book is Par. gr. 1630 and I have called it a “personal encyclopedia”, since it gathers many poems and small texts copied in an informal and irregular way by Chariton, who was fond of poetry and ethical notions (I. Pérez Martín, “Les Kephalaia de Chariton des Hodèges [Paris, BnF, gr. 1630]”, in P. Van Deun – C. Macé, eds., Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium?, Leuven, Peeters, 2011, 361-386).

Here I am presenting a second example of a book a professional scribe copied for himself or his circle. Laur. Plut. 87.16 is a primary testimony of Blemmydes’ Epitome physica, as Stefano Valente has confirmed to me (see “Zur Überlieferung der Epitome physica des Nikephoros Blemmydes: die ältesten Handschriften”, in Chr. Brockmann, D. Harlfinger, S. Valente eds., Griechisch-byzantinische Handschriftenforschung. Traditionen, Entwicklungen, neue Wege. Berlin/Boston 2016, forthcoming). The ms. is almost unknown, but Jürgen Wiesner wrote for P. Moraux et al., Aristoteles Graecus. Die griechischen Manuskripten des Aristoteles, vol. I, Berlin 1976, 311-315, an accurate description of...
the codex, now updated on Teuchos website. For some manuscripts, accurate is not enough, and it would have taken some time to understand in depth how this codex was made up. Wiesner dated it from the end of the 13th century, while the Teuchos website notices 1273 as a reference year for the volume. What I am offering here is a more precise context for the Florence ms. and the identification of his main scribe.

Laur. Plut. 87.16 is a small book, 170 x 120 mm., the size we get when we fold twice the smallest size of the oriental paper (340 x 240 mm.). If the book were smaller, the stuff would be almost entirely wasted, so that we are at the limit of a small Byzantine book. This is a relevant point since the size points out that the book was intended for private use and not for preservation or ornament and that the texts chosen to be copied could fit in well with such a small book. It was its main scribe who organized the miscellanea of philosophical texts made up of 6 codicological units. CU1-5 follow a simple pattern: they are shaped around a main text by Aristotle or Nikephoros Blemmydes, followed or foregone by other secondary texts since the scribe had left blank pages in order to protect the written pages or to add notes: CU1: ff. 1-23, Aristoteles, *De mundo*; CU2: ff. 24-63, *Organon* [des. AnPr I 29b29]; CU3: ff. 64-143, Blemmydes, *Epitome logica*; CU4: ff. 144-231, Blemmydes, *Epitome physica*; CU5: ff. 232-323: Aristoteles, *Physica*. For its part, CU6 gathers a collection of brief prose and verse texts and the beginning of Euclid's *Elements*. Each codicological unit has a specific quire numbering, meaning that it has been copied separately (but there is also a general quire numbering and it reveals that the current volume has lost its first 11 quires, since we read on the upper margin of f. 1: 15').

Even if this scribe is not a scholar (indeed, if he read Aristotle or Blemmydes he did not add significant marginalia), we may prove that he was not copying on demand and that we can not reduce his work to the simple task of copy. It is true that in CU2 he respected the Aristotelian corpus of logic or *Organon* (Porphyrios' *Eisagoge*, *Categoriae*, *De interpretatione*, *Analytica priora et posteriora*, *Topica*, *De sophisticis elenchis*), but he interrupted the series in medias res and closed with a cross the incomplete text of *Analytica priora* I (ad 29b29), giving the false impression that the text had come to an end. The same is true for Euclid's *Elementa* at the end of the book (ff. 357-384v), copied contemporarily by a second scribe. This is probably an independent project that never came to an end (in fact, the volume's size was not very suitable for an entire copy of the *Organon* or of the *Elementa*), but was interrupted with a final cross after the demonstration 32 of Book I. This is something you do not do if you want to sell your work. Neither you choose fragments as the scribe did with Blemmydes, *De fide* (ff. 227-230v), or Choiroboskos, *De figuris poetici* (ff. 66v-67v), which he copied in the blank spaces left by the *Epitome*’s pinax. This is even more evident in the personal selection of CU6, where he chains canones paschales and brief letters with sentences, poems, basic tools to measure times, and scientific definitions.

In Byzantium the *Organon* was the omnipresent basis of logical training, while the copy of Aristotle’s physical treatises was less common. If the scribe chose to put together both corpora it is because he was following the pattern of Blemmydes’ *Epitome logica et physica*. This twofold approach to the Aristotelian tradition may be in fact much closer to Blemmydes than it appears at first sight.

The scribe of Laur. Plut. 87.16 is the famous but anonymous scribe of three geographical manuscripts: the first complete preserved copy of Strabo’s *Geography* (Par. gr. 1393), the so-called “Fragmentum Fabricianum” (1 bifolium, now Copenhagen, Fabricianus 23 2°) and Istanbul, Seragl.
gr. 57 of Ptolemy’s Geography (A. Diller, “The Oldest Manuscripts of Ptolemaic Maps”, TAPhA 71 [1940] 62-67). In contrast with Laur. Plut. 87.16, they are big manuscripts on in-folio oriental paper and on parchment. They have usually been dated from the end of the 13th century and related to Maximos Planudes. Planudes did use Par. gr. 1393, but this does not mean that he ordered the copy or was involved in its production. In fact the handwriting of those luxury manuscripts may only be explained in the earlier context of the imperial chancellery, probably during the reign of Michael VIII but not necessarily after 1261, since we find it in some chrysoboullae from 1259: Lavra 71A (P. Lemerle et al., Actes de Lavra II: De 1204 à 1328, Paris 1977 [Archives de l’Athos VIII]), Iviron 58 (J. Lefort, Actes d’Iviron III: De 1204 à 1328, Paris 1994 [Archives de l’Athos XVIII]), as well as in Vatopedi 16 de l’an 1265 (J. Lefort, Actes de Vatopédi I: Des origines à 1329, Paris 2001 [Archives de l’Athos XXII], an order, not a chrysoboulla).

It necessarily leads us to conclude that Laur. Plut. 87.16 was copied in the third quarter of the 13th century in the entourage of the imperial court in Nicaea or Constantinople. His copy of Aristotle and Blemmydes followed the latter’s pattern and it is explained by the philosophical training he probably got in Nicaea. This statement should lead to a review of the traditional dating given to the Palaiologan recovery of Ptolemaic maps. Palaeography clearly proves that the scribe of these manuscripts was a notary attached to the imperial administration in the first years of Michael VIII’s reign. This environment is demonstrated not only by his handwriting but by the nature of the secondary texts he included: ff. 348r-349: Περὶ τῶν βαθμῶν τῆς συγγενείας (Justinian, Institutes, III 6, with tables); Canones Paschales (ff. 324-325v); Περὶ θεμελίων καὶ κύκλων τῆς σελήνης καὶ τοῦ ἡλίου (ff. 18-20 + 21v); Michael Psellos, Περὶ τῆς κινήσεως τοῦ χρόνου (ff. 325v-347v); f. 21v: definitions of distance measurements. The same historical context is supported by the comparison with a much more complex codex (this time an in-folio miscellany), Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barocci 131, another product of the courtier circles in Nicaea and Constantinople, preserving also some writings by Blemmydes and Psellos as well as chrysoboullae and other imperial acts (I. Pérez Martín, “The philosophical teaching of Michael Psellos in the Palaeologan Renaissance,” in A. Rigo – P. Ermilov – M. Trizio eds., Theologica minora: The Minor Genres of Byzantine Theological Literature, Turnhout, 2013, 159-174 + 180-185).

Soon after the copies in the Florence ms. were finished they were available for other people belonging to the same entourage at the same time. This is proved by the brief historical notes in f. 64r-v providing specific and partial information on Byzantine rulers from 1204 to 1282 (ed. P. Schreiner, Die Byzantinischen Kleinchroniken, Wien 1975-79, vol. I, 176-177, nr. 21). Moreover, the lists of emperors and patriarchs of CP. added in ff. 320-323v prove the continuity in the preservation of the codex: the emperors’ list ends up with Andronikos III, while the last patriarch in the original list is Athanasios I, but they are two updatings, the first until Isaias (1321-1334), the second until Kallistos’ first patriarchate (1351-54).

All this evidence points out to an administrative milieu or a court circle in Nicaea and Constantinople. Its members worked for the imperial administration and had a broad intellectual background where books were produced not for sale or on demand but to be used by themselves; these codices were not simple copies of ancient texts but repositories of texts arising from an enkyklios paideia as well as intended for specific training. The recovery of the mathematical geography of Ptolemy and of the historical geography of Strabo took place in this environment, apparently before Planudes.
Δισσοὶ λόγοι sur les livres philosophiques byzantins.
Retour sur la « collection philosophique »

La transmission manuscrite des ouvrages philosophiques à Byzance au IXe siècle est devenue un sujet de confrontation scientifique central au cours des quinze dernières années, grâce à de nouvelles découvertes d’une part, de l’autre, à la formulation d’hypothèses qui proposent de briser certains paradigmes critiques bien enracinés. Les unes et les autres concernent un groupe de livres qu’on appelle, suivant une longue tradition bibliographique, « collection philosophique ».

Etat de l’art


**Pistes d’analyse**

C’est dans cet esprit constructif que je propose un supplément d’enquête, afin de donner une contribution ultérieure à ce débat, qui exige encore des études approfondies sur la nature du milieu (ou des milieux) de production de ces livres, les régions (ou la ville) d’où parvinrent à Constantinople leurs modèles, la légitimité ou l’illégitimité de la dénomination même de « collection philosophique » (stricto sensu ou lato sensu) et sur la dimension culturelle qu’une telle dénomination sous-entend.
A cette fin, je propose une intervention en trois temps : un premier volet manuscritologique, un deuxième prosopographique, un troisième historico-textuel.


b) Le volet prosopographique portera en particulier sur Zacharie dit ὁ Κωφός, métropolite de Chalcédoine et partisan de Photius. A celui-ci, comme on le sait, est attribué un bref traité Περι τοῦ χρόνου, qui figure dans l’un des livres de la « collection », le Marc. gr. 258. Une reconsideration de la période d’activité de Zacharie (qui constitue un terminus post quem certain, et un terminus ante quem possible pour la réalisation d’une partie des livres de la « collection ») s’avère de la plus grande importance, de notre point de vue. Il est nécessaire de se concentrer sur la vie de ce personnage, car, dans ce cas aussi, des erreurs ont perduré dans la bibliographie. La consultation de la Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit et l’étude ciblée des actes de certains conciles nous permettra de faire la lumière sur ce personnage.

Une telle démarche permettra, dans mes intentions, d’ajouter une tesselle à notre connaissance de ce qu’on appelle encore parfois la « collection philosophique ». Sans avoir l’ambition de résoudre définitivement l’épineuse question que constitue ce groupe de livres, mon étude, par ce biais, souhaite contribuer à une meilleure connaissance des dynamiques culturelles sous-jacentes à la recherche, la lecture et la transcription d’ouvrages philosophiques de l’Antiquité classique et tardive durant cette période féconde que Paul Lemerle a appelée « le premier humanisme byzantin ». 

463
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Administrative Market Control in Illyricum:
Caričin Grad as Pottery Production and Consumption Center

In an effort to reconstruct the daily life of the Byzantine city, archeology nowadays focuses more on the study of activity patterns in broader political, economic and social terms. In recent decades significant steps have been made especially in the field of late antique archeology; it has thus become a proving ground for theoretical models of the city activities and their socio-economic contexts (cf. Late Antique Archaeology series, managing editor L. Lavan). These researches have showed that pottery studies yield invaluable insight into sociopolitical organization through the study of the organization of production, functional analysis of vessels and their distribution.

Within the spacious prefecture Illyria, positioned in the central part of the Balkan Peninsula, from the Danube to the Peloponnese (Dacian and Macedonian dioceses), the cities of different size and structure according to their different cultural and economic heritage existed. Although all of these are well known from written documents, Caričin grad stands out because of the archaeological indicators, especially the precise chronology, spatial layout and inner (architectural) structures, as well as of contextual pottery assemblages. Therefore, the character of pottery from its city area will be used in creating models of production and consumption behavior of the Early Byzantine city.

Establishing the City

Caričin grad is positioned within the province of Dacia Mediterranea, close to the frontier of Dardania. It was occupied c. 530 *ex nihilo* in such an isolated area away from the main communications, but still with good access to the road system. It lies almost on the halfway between Naissus and Scupi; beyond these cities were main roads leading either north to the Danubian border or south into Macedonia (Bavant 2012). The city is considered to be Justiniana Prima, founded by emperor Justinian I (527-565) near to the village (Taurision) where he was born. The intention of the Emperor – attested in Novel 11 of the *Code of Justinian* – to transfer of the seat of the Praetorian Perfect of Thessaloniki to Justiniana Prima did not happened, because of intrusions of Gepids, Kutrigurs and especially the Slavs; Justiniana Prima remained primarily religious administrative center of Dacian diocese and the military city. According to the latest minted coin finding, Caričin grad was abandoned c. 615 or shortly afterwards. In favor of it, from the historical records Justiniana Prima disappeared after the pontificate of Gregory the Great (590-604).

The urban layout of the city reflects classical traditions and early Byzantine specifics; the urban area is divided into several fortified quarters, each with its own closed plan of buildings: Acropolis – a sacral complex with cathedral, baptistery and administrative buildings; Upper City – seat of military administration; Lower City – residential quarter with public facilities (cistern, basilicas and baths), craft workshops, and private buildings (Bavant et Ivanišević 2006; Ivanišević 2010). On the slopes around the city walls a spacious suburb was formed, surrounded by defensive ditches, earth ramparts, drystone walls and wooden palisades. Workshop area was situated at a foothill, on the banks of the rivers.
Pottery production in Caričin grad – analyses of vessel attributes

Because of the clearly defined context, with chronology that encompasses around 80 years, and number of vessels, pottery from Caričin Grad has become an important landmark assemblage in the study of early Byzantine pottery (Bjelajac 1990; Bikić forthcoming). It gives an impression of uniformity, in color, fabric, dimensions and shapes, in spite of variations which reflect the function of vessels. All pottery classes have been made of similar raw material that compositionally corresponds to lithological units of the local area, strongly indicating production that has been organized in the city area. Relatively fine fabric with fine sand and mica admixtures is characteristic for all classes, while the firing procedures are different, and closely related with vessel function (Damjanović et al. 2014).

Pottery from Caričin Grad can be defined as standardized, regarding both in technological and formal properties. Its specific technological style follows the common trends of the early Byzantine pottery, but the overall character is regional, with selection of cooking pots and glazed jugs that represent it. The reconstruction of pottery production process clearly shows the intentional standardization, consciously controlled by craftsmen. It is reflected in particular raw materials for specific purpose, composition and techniques used to form vessels, application of glazes and procedures of firing, as well as in morphology, which is related to the function and size of vessels, and type of decoration and motifs in some cases.

Caričin grad on pottery distribution map

The amount of vessels that comes via complex exchange mechanisms is significantly higher than on other sites in the region, about 3% of total pottery findings. It is about the two functional classes of products: containers for transporting food – amphorae, and tableware. (Bikić and Ivanišević 2012). Among amphorae, the North African spatheion and LRA 2 are far more numerous than other types, and those are LRA 1 and LRA 4; it indicates wine as main content, i.e. main commodity of trade. In addition, only a few types of fine tableware are continuously commissioned – African red slip ware and, significantly less, Late Roman C from Asia Minor. For the Early Byzantine period these very products represent landmarks of trade, therefore it can be concluded that the Caričin grad was completely incorporated into the state system of supply (annona militaris); they were reaching consumers in Caričin grad via an extensive local road network.

Socio-economic context of pottery

Bearing in mind the overtly large role of the state administration in all spheres of daily life during the early Byzantine period, certain sociopolitical consequences and contexts can be assumed by reading the indicators of pottery production and consumption (cf. Sinopoli 2003; Costin 2005). Caričin grad/Justiniana Prima is a reference polygon for testing that aspect; due to the political and economic background of its founding, as well as to its overall character, it is considered as an urban model of the late antique period. In another words, the state control, which is expressed not only in the administrative sphere, through the annona militaris, is also expresed through the production of vessels. Consequently, vessels exhibit high degree of formal and technological standardization.

On the other hand, the pottery produced and used again actualized the issue of social structure of the city (Sodini 2003). In this regard, Caričin grad reflects a very modest environment in which luxury objects are very rare. Pots for daily use are strictly functional, including large containers for...
grain storage (pythoi) and for transport wine and oil (amphorae). The number of glazed vessels emphasizes the production trend of late antiquity. In addition, bowls and plates from the class of red slip ware show the extreme uniformity.

The spatial distribution of the pottery gives certain guidelines in regard of exploring social differences in the city. Although there is an observation regarding use of certain types of cooking pots in different spatial units (Upper City vs Lower City), differences registered so far can indicate the social groups only indirectly, through the function of vessels i.e. eating habits, and perhaps their chronology. Also, the clusters of amphorae and pithoi in the areas around the Acropolis and the Upper City (Bjelajac 2010) confirm the firm organization of activities related to the supply, storage and distribution of strategic food; in such context, the presence of luxurious dishes can be expected too. However, distribution of red slip ware on the urban plan points to social differentiation within residential quarters. Thus, a complex of buildings with an atrium in the Lower City, where about 30 African red-slipped plates and number of amphorae have been found, is presumed to be a residence of a wealthy trader (Bikić and Ivanišević 2012).

Closing remarks

Briefly presented data on pottery make Caričin Grad/ Justiniana Prima one of the key sites for the establishing of a model of production and consumption behavior in an Early Byzantine city. As extraordinary administrative stronghold, it shows the patterns of production and trade that also can be observed in other, smaller settlements in Illyricum and beyond. Production trend shows a high level of pottery standardization, which is reflected both in the technological choices (the composition of raw materials, techniques and procedures) and a small number of forms in all functional classes (cooking, storage, transport and table wares). This refers to the pottery specialists; they are under “control” of state administration (which employs them and who is their main consumer) and, at the same time, they are controlling themselves (in the aspect of specialization, daily demands, and volume of production), thus creating a dynamic pottery market. The exchange and trade, which includes ceramic containers, should be considered in the same context (Laiou and Morrison 2007).
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Consuming Copper in Early Byzantine Crete

Cities are traditionally regarded as the primary centres of production and distribution base metal – including copper and copper alloy – artefacts (Bouras 2002, 518 with references). They were also presumably the main consumption centres of these materials. The archaeological record, which consists primarily of small utilitarian objects like those catalogued in publications of ‘minor objects’ or instrumenta domestica (see for example Davidson 1952 for Corinth, Waldbaum 1983 for Sardis, and Dieudonné-Glad et al. 2013 for Zeugma), illustrates the wide range of copper and copper alloy objects that were available in cities and met the domestic, professional, and devotional needs of their citizens: architectural and structural fittings, domestic implements, vessels, lighting devices, jewellery and dress accessories, weighing equipment, tools, weapons, horse trappings, etc. Inevitably such finds raise a number of questions: what part of a building’s original equipment do copper and copper alloy objects represent, what do the copper equivalents of objects usually available in cheaper materials (pottery, glass, or wood) tell us of a city’s economy (industry, trade) and social fabric (purchasing power, aspirations, taste, etiquette) (Mundell Mango 2009, 230-233; Drandaki 2013), who were these objects intended for (in other words, who among city dwellers would choose to invest in copper and copper alloy implements and utensils and under what circumstances; for a recent discussion on the consumers of copper and copper alloy objects see Sanders, in press), what can copper scrap and slag, which represent a considerable yet underexploited quantity of excavated metal, tell us on metal production in urban environments (other than that it existed).

In this presentation I focus on copper and copper alloy consumption in the cities of Early Byzantine Crete (6th-9th c.). Located at the heart of the maritime network that Africa to Constantinople (until the Arab conquest of Alexandria in 642) and the Eastern Mediterranean to the Black Sea and the West, largely self-sufficient, isolated from the population movements and wars in the Balkans and the East, Crete was a microcosm of relative stability if not prosperity right up to the early 8th c. (Tsigonaki 2007, 263-4; Tsigonaki 2012, 77; Zanini 2013, 181, 182). It was also one of the Empire’s most urbanized provinces throughout the Early Byzantine period and until the Arab conquest of 827-8 (Tsigonaki 2007, 263; Tsigonaki 2012, 77-8). With its capital Gortyn and plethora of peripheral cities and harbours, Crete was a major regional consumption centre and trading hub for goods produced locally and originating from long distance trade (the latter included architectural sculpture, tablewares, and foodstuffs attested by amphorae). Whether imported or locally manufactured (on the possibility of local production at Gortyn and elsewhere see Brokalakis 2005, 48, n. 30-31 with earlier references and Poulou-Papadimitriou 2011, 439), the copper and copper alloy finds from the systematic excavations in cities such as Gortyn and Eleutherna and rescue excavations in several others (Kisamos, Chania-Kydonia, Knossos, Herakleion) corroborate the picture painted by other archaeological materials: that of a wide range of products available to city dwellers throughout the island, some of which can be associated with specific groups of high-end consumers.
One of the most characteristic elements of this range of products is the belt buckle. The cities of Gortyn, Knossos, Herakleion, Eleutherna, Kydonia, and modern Agios Nikolaos have all yielded examples of these small, highly standardized ornaments, which became fashionable from the mid-7th to the late 8th/early 9th century, probably because of new trends in male dress (originally attributed to ‘barbarians’ and soldiers, they are now believed to reflect the adoption of the ‘barbaric’ trousers or *vrakia* by part of the Byzantine population). The Cretan specimens have been dealt with extensively by Natalia Poulou-Papadimitriou (Poulou-Papadimitriou 2004; Poulou-Papadimitriou 2005; Poulou-Papadimitriou 2011, 431-3), who associates the more distinctive types with high-end consumers, possibly administration or military officers, stationed in or moving through the island right up to the Arab conquest (Poulou-Papadimitriou 2005, 703 and Poulou-Papadimitriou 2011, 432: Poulou associates the specimen from the rural complex at Pseira with such a user). Of particular interest is a gilded copper alloy belt buckle from the Eleutherna acropolis, the city’s last Early Byzantine administrative centre and habitation nucleus (Tsigonaki 2007, 282). This simple belt buckle features a trapezoidal chape, integral ovoid frame, and basic linear decoration. I do not know parallels for this shape in Crete or elsewhere (there is nothing to suggest that it was not produced in Crete), and the area’s disturbed stratigraphy cannot provide a secure date. Although not quite as precious as the more elaborate gold belt buckle from Kasteli Selinou (Poulou-Papadimitriou 2005, 697-8, fig. 11), it belonged to someone with a sufficiently elevated status to be able to acquire such a ‘precious’ object either as a gift or purchase. A mid-7th-c. or later context in Eleutherna’s ‘lower city’ (Late Roman/Early Byzantine nucleus) yielded another interesting specimen, a purse buckle of a type that is rather rare in Greece (Tsivikis 2012, 65, fig. 6.4: a cross between Sina Uenze’s ‘Gátér’ and ‘Emling’ types = Schulze-Dörrlamm’s RGZM D37 type) and whose context of manufacture – Byzantine, or ‘barbaric’, or both – is still debated (Poulou-Papadimitriou 2002, 129; Tsivikis 2012, 66-7). This and the other buckles from Eleutherna reflect an interest in and access to current consumer trends even in this remote Cretan city.

Eleutherna also yielded a number of copper and copper alloy utensils. These include (a) a hammered copper piriform jug with splaying foot, engraved decoration and cast copper alloy handle from a 7th c. domestic assemblage in the room south of the basilica annex in Eleutherna’s lower city (Themelis 2004, 59, 101, fig. 78); (b) a hammered copper cylindrical flask with conical neck and iron handle and neck strap from a 7th/8th c. context on the acropolis (Tsigonaki 2012, 98, fig. 9; a possible lid for a jug of this type comes from the same area: Stampolidis 2004, 217, no. 186; see Pitarakis 2005 for this type of jug); (c) two censers, a (cast?) hemispherical tripod censer from the same context as the piriform jug mentioned above (Themelis 2004, 60, 102, fig. 79) and a fragmentary cast copper alloy hexagonal censer from the final phase (6th-7th c.) of the lower city’s Small Bathhouse (Brokalakis 2005, 44-5, figs. 14, 15); and (d) the lid with baluster knob of a cast copper alloy nozzled lamp also from the same domestic context as the aforementioned piriform jug and censer (Themelis 2004, 60, 102, fig. 80). Similar utensils are known from other sites: for example a hemispherical, three-footed censer from a 7th-c. urban domestic context at Kisamos (Fantakis 2010, 733, fig. 10) and a hemispherical censer with circular foot from a 7th-c. ?suburban church at Perama Mylopotamou, a short distance from Eleutherna to the north (Fraidaki 2010, 533, fig. 2a). All of these items correspond to standardized, widely distributed types of utensils, normally associated with a relatively affluent standard of living and the tastes and aspirations of urban consumers.
The variety, however, of types and quality of copper and copper alloy products available in Cretan cities is best illustrated by two hoards from Gortyn and Eleutherna, the two cities at the top and bottom of the hierarchy of Cretan bishoprics. Both hoards consist of church furnishings. The Eleutherna hoard comes from the Early Byzantine church on the acropolis, which was the main church of the city’s final phase, probably built in the 7th c. upon an earlier tetraconch (Tsigonaki 2015, 396). The hoard, which consisted of copper alloy suspension devices for lamps or polykandela and marble liturgical sculpture, was buried in the building’s south apse probably after the building was abandoned sometime in the 8th c. (Tsigonaki 2015, 396). The copper alloy objects included two complete tripartite holders (Stampolidis 2004, 222, nos. 212-213) and part of another, one complete (Stampolidis 2004, 222, nos. 214) and one fragmentary chrism with attached chain, and a fragment of a cross or chrism with chain. The objects are fairly generic, common throughout the Empire (including Crete: see a tripartite holder from Mitropolis, Gortyn in AD, Chronika, 24, 1969, pl. 460γ), attested in urban and rural, domestic and liturgical contexts alike from the 5th to 7th/8th c. (Xanthopoulou 2010, 54-5 [groups c and d], 56) – i.e. nothing out of the ordinary.

The Gortyn hoard (Xanthopoulou 1998), on the other hand, is the exact opposite as far as copper is concerned. Excavated in the church known as Hagios Titos, this large group of high quality copper and copper alloy vessels and implements (77 objects in total) is worthy of a provincial capital and a sophisticated urban church with an important role to play, particularly after Gortyn's metropolitan church was damaged in the 670 earthquake. The hoard's deposition date is problematic (Baldini 2009, 645, 660, argues that it was buried before the Arab conquest), as neither the context nor any of the objects can be precisely dated. Its content may have accumulated over a long time period, possibly from as early the building's first inauguration in the late 6th c. (Baldini 2009, 659) to the Middle Byzantine period (Xanthopoulou 1998, 107-8: date attributed to several objects on stylistic grounds), during which the church continued to function as suggested by architectural sculpture dating to this period (information provided by Chr. Tsigonaki).

One of the hoard's three polykandela (Xanthopoulou 1998, 108-9, figs. 29-32; Xanthopoulou 2010, 298-9, no. LU 4.027, 303, LU 5.008, 312, LU 6.013) features a cruciform monogram, which Stefanos Xanthoudidis read as Theoktistou (or Theopemptou), a name attested in a funerary inscription from Mitropolis, Gortyn mentioning a bishop or metropolitan Theoktistos from Herakleion (Baldini 2009, 640, n. 7, 644: possibly 5th-6th c.) and on the seal of a Cretan archbishop of the first half of the 9th c. (Baldini et al. 2012, 252 mentions Touratsoglou et al. 2006, 51, no. 3). Alternatively, the inscription could be read as an invocation to the Virgin (Xanthopoulou 2010, 72: Theotoke boëthei […]tou), to whom the church was probably originally dedicated (Baldini et al. 2012, 277). Either way, the polykandelon was a reasonably expensive item, which was personalized at the time of manufacture and so could be local. A hammered copper conical chalice foot with the relief votive inscription Hyper euchēs Andreas (sic) from a late 7th c./early 8th c. context (an annex of the city’s largely ruined metropolitan church, see Baldini et al. 2012, 264, fig. 15) could have also been produced or at least personalized locally. Despite the inscription's poor grammar, it is tempting to associate it with Gortyn's early 8th-c. metropolitan Andreas, who is known to have donated new vessels to the city's churches (Baldini et al. 2012, 252). Most of the hoard's remaining objects form a homogenous group of heavy, well-crafted, cast copper alloy artefacts, the finest in their respective categories: 24 openwork discs with foliate designs, one large rayed (?manoualion) disc, a hemispherical censer with engraved decoration and cast baluster chains, a ?processional cross, an
almost identical cross designed to interlock with a series of six bars and two interlocking bars and discs, four icon stands, and various fragments of cast lampstands or candlesticks, calyx-shaped prickets, and tubular supports, possibly for large candles (Xanthopoulou 1998, 105-8, 109-11). Two hammered copper utensils, a patera with moulded rim and a piriform jug (the handle is missing), complete the assemblage (Xanthopoulou 1998, 103-4). Such high quality objects call for a high-end patron, and Andreas, whose ambitious early 8th-c. restoration program probably included the refurbishment of this church (Baldini 2009, 666), is a possible candidate. Whether it belongs to the 8th c. or later, this group probably represents the finest in copper alloy products available to urban consumers in Byzantine Crete.
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Production and Consumption in Crete from the Mid 7th to 10th C. AD: The Archaeological Evidence

In the present study we will investigate how bigger or smaller cities and small-sized settlements in Crete participated in the commercial network which was under development in the Byzantine Empire. More specifically, we will be particularly concerned with the contacts of Crete with the islands of the Aegean.

It is well-known that there was an exchange of goods among the cities of the Empire. Over the last thirty years, archaeological research on the island has yielded important evidence, which throws enough light to the period under study.

Crete, an important province of the Byzantine Empire, had, on account of the Arab conquest in 827/828, rather different turning points in its history comparing to the Aegean islands. The First Byzantine era (4th c. - 827/28), the period of the Arab occupation (827/28 - 961) and the Second Byzantine era (961-1210/11) left heir traces on the archaeological remains. The period that we will focus on, concerns the late 7th to the late 10th century and it is particularly interesting because it contains both the transitional period of Byzantium and the period of the Arab occupation.

In order to detect the productive activities, the existence of commerce and of imports and through them the consumption of goods in cities or in small-scale settlements in Crete, we will examine the material culture objects recovered in different sites of the island. Pottery and the amphorae, in specific, provide evidence about the production and transfer of goods. At the same time painted ware and glazed ware also constitute important evidence for the production and consumption in the Byzantine cities. In order to facilitate the study we have included metallic objects and some jewelry examples as well.

Research in cities and large or small-scale settlements reveals that the human activity does not cease in the middle or, in cases, the end of 7th century, but it is continuous, in the majority of cases, throughout the 8th and at least the early decades of the 9th century. Although parts of the cities are being fortified, activity persists extra muros as well. The findings coming from coastal areas or islets are highly important; dating these settlements in the 8th and, occasionally, in the 9th c., a period of intense Arab danger, allows us to assume that central administration, perhaps in view of that danger, chooses to strengthen the defense and to create safe conditions for the commerce and the harboring of ships in cases of emergency. Several of these coastal settlements retain activity in the Second Byzantine period as well. There is significant evidence on the existence of pottery production centers in the same period.

The archaeometrical research has shown that the production of ceramics continues in several places of the island. The fact that, during the second Byzantine period, local production has been
identified in places where production existed before the Arab conquest is very significant. The production of amphorae suggests the existence of agricultural production in Crete. At the same time, the imports of agricultural products from all the Aegean regions continue, whereas the first glazed wares are imported from Constantinople. The types of transport vessels that are produced on the island are identical to the ones produced in the production centres in various regions of the Empire.

The publications on metallic objects are not numerous, but the recovery of some bronze belt buckles is important, because they demonstrate the existence of dignitaries during the 7th, 8th and 9th c.

As far as the period of Arab occupation is concerned, there is little material witness evidence. It is well known that the Andalusian Arabs conquer Crete between 827/828. The fact this scarce material witness comes from Heraklion corroborates the hypothesis that the Andalusian Arabs inhabited the city of Al-Khandaq; at the same time, life must have continued without serious alterations in all of the cities that have survived the Arab conquest as well as in rural or small-scale settlements.

The sources refer to abundance in agricultural production during the period of Arab conquest. What is surprising, though, is the absence of common pottery among the findings dated during this period. Research has led us to the conclusion that apart from the small amount of imported pottery, the products must have been transferred in vessels that were produced in Crete. This local pottery production was not differentiated and probably followed local tradition as formed during the 8th and the 9th century. At the same time, as has been already proposed, a great number of Early Byzantine period settlements must have survived during the Arab occupation. We suppose that there was not serious differentiation in the activities of these settlements, consequently, the pottery production must have continued.

Small artifacts dated safely in this period are limited. Valuable witness for this period is a group of golden earrings, part of a treasure found in Messonisi (Rethymno). Pointing to the hybrid character of their decoration, closely related to both Byzantine and Fatimid traditions, it is suggested that these earrings were manufactured in 10th-century Crete for Islamic residents, probably before the Byzantine re-conquest of 961.

What is most distinguishing about Crete in the whole Second Byzantine period is its close contact with the center, Constantinople. Chandax is a city with significant commercial activity, while the percentage of agricultural production rises all over the island. It is interesting to note that in some of the regions with confirmed activity during the last centuries of the Early Byzantine period we observe a continuation of this activity throughout the Second Byzantine period too. The function of pottery workshops in the same or similar areas as those in the First Byzantine period has already been pointed out. The hypothesis about the function of metallic objects workshops is considered realistic.

In conclusion, I would like to stress out that throughout the whole Byzantine period Crete had contacts with many of the Empire's regions, even though its prevailing space was the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean in general. Only after the Venetian occupation, Crete, among other substantial differentiations, will open to the West as well, while the bulk of its imports in everyday or luxury goods will thereafter be coming from there.
Geographies of Consumption in Byzantine Epirus ‘Urban’ Spaces and Practices from the Seventh to the Twelfth Century

Located on the western frontier the province of Epirus was both a vital asset and strategic apparatus for the Byzantine empire between the seventh and the twelfth centuries. This was concluded in many ways by the investigation of several kinds of material culture, either still in situ or part of museum collections, during an archaeological extensive-survey project, within the years 2000-2007 (Veikou 2012). Based on the results of that investigation, this paper will focus on the geographies of consumption in this province, from the seventh to the twelfth century, with special interest on spaces and practices which can be considered as part of ‘urban’ environments in that particular context.

The discussion will be based on a comparative consideration of archaeological evidence from such environments (ceramics, metal- and glass artefacts, art, coins, sculptures) and Byzantine texts referring to them, towards an effort to answer three main questions:

1. How can we define the notion of consumption in the Epirote Middle-Byzantine ‘urban’ environments?
2. Can we discern place-, region- or province-specific consumption patterns?
3. What do consumption geographies offer in this particular context?

This paper aims to contribute to the Round Table by proposing the following issues for discussion:

- Different approaches towards our definition of the notion of consumption in Byzantine cultures.
- Ideas for our optimal use of consumption geographies in the investigation of Byzantine cultures.

1. Consumption in Epirote Byzantine ‘urban’ environments

The definition of ‘Middle-Byzantine urban environments’ in Southern Epirus on the basis of the settlements’ form and planning is an unproductive task. Despite the indisputable uninterrupted existence of a provincial capital ‘city’ at Naupaktos and the short-lived ‘town’-formations at Lefkada (7th-12th c.), Nikopolis (7th-11th c.), Vonitsa (9th-12th c.) and Arta (12th century), settlement patterns in this specific region and period of time mostly allowed for more flexible and hybrid formations that eventually worked out as ‘urban’ environments (Veikou 2010; 2012, 273-303). Such hybrid formations (rather dispersed or with multinucleate) can be traced all over the area (Veikou 2012, 282-295, 350-357):

- around Arta and Rogoi from the 10th to the 12th century,
- in the upper deltaic area of Acheloos River from the 9th to the 12th century,
- between the lower deltaic area of Acheloos River and Varassova Mountain from the 9th to the 12th century,
- on the West coast of Acarnania from the 7th to the 12th century.
A comparative investigation of consumption practices in all aforementioned sites may offer further criteria for the overall evaluation of settlement in respect to the question of urban features and its meaning. My analysis will compare and contrast the production and supply of all kinds of goods for the consumptive demands of population in all these sites. I will discuss evidence of consumption goods ranging over the entire spectrum of durable goods (e.g. tools, ornaments) to non-durable goods (e.g. food, perishable objects) as well as to services (work done by one person or a group that benefited others) and symbolic goods (cultural ones, which are certainly attested in all material culture but they are perhaps more eloquent in artisanal production, monumental art, sculptures, and inscriptions).

So, what exactly was consumed and where? (Tables 1-2) To begin with the area of Nafpaktos, people seem to have been consuming a wide range of goods which were either produced in the city and its hinterland or imported from neighbouring regions (mainly Boeotia and the Peloponnese) during the entire period in question. Its population also enjoyed services such as administration, secular- and religious-building construction, water-supply, artisanal production, monumental art as well as intellectual production (attested only through the building inscriptions, unfortunately). The area of Mt Varassova and the southern part of Aetolia (especially along the Northern coast of the Patraic Gulf and the lower deltaic area of Acheloos River) must be accounted for as part of Nafpaktos' organic hinterland and as a typical 'dispersed urban environment'. These areas, first of all, were supplying several industrial products for consumption: ceramics, metalwork and probably silk textiles judging from the huge amount of loom weights and the neighbouring industrial network (Dunn 2006); secondly, they offered nodes for communication with Northern Peloponnese towards an even wider circulation of goods. The ceramic products, which were locally produced and consumed in the entire hinterland of Nafpaktos between the 7th and the 12th century, consisted of: 1) pottery (plain and glazed coarse wares for food preparation, serving and storage), 2) a great variety of loom weights, and 3) tiles. The metal artefacts consisted of nails and belt buckles, made of iron. The same region (Nafpaktia and Southern Aetolia) seems to have also produced sculptures for local consumption from the 10th to the 12th century. As far as the consumption of non-local goods is concerned, people showed a preference for selected goods which were principally produced by reknown Peloponnesian workshops (such as a bread stamp from Patras and plentiful Corinthian pottery, metal dressing accessories and glass vessels).

Another wide center of consumption is observed around the Northern and Southwest coasts of the Ambracian Gulf. The earlier city of Nikopolis seems to have broken down in several smaller nuclei forming another ‘dispersed urban environment’ (Kefalos and perhaps also Korakonissa, Drymos, and Koum on Lefkada) from the late 6th century until the 10th century. Eventually, new dense concentrations of population emerged (Rogoi, Arta, Vonitsa) consisting of urban settings that functioned within a multinucleate hinterland, between the 10th and the 12th century. In the 7th century, Nikopolis and its neighboring nuclei continued to consume all goods typical of a late antique provincial capital (ceramics, glass and metal artefacts, sculptures, building construction) and they also ‘consumed’ coins by hoarding them. This consumption seems to drop dramatically during the 8th century and slowly restart from the 9th century onwards. Its peak is visible in 12th-century Arta which shows again a consumption of goods similar to that of late antique Nikopolis: of non-durable goods (such as foods and beverages) and their respective vessels, of durable goods (such as jewellery and utensils), as well as of services (such as administration and building construction).
Cultural goods seem to have been very important in this region: this is evident in decorative artisanal production part of which seems to have been systematically imported. Many of the consumed goods in this region were local (e.g. pottery). Others were imported from neighbouring areas currently in modern central and Western Greece, Albania and Italy (e.g. pottery, jewellery and perhaps also glass, imported from Corinth, Boeotia, Italy and elsewhere). Some goods were local manufactures of imported raw materials (e.g. produce of the glass workshop in Nikopolis) or local products made through imported expertise or workmanship (e.g. sculpture in the area of Arta).

Alongside these ‘urban’ environments, smaller yet substantial centres of consumption existed as well. Two important ones were located: a) along the Western coast of Acarnania from the 7th to the 12th century, and b) around the upper deltaic area of Acheloos River from the 9th to the 12th century. In these areas, consumption seems to have been diachronically more focused on a) domestic goods (e.g. the domestic type of coarse pottery), and b) a traditional interest in monumental art (several frescoes of provincial style). Otherwise, both areas demonstrate a rather moderate consumption of durable and non-durable goods and of services; however, archaeological research of many sites (especially along the Acarnanian coast) is still limited.

On the basis of all this evidence, how can we define the notion of consumption in the Epirote Middle-Byzantine ‘urban’ environments? (Open for discussion)

2. Place-, Region- or Province-Specific Consumption Patterns

A comparison of consumption among the afore-mentioned – nucleate or multinucleate – urban environments reveals a number of province-, region- and place-specific phenomena. First of all, the geographic location obviously affected the patterns of consumption. For example, people in Nafpaktia and Southern Aetolia seem principally orientated towards Peloponnese and Boeotia, while people living around the Ambracian Gulf seem to have been more cosmopolitan, when economy allowed them. This is evident in their choices for either local or imported artefacts (pottery and metawork), services and symbolic goods and their preferences for specific imports (from Peloponnese and Boeotia in Nafpaktos and hinterland – from Italy, Albania, central Greece and Peloponnese in the Ambracian Gulf). The same is especially evident in people’s preferences for symbolic goods, as seen in the heterogeneity of sculptures. Sculptures around Arta stand out as having the greatest quantity, variety of motifs and highest level of artistic and technical sophistication and present analogies with contemporary ones from central Greek mainland and Peloponnese. Imports of expertise or craftsmanship can be here discerned (Vanderheyde 2005). On the contrary, people in Nafpaktos seem to have preferred locally-made sculptures. However, even the local sculptures present a common point of artistic reference relating them with contemporary workshops in Thesprotia, Boeotia and Peloponnese. All these connections signify cultural movements and flows from one space to another in the Middle-Byzantine western provinces.

Secondly, a preference for iron, in artefacts that were commonly made of copper alloys, must be considered as a province-specific practice referring to a particular cultural context (Veikou 2015).

Thirdly, the circulation (and probably the production) of domestic pottery wares is observed in the poorest areas – yet not necessarily remote or secluded from the rest – such as in Western Acarnania and Northern-Central Aetolia. This confirms A. Dunn’s observation of “sustainable combinations of agriculture, pastoralism and artisanal production across a variable but broad ‘front’” within rural environments (Dunn 2007, 103).
3. Geographies of Consumption in Middle Byzantine Epirus

Consumption geographies allow a variety of research approaches not only onto Middle Byzantine Epirus but also on the rest of the Byzantine empire.

First of all, consumers’ preferences can be related with:

- economic aspects such as their personal consumption expenditures and the price systems,
- the existing cultural movements and flows from one space to another, depending on communication access, contact and connectedness,
- the dynamics of power in society, since judgments of taste are related to social position, or more precisely, are themselves acts of social positioning (Bourdieu 1993).

Furthermore, based on the investigation of consumption patterns in respect to all kinds of goods (durable, non-durable, symbolic and services), one can look closely at the numerous different ways in which culture is consumed – used up, made sense of, embraced, and explored.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centuries</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. SYMBOLIC GOODS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscriptions, painted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscriptions, carved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus sectile and mosaics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytikas, Ag. Sophia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt Arakynthos, Panagia Trimitou</td>
<td>Mt Arakynthos, Ag. Nikolaos Kremastos</td>
<td>Efplio, Varnakova Monastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastro, Episkopi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agrinio, Mavrikas, Ag. Triada</td>
<td>Gavrolimni, Panagia Panaxiotissa</td>
<td>Agrinio, Mavrikas, Ag. Triada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamma, Ag. Theodoro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nea Kerassounda, Kastro ton Rogon</td>
<td>Kandila, Mytikas, Ag. Eleousa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frescoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skala, Metamorfosi Sotiros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Varassova N-E, Ag. Pateres</td>
<td>Mytria, Mytria Monastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetoliko, Finikia, basilica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arakynthos, Ag. Nikolaos Kremastos</td>
<td>Mt Arakynthos, Ag. Nikolaos Kremastos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandila, Mytikas, Ag. Sophia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lefkada, Vurnikas, Ag. Ioannis Karavias</td>
<td>Mastro, Episkopi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculptures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skala, Metamorfosi Sotiros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plissioi, Ag. Dimitrios Katsouris</td>
<td>Plissioi, Ag. Dimitrios Katsouris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arta, Ag. Vasileios stin Gefyra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arta, Ag. Ioannis Prodromos Monastery</td>
<td>Kandila, Mytikas, Agia Eleousa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kefalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gavrolimni, Panagia Panaxiotissa</td>
<td>Efplio, Varnakova Monastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kato Vassiliki, Ag. Triada Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vomvokou, Ag. Ioannis Prodromos Monastery</td>
<td>Kirkizates, Ag. Nikolaos Tis Rodias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arta, Kato Panagia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centuries</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arta, town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Varassova S, Ag. Nikolaos</td>
<td>Aetoliko, Panagia Finikia</td>
<td>Agios Georgios (Evinochori), Agios Georgios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naupaktos, city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vlacherna, Vlachernai Monastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculptures</td>
<td>Arta, Ag. Vassilios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Koronissia, Genethlio tis Theotokou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt Kordovitza, Loutra Tryfou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monastiraki, Metamorfosi Sotiros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nea Kerasounda, Kastro ton Rogon</td>
<td>Nea Sampsounda, Agioliatharo, Agioi Apostoloi</td>
<td>Oropos, Ag. Dimitrios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. SERVICES

- **Ceramic Tiles production**
  - Kato Vassiliki, Ag. Triada Hill
  - Kefalos
  - Skala
  - Stefani, Ag. Varvara
  - Mastro, Episkopi
  - Mastro, Episkopi

- **Pottery production**
  - Northwestern and Western Acarnania
  - Central and Southern Aetolia

- **Textile industry**
  - Kato Vassiliki, Ag. Triada Hill

- **Metal industry**
  - Kato Vassiliki, Ag. Triada Hill

- **Glass (windowpanes?) workshop**
  - Nikopolis

- **Sculpture craftsmanship**
  - Naupaktos

### III. DURABLE GOODS

- **Loom weights**
  - Kato Vassiliki, Ag. Triada Hill
  - Kefalos

- **Nails (iron)**
  - Kato Vassiliki, Ag. Triada Hill
  - Kefalos

- **Tools, utensils (copper alloy)?**
  - Arta

- **Vessels (copper alloy)?**
  - Macheras, Vristiana?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centuries</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pendant cross, simple (copper alloy)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendant cross, reliquary (copper alloy)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (iron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckle, plain 8-shaped (iron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckle, simple square (copper alloy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellery (copper alloy)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money hoards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. NON DURABLE GOODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Ware, coarse (cooking-, serving-, storage-) wares, plain / glazed</th>
<th>Pleuron</th>
<th>Stamna</th>
<th>Stratos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monastiraki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koulmos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kefalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Ilias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Ware, coarse, plain / glazed</td>
<td>Nafpaktos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Slavic Ware&quot;</td>
<td>Megali Chora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Glazed Wares</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varassova, Ag. Nikolaos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass (tesserae / vessels)</td>
<td>Kefalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nikopolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centuries</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. SYMBOLIC GOODS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture craftsmanship (Peloponnese, central Greek mainland, W. Macedonia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. DURABLE GOODS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibula, copper alloy (Corinth)</td>
<td>Kato Vassiliki, Ag. Triada Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckle, rectangular, copper alloy (Corinth)</td>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. NON DURABLE GOODS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR1 amphorae</td>
<td>Kefalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR2 amphorae</td>
<td>Kefalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR13 amphorae</td>
<td>Kefalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamped dish (Phocean Ware?)</td>
<td>Drymos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARS lamp</td>
<td>Kato Vassiliki, Ag. Triada Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Slip Ware (lamps)</td>
<td>Kefalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread stamp (Patras)</td>
<td>Nafpaktos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorphae Gunsenin Type 1</td>
<td>Varassova, Ag. Dimitrios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorphae Gunsenin Type 2 (Riley type 13)</td>
<td>Kefalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otranto I amphora</td>
<td>Kefalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorphae Gunsenin Type 2 or 3</td>
<td>Kefalos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse unglazed ware (Boeotia)</td>
<td>Lefkada, Koumos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed White Ware II</td>
<td>Lefkada, Koumos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine-sgraffito wares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine-sgraffito (Central &amp; Northern Albania)</td>
<td>Kato Vassiliki, Ag. Triada Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centuries</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Painted Fine-sgraffito wares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kato Vassiliki, Ag. Triada Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip-painted Wares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nafpaktos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted glazed wares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nafpaktos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slip painted 'dotted or Oyster/Spotted Style'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kato Vassiliki, Ag. Triada Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine-Sgraffito 'Spiral Style' (Corinth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green and Brown Painted Ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nafpaktos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgraffito (Corinth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Megali Chora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incised Sgraffito 'Medallion Style' (Corinth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monochrome Green Glazed Ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed Green Painted Red Ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Megali Chora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed &amp; coarse wares (Italy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Angelokastro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Vessels (Corinth?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckle, rectangular, copper alloy (Corinth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Varassova S, Ag. Nikolaos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drymos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Picky Were the Byzantines?
Ceramic Evidence from North-Eastern Bulgaria (Late 10th-Early 11th Century AD)

When at the end of the 6th century AD the First Bulgarian state was formed, the lands to the north of Haemus were no longer under Byzantine influence and a new material culture appeared. In terms of ceramics, a different technology for making pots was used. Local pottery was either hand-made or produced using a hand-powered pottery wheel. The latter had relief signs on their bottoms – a mark left by the wooden support that helped fix the pot firmly on the pottery wheel. The diversity in shapes was also limited, in comparison to the previous period. Closed-ones prevailed over open-ones.

Pots were the most commonly used and two distinct groups among them can be differentiated. The first group is formed of pots with high conical bodies, where the maximum diameter was placed in the upper half of the vessel. The rim was more or less turned outwards and the rim profiles differed – from thinned and pointy to thickened and comma-shaped. The fabric was quite coarse, since the clay was mixed with considerable amount of sand. After firing it turned to an uneven brown-black color. Decoration covered the shoulders and the body of the vessels and consisted mostly of incised, closely set horizontal or wavy lines. These vessels were used as cooking pots, since most of them have traces of fire exposure. The pots in the second group were with spherical bodies and the maximum diameter was at their middle. The diameter of the bottom was almost equal to the diameter of the rim and the vessels looked more thickset. The rim was thickened, also turned outwards and comma-shaped. Some had two small ring-shaped handles on the neck. The fabric was well-refined, mixed with fine sand, and well-fired. The color after firing turned from pale grey to grayish-black. The decoration consisted of one or few incised horizontal lines on the shoulders while the rest of the body was covered with vertical or crisscrossed burnished lines. These pots were always made on a hand-powered pottery wheel.

Hand-made, flat-bottomed baking dishes with small vertical ridge were used for preparing bread. The tableware consisted of jugs. All of them were thrown on a hand-powered pottery wheel. The shape, the decoration and the fabric of the majority were similar to the second group of pots. The thickset, spherical, flat-bottomed body had its maximum diameter either in the middle or the lower part of the body. The tall neck was cylindrical ending in a trefoil rim. The body was decorated with burnished lines between two bands of horizontal incised lines. A single handle connected the neck and the shoulders of the vessel. The fabric was well-purified, mixed with fine sand, with grey or grayish-black, but also pale yellow color after firing. There are only a few examples outside this group. They were made either of yellow clay and were covered with dark red slip or the fabric turned orange-red after firing and no slip or decoration was present.

The two-handled pitchers were another type of vessels destined for liquids. They were also made using the hand-powered pottery wheel. Like the jugs, a great variety of shapes existed and
there are rarely two identical specimens. They were all flat-bottomed. The two handles linked the
neck and shoulders. Some were made of well-purified fabric that turned to grey, black or pale yellow
color and were decorated with incised single lines and burnished decoration, while others were
covered with a dark red slip.

Bowls and cups were very rare. A small-sized pots or small conical flatt-bottomed vessels were
used as such.

From the second half of the 10th and the early 11th century AD noticeable changes in the
characteristics of pottery from Northeastern Bulgaria can be detected in the technology, the shapes
and the larger variety of forms. Although locally-produced pots on hand-powered pottery wheel
decorated with incised horizontal and wavy lines, and bearing relief signs on the bottom were still
produced, by the second quarter and the middle of the 11th century AD the vessels thrown on a
kick wheel become predominant. Again, the largest share was held by the pots. They were thin-
walled, with ovoid bodies where the maximum diameter was still in the upper part of the vessel with
tendency to reach to the middle part. The rim was turned outwards, obliquely cut or rounded. Quite
often on the inside of the lip there was a ridge, marking the bed for a conical lid. Contrary to the
earlier period and the local pottery, pots with one or two handles with flattened ovoid cross-section
and longitudinal grooves become frequent. The decoration was simple and scarce. It consisted
usually of few spaced incised lines on the shoulder or shallow grooves covering the entire body.
Single wavy lines or incised dots were rather the exception. The fabric was well purified, mixed with
fine sand and turned to orange-red after firing.

Although still small in number, a new type of bowls appeared. Besides the flat-bottomed
conical ones, semi-spherical bowls on a hollow ring-shaped foot can be seen. The fabric was well
purified, mixed with very fine sand and mica, and turned orange-red after firing. The vessels were
covered with green glaze or remained unglazed.

A bigger variety of pitchers was registered. The ones made on hand-powered pottery wheel
coexisted with the thrown on a kick-wheel until the second quarter of the 11th century. The first
were flat-bottomed or on a short foot, with elongated bodies and funnel-shaped necks. The fabric
turned to red-brown color after firing. They were covered with yellowish-green glaze, sometimes
with bands of white slip underneath. The latter were very thin-walled, well-fired, and orange-red in
color. The profiling of the rim and the bottom was diverse. The handles were vertical, with grooves
and fingerprints at the place of attachment to the body. The decoration consisted of combination
of single incised lines and circles forming geometric shapes, relief bands and buttons, relief animal
and human shapes. The outer surface was covered directly with a brownish-green glaze. Unglazed
pitchers were small in number.

What was said about the pitchers thrown on kick-wheel can also be said about the jugs. They
were also covered with brownish-green glaze and possessed all kinds of relief decoration.

Not found during the previous period were the large flat-bottomed storage jars that reach up
to 70 cm in height. They were thrown on a kick-wheel and had ovoid bodies with the maximum
diameter in the middle of it. The short cylindrical neck ended with a lip that was turned outwards
and profiled. The decoration consisted of horizontal relief bands that divided the outer surface into
sectors. The upper ones were often decorated with incised single horizontal, wavy or arc-shaped
repetitive motifs. The fabric was mixed with fine sand and turned to brown-red after firing.
A great quantity of amphorae was recorded at almost every site. There were two basic shapes - the Günsenin I and II types. Both were thrown on a kick-wheel. While there is uniformity with respect to the Günsenin I amphorae – spherico-conical bodies, rounded bottom, medium-high neck, small arch-like handles not going above the rim level, well purified fabric mixed with fine sand and large quantity of mica, and creamish-slip covering the outer surface, the Günsenin II vessels show variety in shapes and fabrics that suggest several different production centers.

A very peculiar vessel, used for drawing liquids from amphorae (syphon), was part of the pottery thrown on a kick-wheel. It had a flat bottom and ovoid body. There was no neck and rim. The upper part was closed with a lid-like ending, possessing a small hole on top. A tube started from the upper part, curved and ended at the bottom level with a large opening. These vessels were mostly undecorated and unglazed, but there were some that had a very exquisite relief decoration and were covered with greenish glaze.

The two sets of pottery described above point out to similarities, but also to some differences in food consumption. Since pots with traces of direct fire exposure were predominant during the Medieval Bulgarian state, one may conclude that stews and porridges were cooked, together with home-made bread, baked on clay pans. The presence of a few small-sized bowls suggests that aliments were served individually. The absence of more ceramic bowls may be due to the fact that most vessels were made of wood or bark – a perishable material that did not last. The absence of plateaus and dishes may be because the food usually served in them was not commonly eaten and that eating from one common dish was not habitual for the inhabitants of the First Bulgarian state. With respect to the drinking habits, pitchers and jugs show that liquids accompanied the dining. Again, individual consumption may have been the rule, since few cups were documented. Most likely small pots or vessels made of wood were used. Still, drinking straight from the pitcher or jug may not be excluded.

With respect to the kick-wheel thrown pottery from the late 10th to mid-11th century AD, cooking pots were again predominant, thus stews and porridges were usually cooked. Individual consumption is again documented, but especially made ceramic bowls, some of them glazed, show that eaters were more sophisticated. No sharing of food is recorded since dishes and plateaus were absent. Drinks were served in pitchers and jugs and portions were poured in individual cups.

So far we have described the similarities. Differences concern the scale and organization of the production of ceramics. While during the First Bulgarian state some professional potters existed, pottery production was rather small- to medium-scale and was not so much oriented towards the market. It aimed mainly to satisfy the needs of a limited circle of people or small communities. Even in some villages pots were produced non-professionally in the confines of the household by its inhabitants, thus the diversity and variety of forms was very limited. The pottery from the late 10th to the mid-11th century AD was thrown on a kick wheel - a new technology introduced from Byzantium. The shapes were standardized and soon influenced local ceramics. Professionals potters were producing an excess that could be marketed and tended to create a large-scale production. Variety and specification of forms were present and point out to more refined consumption habits.

The fact that the whole specter of kick thrown pottery (coarse, table, storage and transport ware) appeared exactly at the same time and was found in the exactly same archaeological contexts in all sites in North-eastern Bulgaria can be correlated with certainty with the Byzantine occupation
of these lands. Pottery thrown on a kick-wheel was introduced there and did not appear as result of evolution. It looks like that when the Byzantines came to conquer these lands they did not rely neither on local supply for food, nor on using local ceramics for dining. Even though since the mid-9th century AD Medieval Bulgaria was converted to Christianity and the Bulgarian aristocrats and culture were strongly influenced by Byzantium and were no longer considered barbaric, the Byzantines brought with them everything – from the wine and oil in the amphorae to the pots for cooking their daily meal and the bowls, pitchers and jugs to serve it. They brought along even the potters to produce them. It is still difficult to stay if this was because they were used to different meals that could not be found in the new lands or they just could not trust the local supplies, but it looks like that Byzantines were kind of a picky.
The Middle Byzantine City as a Consumption Centre: The Numismatic Evidence

On his way back from the palace of Blachernai, John of Poutza, the twelfth-century *megas logariastes*, saw some female street vendors selling pickled vegetables. Despite the fact that his own dinner was approaching, he decided to satisfy his craving. He greedily grabbed a dishful of them, gulped down the juice and devoured the vegetables. He then took out from his purse a copper coin (*stateran chalkeon*) and gave it to one of his attendants with orders for it to be changed down into four smaller coins (*oboloi*), of which two were to be handed over to the vendor and two to be returned to him immediately. Although the episode is related by Niketas Choniates as a proof of John's gluttony and low manners, it represents one of the rare cases where an everyday transaction in petty coinage is recorded.

Unfortunately, most mentions of transactions in coinage for the middle Byzantine period can be found in the surviving monastic archives. They thus involve important sums of money, are usually relevant to taxation and land purchase, and refer mainly to rural areas. More information regarding urban activities can be deduced from the commercial contracts of the Italian merchant cities (Venice, Pisa, Genoa), but in this case too it is unclear whether the city mentioned as the final destination of a maritime voyage is also the final destination of the merchandise or just a distribution point.

Indirect literary evidence, however, points to the need for availability in coinage – both precious metal and petty coinage – in the marketplace. It refers to the role of money changers, who, in the case of Byzantium, were primarily in charge of providing small change to private individuals in order to proceed to purchases and, conversely, to exchange the copper coins accumulated by the shopkeepers for gold specimens. Their seminal role in everyday transactions is illustrated by the location of their establishments. Information comes from Constantinople where the existence of money changers' shops and iron tables in the commercial zone of the Mese is attested from the early tenth to the beginning of the thirteenth century. Thus the tenth-century Book of the Eparch precises that the establishments of the *argyroprattai* – and this was probably the case for the *trapezitai*, as well – had to be located on the Mese. In 1161, it was in that same area that the money changers moked the Seljuk sultan Kilic Arslan by hammering on their iron change tables. And just before the Latin conquest of the City by the Fourth crusade, according to the testimony of Robert of Clari, the *cangeeurs* with piles of gold coins and precious stones in front of them were to be found near the Forum of Constantine. The Book of the Eparch is very strict regarding the requirements that had to be fulfilled in order to enter the profession, but by the twelfth century one only had to buy the place for a changing table (*trapezotopion*)

Moreover, the Book of the Eparch strictly forbids any money changing outside the Mese and encourages licensed money changers to expose the *sakkoularioi*, that is people exercising the profession illicitly, walking around and carrying their coins in a bag rather than exhibiting them on a stationary table. This clause underlines the existence of unlicensed money changers all over
the capital and stresses the need for readily available petty currency in its remote areas. These restrictions do not seem to apply in the twelfth century, as we can deduce from the episode of John of Poutza, where recurrence to a money changer is implied. Although Choniates does not reveal the location in which the event took place, it is probable that this was near the Blachernae palace from which John was returning. Similar evidence is offered by the existence of money changers’ tables (katallaktikai trapezai, trapezotopia) in the Italian quarters of the city during the twelfth century: at least ten changing tables in the Venetian quarter, nine in the Pisan quarter and one in the Genoese quarter. In this case, it is logical to assume that the exchange of foreign currencies was also part of their activities.

Should we assume the existence of similar services in provincial cities, as well? The evidence is scanty, while differences in the circumstances reigning within the middle Byzantine period in different areas of the empire should be taken into account. For example, we know that Mesembria was until the early ninth century a specific station of trade between the Byzantines and the Bulgarians. When the city was taken by Krum in 812, it was found with much gold and silver. Given, however, the fact that the Bulgarians at that time did not have coinage, we should assume that trade in the city was at least partly carried out in barter, a situation that continued with the Bulgarians until the tenth century. Complementary to that, unminted gold and silver (in ingots?) could also have been used. This, however, is a case in a marginal Byzantine area at a time characterized by the well-known particularities of coin circulation during the transitional period.

For later periods, written evidence refers only to local fairs and markets, mainly in rural areas. In a brilliant article, Michael Hendy was able to demonstrate that the Gornoslav hoard, whose concealment was caused by the Third Crusade, belonged to the monastery of Petritzos in Backovo, Bulgaria. The hoard included also the sum of 24 gold coins, destined, according to the typikon of Pakourianos, to be distributed to the monks and the poor during the monastery’s panegyris. It included also an extra gold coin that, according to Hendy, was the moneychanger’s commission, since for the purpose of distribution the gold specimens had to be changed down to petty coins.

If moneychangers were present in fairs organized in rural areas, we can assume with certainty their presence in fairs taking place in an urban context, such as the panegyris of Saint Demetrios in Thessaloniki, as it has been recorded in the twelfth century by Pseudo-Loukianos. Despite the absence of specific evidence, for large cities, such as Thessaloniki, it is logical to assume that money changers must have been present throughout the year in the marketplace and possibly in other areas of the city, as well. Nevertheless, the testimony of the Crusaders implies that this was not necessarily the case elsewhere. Byzantine emperors took special measures during the Second and Third Crusade in order to guarantee the iustum cambium of the Crusaders currencies and the existence of markets with sufficient supplies where the exchanged coins were destined to be used. However, as Odo of Deuil informs us, during the Second Crusade the exchange rates differed significantly between Constantinople (one stamenon for less than two pennies) and the Balkans (one stamenon for five pennies) or Asia Minor (one stamenon for five or six pennies). These differences illustrate the problems that provincial cities faced in supplying a large army with exchange, a fact that rendered Byzantine coinage more expensive. Be that as it may, it should be stressed that the Crusades presented an exceptional situation.
Besides purchases and transactions, coinage in Byzantium was used mainly for taxation. Although at first sight there does not seem to be a connection between fiscal obligations and consumption, this is not the case. A significant change in the nature of taxes, which occurred during the middle Byzantine period, had an impact also on the role of the city as a consumption centre. I am referring to the shift from the collection of taxes in kind to the monetization of taxation. Although no general consensus has been reached regarding the date of this shift, whenever it happened, it must have had an impact, since it forced the peasants to search for coinage in order to pay their land taxes. In other words, at least once a year peasants would have been obliged to sell their products either in the local fair or in the nearest city and obtain the necessary gold coins for their fiscal obligations.

If we now turn to the archaeological evidence on the use of coinage in cities, the conclusions that can be deduced from it are rather disappointing. Coin finds are telling with regard to the monetization level of a given site, but usually do not offer information as to the specific purpose for which they were used – trade, taxation, payment for services – unless this is specified by other kinds of archaeological evidence. However, comparisons of coin circulation between urban and rural areas demonstrate the clear difference that existed between them. Even during a period of high monetization, as was the period from the tenth to the twelfth century, rural areas seem to be less monetized than urban centres. The phenomenon has been observed in different parts of the empire (the Peloponnese, the area south of the Danube, western Thrace etc.). Certainly self-sufficiency in food and clothing, the lack of services and the absence from rural areas of a taste for luxury that had developed in the cities are to be accounted for.
The Collapse of Urban Consumption in Middle Byzantine Anatolia.
Marble Carvings, Miletus, and Ruralisation

Marble carvings for churches and other buildings were employed throughout the Byzantine period, and their production and distribution in town and countryside seems to reflect the settlement pattern and how it changed over time. The early Byzantine period was dominated by three supra-regional quarries that had been trend-setting already during the Roman period and continued to set the example for various local workshops: Docimium in Phrygia for the central Anatolian High Plateau, Proconnesus/Constantinople for the Mediterranean Basin, and Sivec near Prilep in Macedonia II for the central Balkan region. In addition, numerous local workshops followed distinct regional traditions, for example special ambos in Macedonia I and in Caria. The early Byzantine output was driven by urban consumption, notwithstanding many rural settlements and buildings that were also decorated with marble carvings.

In contrast, the middle Byzantine production was not characterised by major centres and regional traditions but by countless different local workshops. Their products are as often found at remote rural locations as at ancient city sites. The numbers of middle Byzantine finds per site are often low because new marble carvings were used sparingly and were often restricted to repair work and spare parts rather than complete outfits. The difference between the early and the middle Byzantine pattern may be explained by a collapse of urban consumption, as has become apparent at Miletus on the west coast of Asia Minor. New excavation results show that Miletus was deserted in the middle Byzantine period, and settlement instead gravitated to rural locations, including a site on the outskirts of the ancient city. A similar decline of urban centres in favour of rural sites appears to have been common throughout middle Byzantine Anatolia, and this paper asks whether genres other than marble carving also experienced a (temporary) ruralisation of consumption patterns.
Cities of Central Greece in the Middle and the Late Byzantine Periods: Changing Patterns of Ceramic Production and Consumption in Thebes and Chalcis

In Middle Byzantine times Thebes and Chalcis were among the principal centres of Central Greece. Thebes, being the administrative and military capital of the Theme of Hellas from the 9th century onwards, developed into the largest population centre of the area. The prosperity and rise of population was partly due to the exploitation of its rich agricultural hinterland, combined with a large output of manufactured products. It is reflected in the notable building activity not only on the old nucleus of the Kadmeia, but also in a number of suburbs that developed on the foothills around its walls by the 11th century. The population comprised civilian, military and ecclesiastic administrators, members of the local land aristocracy, various merchants and craftsmen, including those involved in the production of silk textiles and architectural sculpture, as well as a considerable Jewish community.

Chalcis on the other hand, is much less documented during the Middle Byzantine period. It seems that the city (then known as Euripos) was relocated in the 9th c. from its ancient position to the area next to the Channel, in order to better serve the strategic interests of the Empire. It therefore acquired a certain standing, and became the main harbor in the Aegean for Thebes. From the late 11th c. onwards the historical and archaeological evidence points to an increasing economic and demographic growth, based mainly on its flourishing commercial activity. The image provided by rescue excavations is that of a dense fortified settlement, with houses, streets and churches, the earliest of which have been dated to the 9th-11th century.

After the Fourth Crusade and the political fragmentation of the Aegean, Thebes and Chalcis became seats of two distinct Latin states. Thebes became the capital of the Duchy of Athens and seat of a Latin archbishop. The city remained prosperous throughout the 13th century, with a flourishing industry, including the manufacture of silk and metal products. However, the 14th century was a period of political upheavals and crisis, due to the Catalan and later Florentine conquest of Boeotia. Despite plagues, raids and wars, the area seems to have recovered during the late 15th century, when it passed to the Ottomans.

Chalcis’s history was equally eventful. From being the seat of a lesser feudal lordship in the early 13th c., it passed gradually under Venetian influence until 1390, when Venice assumed direct control of the entire island. Being ideally located for the Serenissima’s maritime interests, the city (now called Negroponte) became a major commercial and naval crossroads of the Venetian empire, located on the routes connecting the Black Sea and Constantinople with South Greece and Venice.

Within this general historical framework, the scope of my paper is to present the testimony of the ceramics, which may not exactly coincide with that of the historic accounts. In this way, ceramics may help us get a better understanding of social and economic circumstances, production models and consumption patterns.
9th - 11th century

During this period the excavated deposits from both cities provide a similar picture of ceramic use. A considerable number of high-quality polychrome and other whiteware variants were imported from the area of Constantinople. These were not randomly brought and isolated pieces, but they rather represent a steady flow of commodities sold for local consumption. They circulated alongside various other probably local wares, with the class of unglazed incised ceramics standing out.

When it comes to the amphorae for the storage and transport of agricultural products, such as oil and wine, we find a similar picture. Large quantities of amphorae have been found in 10-11th-century contexts, which obviously contained the produce of countryside. Agricultural products must have been brought to the cities and destined either for local consumption or for more distant market. There is therefore a production pattern which we can be encountered in a few other important agricultural regions of the Empire, such as Ganos in the Sea of Marmara. An agricultural surplus is combined with the availability of good clay deposits (in the case of Chalcis, these are situated in the Lelantinian plain), as well as with the accessibility of markets through maritime networks.

12th century

The 12th century emerges as a period of great prosperity for both cities. At the same time, there seems to exist a remarkable uniformity in the pottery used throughout the Empire, which was now mainly confined around the Aegean and adjacent coastal sites. The same decorative styles and forms of tablewares are constantly found, particularly in harbors and urban centres, reflecting a unified cultural and economic sphere with shared consuming needs and dining habits.

Chalcis has been recently identified as a main manufacturer of what we called “Middle Byzantine Production” (or MBP). MBP included a variety of glazed types, such as ‘Slip-Painted’, ‘Green and Brown Painted’, ‘Fine Sgraffito’, ‘Painted Sgraffito’, ‘Champlevé’ and ‘Incised Sgraffito’ or ‘Aegean Ware’. Although it is possible that other cities, such as Corinth, manufactured similar wares as well, Chalcis appears to have been a major provider of MBP ceramics. This large-scale produced commodity was mainly intended for the markets of the Empire and beyond.

The abundance of MBP ceramics not only in Thebes and Chalcis, but also in rural sites of Boeotia and Euboea, may reflect the availability and accessibility of these wares to a large part of the local population beyond the urban society.

Simultaneously, the abundance of amphorae, particularly of the type known as ‘Günsenin III’, may point to a large agricultural surplus that covered local needs, and probably was also exported through the same maritime network as tablewares. The maritime route departed from Chalcis towards the Southern Euboean Gulf and the open Aegean Sea, and extended around the Eastern Mediterranean, as it can be traced through finds in coastal sites and shipwrecks.

13th century

The production and distribution of MBP ceramics continued on a large-scale well into the 13th century despite the political upheaval after the Fourth Crusade. This indicates that the new political conditions did not result in sudden and radical changes, at least in everyday life and food consumption. In addition, the use of Günsenin III amphorae during the 13th century suggests continuity in the transportation and trade of local agricultural products. For example, in 1214 Nikolaos Mesarites being
on a diplomatic mission in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople was offered a pungent wine from Euboea. An interesting case of reciprocal relations with the area of Constantinople could be the presence of a few examples of “Zeuxippus ware” in both Chalcis and Thebes.

It seems, therefore, that despite the new conditions, the pre-existing organized system of production and distribution of goods continued to function to a certain degree, with the port of Chalcis remaining a focal point of international commerce.

The second half of the 13th century, marked the beginning of significant and wider changes in pottery production and consumption. There appeared new pottery types and new forms, which however were produced uniformly around the Aegean by a multitude of, often newly-founded, local workshops. This could be seen as the result of the territorial fragmentation of the Aegean to various political entities, and the increasing commercial supremacy of the Italians, predominantly the Venetians, in the trade of ceramics.

Negroponte remained a vital producer of ceramics, yet Thebes acquired its own workshops. They both followed the trend of the period, producing wares similar in form and decoration. These included mainly deep and small glazed bowls, which replaced the large wide-open dishes of the Middle Byzantine period and have been considered as indicators of changes in diet and dining habits under Western influence. At the same time, the production of Thebes and Chalcis included decorated bowls of the distinctive ‘Sgraffito with Concentric Circles’ type (also known as ‘Zeuxippus ware family, imitations, derivatives or subtypes’), which was also manufactured in many places, such as Constantinople, various centres in Northern Greece, Asia Minor, and probably also in Sparta and even in Northern Italy. Within this framework, the production of Thebes and Chalcis seems to have been mainly destined for local demand, rather than for export.

In the second half of the 13th c., the markets in these two cities also witness the first imports of southern and northern Italian wares, such as Protomaiolica from the Salento in Apulia, and Veneto/Roulette Ware from the area of Venice.

14th and 15th centuries

From the beginning of the 14th century and until their Ottoman conquest in the second half of the 15th century, Thebes and Chalcis followed very different historic courses. Local production of Thebes may have been temporarily affected during the upheavals caused during the Catalan rule of Boeotia in the 14th century. Chalcis on the other hand became an international trading post and a hub of the Venetian maritime network. Local manufacturers in the city continued to produce a variety of ceramic types following the contemporary Byzantine styles.

At the same time, both cities witness a multitude of imports originating from various centres in the north Aegean (such as Thessalonica and Serres wares), North and South Italy (RMR, Archaic Maiolica, Sgraffito of the Po Valley), Spain, and mamluk Eastern Mediterranean. At the end of this period, also Venetian Renaissance Sgraffito wares make their appearance in the local markets.

As far as amphorae are concerned, although the evidence for their use remains presently unclear, it is assumed that Negroponte both exported local or regional products, such as wine, honey and grain, and also acted as a warehouse for the concentration, diffusion, and transshipment of various commodities traded between the Eastern Mediterranean and Italy.
The image emanating from the study of the ceramics in the two cities points to the fact that, despite being under Latin rule, the use of western pottery remained limited throughout the 13th-15th century, as opposed to what is witnessed in the Frankish Peloponnese.

**Conclusion**

From the 9th to the 15th century, the two main centres of Central Greece, witnessed changing patterns of consumption and production, influenced to a certain degree by the general and regional political changes.

During the Middle Byzantine period the two cities were clearly connected and functioned complementary to one another. Thebes was the administrative capital and major urban centre. Chalcis served as its port for the export of local products and the connection to the other centres of the Byzantine Empire, while it housed the ceramic workshops for both markets. Large quantities were destined for export, either as commodities or as containers.

Under Latin rule, this connection was gradually lost due to historic reasons. Thebes was restricted to its local role, while Chalcis was turned into an international post. Both cities had their own ceramic production, which was now destined for local or regional use. In their markets one could find next to their own, also a variety of imported wares from other centres.

What is remarkable about the ceramics for the six centuries under discussion is that both Thebes and Chalcis constantly share the same pottery categories, despite the changing political and economic conditions.

Throughout the Middle Byzantine period and until at least the mid 13th century, locally manufactured pottery dominates their market. Especially MBP ceramics were widely popular and distributed, along with agricultural products, around the Mediterranean. From the late 13th century onwards, despite the appearance of a multitude of imported wares in both cities, their inhabitants continued to show a notable preference for locally produced ceramics. Apparently, the imported pottery had to compete with the products of the local workshops, which remained abundant and covered sufficiently the needs and demands of the population.

For the period of Latin occupation, a question that usually arises is whether we can assign ceramic wares to particular ethnic groups of population; should we see for example Italian products consumed only by Westerners? Our evidence, coming from excavations in all parts of both cities, including the Venetian quarter of Chalcis or the Catalan centre of Thebes, shows a uniform pattern of ceramic use: wares of traditional Byzantine style are predominant, with random western imports. We may assume, therefore, that all ethnic groups, including Greeks, Westerners and Jews, used more or less the same ceramics.

Perhaps it is this common consumption by a mixed population that brought forth two very interesting features. The first is that of common shapes, a subject matter which has already been addressed adequately. Another one is attested in the decoration of the ceramics: similar decorative patterns are encountered in both local and imported wares, only rendered in different techniques. These observations may indicate that during this period two previously distinct worlds, Byzantium and the West, tended to produce and consume similar wares, possibly as a result of a long process of commercial exchanges and cultural contacts, interrelations and co-existence. And this may either be confirmed or rejected by future research.
Cities of Central Greece in the Middle and the Late Byzantine Period: 
Remains of a Luxurious Life in Thebes and Chalcis

Having discussed the evidence for the ceramics of these two Central Greek cities during the Middle and the Late Byzantine period, we can now move to another aspect of material culture: that of the luxury products either produced or consumed by the inhabitants. These constituted another important factor, linked to the social standing and the identity of their owners. Having an adequate sample, coming from rescue excavations both of urban structures and cemeteries, we can safely assume that they are representative of the local population. Whether they were locally made or imported, remains a matter of discussion. However, for a major category of precious products, that of the silk textiles, we have few if any surviving artefacts.

In this paper, we will initially present briefly three large categories of luxurious objects which played a vital role in the social life and the economy of Thebes and Chalcis. The first one includes the silk textiles mentioned above. The second incorporates an array of minor objects: religious amulets, dress accessories, jewels and jewel boxes, whose sole common point of reference is the relative value of their material and the significance they held for their owners, since many of them come from burial grounds. The third category is composed of exceptional and precious objects, some of them even unique, obviously belonging to local magnates, both under Byzantine as well as Frankish Rule. Following these, we will concentrate on questions concerning the production patterns, socio-economic relations, and consumption networks within the civic communities of Central Greece, as reflected through luxurious objects.

Silk Textiles

Discussion on the silk industry relies greatly on the work of David Jacoby. During the 11th and 12th centuries, Thebes was the major silk weaving center of Western Byzantium, and the same was also true in a lesser degree for Chalcis (then known as Euripos). The local silk production was destined for the imperial court, the domestic free market (the elites of the various centers of the empire), and foreign customers both in the West and in Islamic Asia Minor. Production and circulation of the high quality silks were closely controlled by imperial authorities, as was the case in Constantinople. Especially those dyed with murex purpurea (purple) were called kekolymena, that is prohibited for private use, sale or export. The production of shellfish purple, the most expensive colorant, was restricted to the coloring of these silks destined for the imperial court. Large concentrations of shellfish remains were located on the outskirts of the village of Thisvi, which is identified with the middle Byzantine Kastorion. They originated from the nearby harbor of Ag. Ioannis and were obviously destined for the silk textile industry of Thebes. A terminus ante quem for this find is 1204, since their use in silk production ceased in Byzantium at that time for lack of funds.

This lucrative production prompted King Roger II of Sicily in the mid-12th century to capture Thebes and to deport its silk workers to his capital Palermo, where they were ordered to teach their
crafts to local workers. Some have even gone as far as to say that the so called Roger's Coronation Mantle is in fact a product of those workers and their pupils.

The production of silk textiles in Thebes and in the island of Euboea continued after the Latin conquest. However, they now faced a fierce competition in the silk textiles imported from Lucca and the Islamic countries. It is assumed that because local manufacture did no adapt to new fashions, it gradually declined and was restricted to the export of raw material for Italian silk manufacturers.

In the area of the city, rescue excavation investigated a workshop installation which has been interpreted as a dye shop (for textiles or leathers?) operating roughly during the period of silk production, from the late 11th to the early 14th century.

**Jewelry and Accessories**

The second category of luxury objects includes minor artefacts destined mainly for personal adornment. They were made of materials that were obviously valuable; yet they were not precious and there lies the main distinction from the third category. An important point is that both for the Byzantine and Frankish period there is uniformity in the two cities, as to the forms and decorations of the recovered objects. Furthermore, when compared with rural sites, it is extremely interesting to observe that similar objects were used and accompanied the people of the countryside in their final rest.

The Middle Byzantine period saw a variety of objects, destined mainly for personal use. Rings were made of bronze, brass, base silver or glass. Many of them are inscribed with linear motifs, invocations or schematic figures that could have an apotropaic and magical function. Some examples are decorated with glass paste and granules.

Earrings come in a number of different shapes, all falling under known types popular throughout Byzantine Greece: Circular rings are decorated with glass beads, spiral wire, metal beads or pending crosses. Lunate-type earrings are usually hollow in the form of Kolti, with an opening that is supposed to have been reserved for perfumed tissues. Some are decorated with enamel motifs; most of them however have simple inscribed decoration.

Pendants are usually religious in character. Crosses are made of bronze, silver alloys, lead or iron. They are either solid, or hollow, functioning as reliquaries. They can be plain or engraved with crucifixion motives. We also encounter a small steatite icon with a mounted warrior saint, as well as a circular bronze pendant with a lion.

Jewels include also bracelets, made of glass or bronze, as well as glass beads from necklaces.

Dress accessories included a number of pins made of bone, obviously used for holding together loose garments, according to contemporary fashion. These are either plain or decorated with linear motives. Bronze buckles were obviously coming from belts, though it is impossible to discern whether they were destined for male or female costumes.

Finally, we can mention a number of incised bone plaques, obviously coming from the casing of small jewelry boxes, as well as a bronze mount with enamel decoration from Thebes, pertaining perhaps to a Gospel cover.

Similar objects come, as mentioned above, from a number of excavated village cemeteries, in the countryside of both Boeotia and Euboea. In the case of Xeronomi (Boeotia) we encounter
steatite and iron pendant crosses; a glass bracelet; bronze and silver rings, some with glass paste; bronze earrings, of the circular and basket type; glass or faience beads probably from necklaces. In Afrati and Eretria (Euboea) excavation revealed bronze circular (either plain or with beads and spirals) and lunette earrings; bronze rings; pendant crosses.

For the period of Latin rule, we witness the same categories persisting in both cities. There has been no clear cut from the previous Byzantine era, as indicated from the excavation sequences. Personal jewels include, once more, bronze rings, and earrings, these latter now smaller and belonging to versions of the ‘clover’ type.

A number of features, however, point to the changes brought by as a result either of evolution or of the arrival of Latin settlers. A new feature of the period is the use of tight fit garments, a feature that gradually came forth during the 13th century. Linked to it, we witness the appearance of buttons and clasps, which we find both in urban communities and the countryside. All buttons are made of bronze, half sphere blanks, which were soldered together to a globular form.

In Thebes, we witness a number of minor objects related to the function of the city as the administrative center of the Burgundian duchy and the Latin church hierarchy, as well as the home of a large number of western settlers. Being the seat of a rather active mint, the city apparently drew together a number of specialized craftsmen. A metal workshop, unearthed in the city center, produced dress accessories and other accoutrements, and had the ability to manufacture precious objects, as indicated by the discovery of Lydian stones used for checking metal alloys. A number of artifacts are connected to the Latin cathedral, such as a pair of tongs for stamping Eucharist wafers, tweezers with relief decoration, a bronze object with a repousse scene of Annunciation, and a stamp bearing a Latin inscription around a cross. Finally, a kit-shaped bronze disc destined for the decoration of horse bridles, is connected with the presence of the western mounted knights.

**Precious Objects**

Exceptional objects may reflect the presence of upper class members, who would have owned and cherished them. Few of them come from the middle Byzantine period, with a large hoard attributed to the final centuries of Latin rule.

A silver bowl of the late 8th century is the only currently known stamped object dated after the mid 7th century, when we thought that the whole Byzantine system of metal control had collapsed. It was found in 2004 at a rescue excavation in Thebes within a complex whose use continued up to the Frankish period. It is a shallow silver plate hammered and chased with high-quality linear and vegetal motifs on its inner side. On the underside it preserves two stamps, one bearing the bust and the monogram of Empress Irene the Athenian (780-802) and the second containing a four-line inscription of a certain imperial administrator, called Ioannes.

Few personal accessories, made of precious materials, indicate the high level of luxury in the everyday life of the upper classes. To them we can ascribe a gold earring of the lunate/kotli type, as well as a gold ring with a gem, both coming from Thebes. An ivory comb dated to the 10-11th century is an exceptional find from Chalcis. It is decorated with relief representations of lions on the one side, and peacocks drinking from a fountain on the other. Its quality material and art bespeak of a highly valuable object.
The most impressive assemblage in this category is a large treasure of jewelry, concealed in the foundations of an old city house of Chalcis, on the eve of the Ottoman conquest in 1470. Some 630 items are presently accounted for.

The objects that have always attracted scholarly attention were the rings: decorative items were adorned with precious stones and pearls; personal rings were engraved with western coat-of-arms and Latin inscriptions, obviously belonging to noblemen; others were inscribed with verses of the famous 14th century poet, Manuel Philes, and their origin has been traced to the imperial workshops of Constantinople. Next to them, we find a number of earrings, again some belonging to the Byzantine cultural sphere and others to a wider European style that cannot be easily pinpointed. The treasure also holds the silver gilt parts from five belts, whose decoration and techniques show various influences and provenances. Some bear inscriptions in Latin and Hebrew, a range of coat-of-arms, a helmeted head copying after ancient coins, gothic architectural settings and mythical animals.

The truly remarkable feature of this hoard is that it contains 340 silver gilt buttons in various forms and sizes, which – to our knowledge- is one of the largest group of such objects preserved throughout Europe. We may also point out two cloak fasteners decorated with the symbol of Venice, the Lion of St. Mark. Furthermore, a precious silver plate thanks to its seals, can be attributed to the production of Napoli, South Italy, in the early 1400s and surely before 1420.

Discussion

Each category of objects gives us hints for the social groups that were involved in their production, distribution and consumption. Through their study we may approach the socio-economic conditions of the Middle and Late Byzantine urban societies.

The exceptional objects of the Middle Byzantine Period, despite their small number, may point to their owner’s higher social standing and economic capacity. The early dating of the silver bowl and the ivory comb, prove that both cities had already by the 9th-10th century acquired a diverse social structure and economic growth.

The silk production, which flourished particularly in the 11th-12th century, offers the opportunity to investigate the involvement and interrelations between multiple groups of local population. Jacoby put forward the idea that there must have been a circuit, that of production, starting with a network of countryside peasants who reared the cocoons and reeled the silk; then a series of workshops with silk weavers and craftsmen who produced the textiles. To them we can add those who fished the murem purpurea and extracted the precious dye, along with those who dyed the textiles. Then came a second circuit, that of distribution, with merchants and ship owners who took these products to the markets of the empire and beyond; also the imperial envoys that commissioned and regulated the products destined for the court.

Those directing the first circuit and addressing the needs of the second were the local elite members, the Archontes who acted as entrepreneurs, providing capitals and commissions to peasants and craftsmen, finished products to merchants and markets. Venetian and Genoese merchants were added to this equation before 1204.

The category of minor objects (jewels and accessories), gives an insight into another aspect of everyday life. The majority of these artefacts were obviously produced locally, since their low relative value would not justify imports. We should envisage a network of metal extraction and supply of raw
materials through commerce, as well as the presence of goldsmith workshops producing affordable jewelry for local consumption. The strong uniformity in object types, styles and materials, observed between Thebes and Chalcis, between these cities and their countryside, as well as between Central Greece and other regions of the Empire, points to continuous contacts, economic relations and interactions.

During the period 13th-15th century, Thebes and Chalcis followed very different historic courses, and this is amply evident in the material record. Thebes, after an era of prosperity in the 13th century, was immersed into a series of wars, which only ended with the Ottoman conquest in 1460. Chalcis, on the other hand, came gradually under Venetian control and profited from its place in the maritime network of the Eastern Mediterranean, becoming an international port of call. This was reflected in the diverse and mobile population, with people differentiated ethnically, financially and socially.

Within this framework, luxury objects may show a number of continuities and changes in the local market.

In the silk industry of Thebes, the previous system of production continued throughout the 13th century. In this period, however Venetian merchants along with Frankish feudal lords replaced the Byzantine Archontes, and were directly involved in the production process, commissioning either fabrics or raw materials which they transferred to Italian manufacturers and markets. These luxurious fabrics also covered the local demand, mentioned especially in the official occasions of the ducal court in Thebes. The social group of Latin officials, either secular or ecclesiastic, also used a number of minor objects, which are representative of their distinct identity.

The political upheavals in Boeotia during the 14th century, is not currently reflected in the preserved artifacts. We can only assume that these conditions contributed also to the decay of local silk production which was eventually limited to the supply of raw materials.

On the other hand, the Chalcis Treasure highlights a civic society that resembles strongly those emerging throughout Europe at the end of the Middle Ages. For these objects we should look to a number of affluent and adventurous individuals who, along with landowning aristocracy, struggled to find their place in a fluctuating social hierarchy, next to secular and religious rulers. Taking as example the burghers of the Italian cities, large-scale merchants, bankers and successful professionals shot to attain social status in an increasingly monetary society confined within city walls. Silver tableware, jewelry and dress accessories, especially when displayed, promoted the standing of each family. The Chalcis objects present a unique case, at least in the former Byzantine territories, where such high quality objects survived.

Luxury objects, silk textiles, jewelry and accessories, may contribute greatly to our understanding of production, distribution and consumption patterns in Central Greece, especially when envisaged over a long period of time. Furthermore, they constitute a direct evidence for the social identity and standing of their owners. Through them we can investigate a number of socio-economic factors, which otherwise would have gone undetected. In this way, we can supplement the poorly documented conditions of provincial civic societies, which developed away from major political centers, and yet functioned, at least in terms of production and consumption, along similar patterns.
In What Terms Can We Talk about the Byzantine City as a Consumption Centre? The Case-Studies of Athens and Corinth

The word ‘consumption’ has become common in modern, and especially contemporary times, simultaneously with the appearance of ‘consumerism’ and ‘over-consumption’. It is therefore linked to a certain economic model, which is prevalent today. This paper presents some thoughts about the meaning of the term ‘consumption’ in correlation with Byzantine cities, towns, and their surrounding countryside. Questions under discussion are the following:

In what terms can we talk about the Byzantine city as a consumption centre?

Using the term ‘consumption’ in the study of pre-industrial cultures entails methodological pitfalls. Residents of Byzantine towns of medium size were, perhaps in their majority, peasants, that is, agricultural producers, as well as consumers. At the same time, a considerable part of the Byzantine elite resided, or at least was active, also in the countryside. It becomes clear, therefore, that consumption over subsistence level was an economic habit which was not linked exclusively to urban settlements.

What do we define as ‘consumption’ in the Byzantine world?

Consumption in urban settlements was linked not only to the elite, but also (and, perhaps, more prominently) to the poor. The lower social strata of cities consumed goods which were provisioned to the city from a surrounding countryside. Provisioning, therefore, held a decidedly special place in the urban economy as a whole.

After presenting this theoretical framework, the paper presents some examples of consumption habits from Byzantine Athens and Corinth. In Athens, ceramic material of the 12th-13th centuries from the urban centre (Agora Excavations) is compared with contemporary pottery from the surrounding countryside. At Corinth, the discussion about trends in dining habits has started already a few decades ago. This discussion is summarized and is juxtaposed with the situation in Athens. Do the two urban centres appear as similar regarding contemporary trends in dining habits, food storage, and cooking? Under which presuppositions can the emerging differences be interpreted as different consumption trends? Finally, what kind of archaeological evidence can draw the countryside into the discussion of consumption, which at the moment appears as linked exclusively to urban centres?
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The Christians of Sicily between Byzantium and Islam (9th-11th C.): State of the Art and New Perspectives

In recent years there has been an extraordinary increase in the number of studies and research around the subject of medieval Sicily, understood particularly in its multicultural sense, a field of study that is considered as a story on its own, almost an anomaly defined by exoticism, at the margins of more general European history and on the periphery of mainstream academic disciplines.

From its ancient beginnings, Sicily has been a land of myth, represented as being beyond space and time where past and present, East and West, live side by side and dissolve in a reality that is described and imagined without apparent contradiction. Approaching the study of the island means, then, in the first place, analysing its myths and symbols, revealing the complex and multi-layered processes of their development and dissemination, which go beyond rhetoric, however persuasive. In other words, studying Sicily means giving a historical dimension to an island in the middle of the sea that, undoubtedly, is not at the centre of the world, whilst being fully aware that Sicily is neither a universal paradigm of insularity, nor a performative model for other historical realities. Sicily is an island that is anything but uniform and unchanging. It is characterised by asymmetry, and the main “constant” of its history and its identity can be found perhaps in its having been, at certain historical moments, a space between cultures, a third space, a meeting point for different languages, societies, and cultures that mixed together, giving life to processes of transculturation and original practices. Sicily then, as an object of study, lends itself well to observation and analysis, a place of encounters but also of conflict, crucial within the polycentric dynamics that lay at the foundations of the current historiographical debate and, in a broader sense, of the same reflection on European cultural identities.

This paper aims to present the state of the art on the Christians of Sicily under Islamic rule, opening new perspectives; the Christians of Sicily, as well as those living in Arab-Islamic world in general, have always suffered from a persistent form of prejudice in terms of narrative and scholarship. While medieval Muslim authors regarded them as allies of the enemy, Byzantium, and a sort of fifth column within the dār al-Islām, modern ones dismissed them because of the strong anti-clerical ideals inspired by the Risorgimento, which in the Sicilian case, are plainly evident in Michele Amari’s Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia, an invaluable work that now needs to be updated and revised. Apart from evidences that Amari was unaware of (i.e. Cairo Geniza, etc.), his frames of reference focus more on establishing and interpreting events, rather than say the socio-cultural movements and formations at the margins, so that he overlooks certain groups like Arabicized Christians and Jews, bilateral operators who are at their most important during times of transition.

According to the surviving testimonies, few but not inexistent, Christian communities living in Sicily during the Islamic period appear to be dynamic enough and not lacking in permeability. The official response of the Italo-Greek ecclesiastical hierarchy to religious pressure in Sicily was flight
to Calabria and the peninsular territories controlled by the two empires (Byzantine and Franco-German) and the Church of Rome, or more broadly turning to the larger “Roman-Byzantine” world. Nevertheless, among the many possible responses to Islamicization there are also other forms of “resistance”, such as the formation of new social entities within the island’s Islamic society: the musha’midhūn/meshummadhūn, “the apostates”, who are for good reason considered a dangerous anomaly in contemporary Arab-Islamic sources. As opposed to fear of Islamicization (which practically meant conversion to the Islamic religion), linguistic and cultural Arabicization did not worry the Christians of Sicily, who apparently chose functional diglossia as well as other forms of “mixed” cultural and religious accommodation. It is also probable that Arabicization played a role in the social advancement of individuals or elite groups. These became part of the Islamic State machinery of the island and as such this was not perceived as negative development, despite the discrimination that must have been the lot of the island’s Christians during the Islamic period.

The apparent absence of Arabic texts composed by Sicilian Christians during the Islamic period could lead to the conclusion that the latter did not enjoy a high cultural level, lacked the means or the communal structure that would have enabled them to produce a literature written in the Arabic language that might have indicated a process of linguistic and cultural Arabicization of the island. But this is clearly a false assumption that portrays the Christians of Sicily who were living under Muslim rule as “subalterns”, a state of things that is obviously incorrect in this case and one that attempts to force the Sicilian case into a mold formed in totally different cultural contexts. There is no doubt, as shown above, that hagiography and hymnography, the preferred literary genres produced by the Christians of Sicily and southern Italy, were predominantly written in Greek before, during and after the Islamic period. This state of things constitutes a clear and sure indicator for the process of Arabization and Islamicization of the Christian communities living in Sicily and it is explained by a growing progressive functional diglossia where Greek serves as the high literary language and has a crucial function in the consolidation of self identity, closely connected to the religious and cultural sphere of the Christian community, while Arabic is used as a vehicle for daily contact, and also as a useful instrument for social climbing within the newly formed Islamic society of the 10th and 11th centuries.
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From Gortyn to Heraklion?
A Case of Redefinition of the Cretan Urbanism during the Eighth Century

Recent archaeological research on Gortyn identified the decades between the late seventh and early eighth century as the period in which the cityscape of late antique origin changed radically. From this time the area of the Praetorium lost its role as a political space of the city by transforming itself into a zone with a marked artisanal and agricultural vocation (as it had happened since the second half of the fifth century in quarter of the so-called “Byzantine houses”). The episcopal district, Mitropolis, continued its existence until the Muslim conquest, while the settlement around St. Titus experienced perhaps a little demographic enhancement, for it was the focus of the urban interventions promoted by Andrew of Crete in the mid-720s. The acropolis was certainly revitalized and refortified between the second half of the 7th and early 8th century. Overall, even in the 8th century, the lower part of the city seems to continue its existence without suffering an absorption of its residential area by the higher city.

Simultaneously to the changes undergone by the urban fabric of Gortyn in the 8th century sigillographic documentation testifies to institutional change in the island’s government. It is now entrusted to an official qualified as βασιλικὸς σπαθάριος καὶ ἄρχων Κρήτης. Information about his functions is meagre and it is not clear where his residence was. It has been argued that he moved his seat on the acropolis, according to a process of strengthening of top-hill sites well documented in the whole empire in “dark ages”. This hypothesis – which is based essentially on the discovery in situ of the seals of Antiochos koubikoularios kai basilikos chartouarios (dating back to the seventh century) – is in itself plausible, but has at least two highly contradictory elements. First, none of the seals that bears witness to the office of archōn was found on St John’s hill, having come for the most part from the antiques market of Istanbul. Second, an episode from the life of St. Stephen the Younger, written in the mid-8th century, contains the mention of a praetōrion that seems to be sited not in Gortyn, but in Heraklion (ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ πραιτωρίῳ τοῦ Ηρακλείου). In former scholarship such information had been interpreted in reference to a residence built by emperor Heraclius in Gortyn. But today while archaeological research has indeed identified a phase of restructuring of the residence of the Cretan governor during the reign of Heraclius, on the other hand it has shown that when the bios of St. Stephan the Younger was drawn up this complex had definitely ceased to function.

The paper shall analyse, then, the evidence concerning Heraklion in late antiquity and its very controversial elevation to episcopal see during the 8th century. From the analysis it seems possible to conclude that the demographic and economic development of Heraklion predated the Muslim conquest of the island. It was part of a broader process of enhancement of the northern coastal sites of Crete faced the southern ones in their relationships with Constantinople. It is in such a context of redefinition of the urban Cretan network, in place between the second half of the 7th and the first half of the 8th century, that the moving of the residence of the archōn from Gortyn to Heraklion (or Knossos) may have occurred.
Cretan Connections: An Island’s Sigillographic Links to Byzantium

In this paper I will use the lead seals struck by state and Church officials based on Crete, and those seals found at Cretan sites, to examine island’s relationship to, and status within, the wider Byzantine Empire. The seals found on and inscribed with the name of Crete will be assessed in two ways, by comparison with seals discovered in other provinces, and with the general corpus of published seals. The seals found on Crete are an important and rare resource in the world of sigillography as they form one of only a small number of groups of seals with a secure provincial provenance. They are thus comparable to a small number of collections from elsewhere, notably Bulgaria and Cyprus. Seals with the name of Crete in their inscription form a separate, but obviously linked, group, which generally come from further afield, with the majority residing in the world’s major collections. By examining the similarities and differences between the seals of Crete and other areas within the empire as a whole group we will begin to explore the administrative and social ties that bound the island to Byzantium, and their changing nature over time.

For the first Byzantine period, leading up to the Arab conquest in the early ninth century, the obvious points of comparison come from the other eastern islands under Byzantine rule, namely Crete’s Aegean neighbours and Cyprus. Comparing and contrasting the seals of office holders from multiple islands, alongside those belonging to Byzantines with court titles, will help to reveal the level at which Crete operated in the Byzantine system, and perhaps contribute to the conversation about the relationship between the provinces and the capital in the early empire. The early administrative history of Crete has been the subject of much debate. It is hoped that the proposed study will contribute to this ongoing discussion. Particularly interesting here are questions arising from the presence or absence of place names on the seals associated with Crete. I will explore this phenomenon and what it can tell us about the administration of the island in light of work being carried out on the unpublished sections of the collection at Dumbarton Oaks.

For the second Byzantine period, from the recovery of the island by Nikephoros Phokas in 961 to the Venetian conquest of 1210/11, Cyprus, reconquered in 965 forms an interesting case for comparison, as do the lands of southern Greece, the Peloponnese, and Epiros. Although these latter regions were recovered by the empire at the beginning of the ninth century a comparison with the seals from these themata with those of Crete will offer an interesting insight into the process of the reestablishment and maintenance of imperial authority on the island. Also interesting in this light are the seals of Bulgaria, reincorporated into the empire a generation after Crete, which, like the seals from Crete, form a distinct group with find spots for which at least some information is known. In Crete we have a provincial administration that had not evolved, but was established anew in 961. Thus, although the seals from the second period are far less numerous than the first, they will help shed light on the evolution of the Middle Byzantine provincial administration.
An Island in Transition: 
Cyprus between the Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages

Research on early medieval Cyprus has always lingered on a chronological tri-partition, which focuses on the Late Antique “golden age” (late fourth-early fifth to seventh century) and the so-called Byzantine “reconquista” (post 965 A.D.) while overlooking the period in between, labeled as the “Condominium era”. Supposedly, this phase was characterized by the division of the sovereignty between the Umayyads and the Byzantines (alternatively defined as condominium, buffer-zone or no-man’s land) bringing about repeated destructions, the end of urban life, a relocation of the Cypriots to the inland settlements with fundamental changes in land-use patterns, a ruralization of the economic life and the social and demographic dislocation of both the elites, the ecclesiastical hierarchies and the rest population of the island. But under the tranquil mantle of this long-established historiographical approach, one can sense a mounting inadequacy at grasping the historical development of Cyprus in the period under consideration (vis-à-vis the impact of the new cross-disciplinary analysis of different archaeological materials\(^1\)) and the passion still stirred by the peculiar present political and social situation of the island.

As with the latter, one could quote Hegel who in the *Phenomenology of Spirit* states that the standard by means of which we measure the situation and establish that it is problematic is itself part of the problem and should be abandoned: the so-called Cyprus problem (that is the division of the island after the 1974 war) has often impinged into and loomed over an objective interpretation of the transitional period under consideration. To be sure, scholars like Dikigoropoulos Kyrris, Megaw, Papageorgiou, and more recently Metcalf, Papacostas, Stewart, Parani and Michaelides have provided admirable syntheses of the history of Cyprus, but I believe that a review of their conclusions about the effects of the Umayyad invasions is in order. The archaeological evidence, in my opinion, points to a less violent and disruptive phase in the island’s history than is presented in traditional interpretations. My paper indeed aims at rejecting “the usual standards” to propose a complex but coherent picture of the fate of Cyprus between the late sixth and the early ninth centuries.

Moving away from the fourth and fifth century Cyprus, with its splendid pre-Christian basilicas and its artistic high achievements (like the famous mosaics to be found in Salamis or Paphos), the paper starts from the period of political calm and economic prosperity associated with the reign of Justinian I, to move to the strategic role Cyprus played in events such as the Heraclian revolt (608-10 A.D.) and the Persian war (as mirrored in the literary and numismatic sources). This should allow me to pierce the barrier between Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages as defined by the gap between two prosperous “trade cycles”\(^2\) and to propose a model of eastern Mediterranean regional, sub-regional and inter-regional connectivity\(^3\).

---

1 Walmsley, *Coinage and Economy*, p.21.
2 Wickham, *The Mediterranean*.
3 Horden-Purcell, *The Corrupting Sea*.
The picture of Cyprus from the mid-seventh to the beginning of the ninth century will be drawn as a story of continuities and slow transformations in the economic aspect, which in turns mirrored into the coherent institutional and fiscal (state) order, in the vitality of the commercial exchange (as linked with the Levant, Egypt and Southern Asia Minor as well as Constantinople and the Aegean), in the persistence of the importance of the local clergy and the Archbishopric (also as reference point along the pilgrimage routes of the eastern Mediterranean) and in the resistance of the local elites (military and civic), yet experiencing the political pull of the Constantinopolitan court to affirm their social status and cultural self-identity.

As a consequence, the long-standing questions of the notorious treaty between the Umayyads and the Byzantines or the political status of Cyprus (as no man’s land or buffer zone ante litteram) will become less prominent by fully grasping the similarities with the “smooth transition” experienced by contemporary Syria and Palestine in terms of political structures and, above all material culture in the transition from the Byzantine to the Umayyad domination.

Here, like in Cyprus, we are facing the unresolved puzzling dichotomy between the many know types and frequencies of transitional coins known through the antiquities market and the lower numbers recovered through archaeological work. Here, like in Cyprus, we have been suffering from practical limitations (poorly excavated material and neglecting of publication), which initially lessened the knowledge of seventh and eighth century ceramic chronology or typology. Here, eventually, these obstacles have been faced and overcome, something which has just begun to happen in Cyprus where the full effect of a revised chronology of local ceramic productions allowed to demonstrate that an empty landscape after seventh century was not a realistic state of affairs and that long-reaching exchange commercial networks included the island.
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Redefining a Byzantine Island:  
Ritual and Fortifications in the Cypriot Countryside

In 965, Byzantium restored its rule over Cyprus. Nicephoros Phocas’ victorious campaign against the Arabs in the Eastern Mediterranean ended a long period of uncertainty and political volatility in the island. Reclaiming control of Cyprus was a complex process that required investment as well as strategic planning in order to manage the changing geopolitical landscape of the broader region. Responding to these challenges, Byzantium turned to the organization and development of the island’s hinterland using fortification networks and monastic institutions to redefine its authority over this insular outpost of its contested realm.

Compared to the socioeconomic realities of Late Antiquity when coastline cities remained the focus of development, in the period after 965 until the end of Byzantine rule in Cyprus in 1187, the rural hinterland experienced greater attention and development. Recent scholarship has shown that besides the revival of cities and towns, the growth of rural communities points to organizational models and strategies that focused on a more sustainable development between cities and countryside. Indicative of this scheme is the economic development of mountainous areas like the Troodos where village communities engaged in activities that exploited the fertile ravines and the natural resources of the mountain.

The growth of rural settlements was complemented by the proliferation of monastic foundations. Monasteries served multiple roles that helped to sustain Byzantine rule and influence over the Cypriot countryside and especially in the mountainous areas of Mount Troodos and the Pentadaktylos range. More importantly, they contributed to economic life and served as points of cultural and religious reference for local populations caught in the midst of political volatility. The foundation of numerous monasteries on the slopes of the Troodos during the period that followed the restoration of Byzantine rule, mirrors the increased importance of the region. Examples such as the major monasteries of Kykkos and Machairas as well as smaller establishments such as the monastery of Saint John Lambadistis near Kalopanayiotis, the Virgin Phorbiotissa in Asinou and Saint Nicholas of the Roof near Kakopetria are indicative of the investment in their diverse role and cultural significance. On the Pentadaktylos, monastic institutions such as Saint Chrysostomos at Koutsoventis, the Virgin Apsinthiotissa and Saint Hilarion served similar roles securing strong cultural ties with local societies. At the same time they contributed to the establishment of networks of defense and communication. Overall, the successful growth of monasticism on the mountainous slopes of Troodos and the Pentadaktylos during this period relied on the direct engagement of Byzantine state and church officials as well as on the work of monastic founders.

Ascetic practice, ritual and tradition were an integral part of the founding process as proven by the existence of numerous hermitages associated with the cult of local saints and often directly related to organized monastic institutions. These traditions were embedded in the cultural landscapes
of the Cypriot countryside; many of them were active before 965. In this respect, they prepared
the way for the island’s return to Byzantine rule and order. The attested arrival of Athanasios of
Athos in Cyprus in 963 was not a timely coincidence but points to the importance of the island
in the framework of Phocas’ campaigns against the Arabs. The role of such monastic leaders was
further strengthened in the following centuries. Monastic founders such as Neophytos the Recluse
withdrew into the hinterland accompanied by a great awareness of historical precedents and careful
strategy. Leading by example they inspired followers, gained the respect of local populations and
won the support of patrons as they laid the roots for flourishing monastic institutions. In turn,
these monasteries exerted influence that helped Byzantium to redefine and sustain its control over
Cyprus. The resiliency of these monastic foundations is shown by their survival and growth through
the subsequent centuries of Latin and Ottoman rule.

Byzantine efforts to reclaim and reorganize Cyprus were also supported by networks of
fortifications. Although mostly known for their Crusader and Lusignan phases, the fortresses of
Saint Hilarion, Buffavento and Kantara on the Pentadaktylos range provide the best preserved
example of middle Byzantine military architecture and planning on the island. The three castles
were part of a broader defensive system that included towers as well as monastic institutions and
provided control of the mountain range that physically separates the central part of the island and
the fertile plain of Mesaoria from the northern coastline of Kerynia. This defensive network aimed
at providing control of the natural passages of the Pentadaktylos while offering exceptional visual
control and early warning.

Recent studies and new evidence have provided a more nuanced understanding of the historical
realities of Byzantine Cyprus. In addition, the archaeological, artistic and architectural legacy of
the last centuries of Byzantine rule demonstrates a growing sensibility to the changing geopolitical
landscape of the broader region of the Eastern Mediterranean. The key geographic position and
role of Cyprus as a Byzantine insular outpost were increasingly important, especially after the
late eleventh century Seljuk conquest of Asia Minor, the ensuing capture of Antioch in 1084 and
the subsequent foundation of Crusader States along the Levantine coast. Learning from the past
and being aware of the vulnerable location of the island, Byzantium’s focus moved beyond strict
military means and unrealistic strategies that aimed to control access to the island. The insertion of
networks of fortifications on the inaccessible peaks of the Pentadaktylos reflects long-term planning
and confidence in the futile nature of an incursion due to the allegiance of the local population.
In this context, Cyprus was redefined as an integral Byzantine island through investment in the
socioeconomic growth of its hinterland and by strengthening the cultural identity of rural societies.
The Status of Balearic Islands in the 8th and the 9th Century and Byzantium: Towards a Periodization in the Context of Western Mediterranean Affairs

Archaeological finds in the last decade allow us to draw a more detailed picture of the political status of the Balearic Islands during the so-called dark centuries that begin with the Muslim invasion of the Visigothic kingdom in 711 (or, alternatively, with the failed expedition of 'Abd Allāh ibn Mūsā in summer of 708 against Mallorca) and end with the conquest of the island by 'Isām al-Jawlānī for the Spanish Umayyads at the very end of the 9th century. Taking into account all the extant evidence and the changing Mediterranean context I shall propose a periodisation in four phases for these two centuries, which could perhaps serve as a basis for future research.

1. First period (708-754): the archontate of Mallorca

The Balearics were never conquered by the Visigoths and remained linked to the Byzantine Empire at least during the first half of the 8th century, beyond control of the Muslim rulers in the Iberian peninsula. They had their own archontes or representatives of the Empire, who had surely connexions with the neighbouring island of Sardinia. Thus, amongst the lead seals recently found in the Santueri castle in Mallorca, we find a Sergios doux, a John hypatos and, most importantly, a Theodotos hypatos kai doux Sardinias. Of the seal of a Georgios ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων (praefectorius), to be dated to the beginning of the 8th century according to Werner Seibt, one exemplar has been found in Ciutadella (Menorca) and other two, significantly enough, in Sardinia. On the other hand, a further seal found in Ciutadella belonged (according to the reading of Werner Seibt) to Iordanes archōn Maiourikos ([Ι]ΟΡΔ[Α]ΝΙ [Α]ΡΧΟΝΤΙ Μ/ΑΙΟΥΠΙΟ/ΚΩΙ), confirming that at least this island along with Mallorca were still directly controlled by Constantinople, which either sent governors to the archipelago or appointed them from amongst local potentates. Byzantine coins dating of the first half of the 8th century (until the reign of Constantine V) have also been found in the islands, also confirming the economic connexions with the Empire. Accordingly, even admitting that they paid tribute to Cordova after the expedition of 708 by 'Abd Allāh ibn Mūsā, the islands remained under the suzerainty of Byzantium, although we must be very careful about the nature of this control. Constantinople did not necessarily send troops from the East, but could have simply relied on local forces as a more flexible and expedient way of assuring the fidelity of the islanders to the Byzantine ‘Commonwealth’, as shown by the parallel cases of other peripheral territories (mainly Sardinia, but also Greek-speaking Cyprus).

2. Second period (754-829): the rise of the Carolingians and Muslim piracy in the Western Basin of the Mediterranean.

Neither Byzantine seals nor coins have been found on the islands from the end of the 9th century until the regency of Theodora, but this does not necessarily mean that the links with Byzantium were broken, as Islamic coins are also unattested in this period. Apparently, a serious demographic crisis in
the Balearics took place and, with it, a settlement of the population in fortresses (the so-called castells roquers), away from the old urban areas of Late Antiquity (Malta provides a good parallel). Since these settlements, as for instance Alaró in northern Mallorca, are for the most part unexcavated, no solid conclusion can be made concerning the political status of the islands. The change of settlement pattern in the Balearics may not have been the same for all four major islands; but in any case it could have been influenced by Muslim pirate raids in the area, if not by the settlement of Muslim pirates on one of the Balearics (unattested until now, but not improbable), following the model of Fraxinetum or Mount Garigliano. This would explain the intervention of the Carolingians in the area, attested by the same Carolingian sources which inform us of the activities of Muslim pirates in the Western Mediterranean. We cannot exclude a temporary alliance of the Balearic Christians with the Carolingians. A Frankish source speaks of submission of the islands to the Western Empire (‘nobis se dediderunt’), but the evidence is too thin and too tendentious to conclude that the islands were subsequently controlled by the Franks. In fact, the situation could have been more fluid and unstable than we presume. Whereas Corsica entered the orbit of the Carolingians, the Balearics probably continued to be connected to Sardinia, which was clearly related to Byzantine South Italy. The still mighty Byzantine fleet is recorded (even in Carolingian sources) to have intervened in Sicily during this period in order to ward off Muslim invaders from Africa. Moreover, contacts between Byzantium and the Idrisids in Northwest Africa are attested; and despite the fact that the Balearics are not mentioned in Uspenskiy’s Taktikon (to be dated according to Živković to 812–813), we have no evidence of the islands being conquered by any of the surrounding powers.

3. Third period (829–867): Theophilos, Michael III and the emir ‘Abd al-Rahman II

The diplomatic actions of Theophilos in the west, following the defeat at Amorion in 838, brought him into contact with the then reigning Andalusian emir ‘Abd al-Rahman II, whose reply to the reigning emperor has been preserved in Arabic. No alliance was established, but the fact that the Balearics are not mentioned in the correspondence of the two rulers, whose common hatred to the Abassids and the Andalusian pirates ravaging Crete is stressed in the letter, points rather to an uncontested statu quo for the archipelago. The naval expedition of the emir against the islands after Theophilos’ death in 848 is justified precisely because the islanders had broken a previous pact and attacked Muslim ships. The inhabitants of the Balearics sued the emir for an agreement and the previous pact and tribute were renewed. Although we do not know the terms, it is to be presumed that the Balearics did not lose the connexion to Sardinia, which perhaps now controlled the islands directly, if we believe Ibn Jurradâdbih. In any case, in contrast to the lack of evidence for period 2, some Byzantine coins (of the empress Theodora) appear to have been found in the islands. Other objects of material culture related to Byzantium (such as a much debated σαλτζάριον found in the forum of Pollentia and dated to the 9th century) are more difficult to interpret.

4. Fourth period (867–903): Muslim conquest and its aftermath

After the conquest of Malta in 870 and Syracuse in 878, Byzantium’s presence in the western Mediterranean relied in practice on its control of the Strait of Mesina (Taormina, Aci and Rometta remained in Byzantine hands until 962) and its alliance with Sardinia. But we might posit the vanishing presence of the Byzantines in the waters west of Sardinia as the reason for the efforts of Servusdei, the bishop of Girona, to obtain direct control of the sees of Mallorca and Minorca (letters to the Popes in 892 and 897) as well as for the invasion plans of the Muslim authorities of Cordova,
which materialised at the very end of the 9th century (exact date debated) after fierce resistance of some ‘Rums’ for ten years in the fortress of Alaró in northern Mallorca. Thereafter, in the first half of the 10th century, Cordova proved to be a good ally to the Byzantines in western Europe against the rise of the Fatimids.
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Introduction

The year 2018 marks the millennium of Michael Psellos’ birth and the present round table seeks to explore his writings in view of this anniversary.

The study of a single author offers a number of fixed points, especially if there are numerous surviving works. In the case of Psellos, more than one thousand texts are associated with his name, making him one of the most prolific authors of Constantinople. The wide ranging nature and peculiarity of his vision point to him as an important author in order to appreciate Byzantine taste and mentality.
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Michael Psellos on Art and Aesthetics

Within the extensive and rich corpus of Michael Psellos’s writings, there are numerous and important discussions of images. These reflections are found in letters, in commentaries and paraphrases of philosophical works, in hagiographic, judicial, rhetorical, as well as historical studies. While the sources are varied, they nonetheless provide an opportunity for us to examine how Psellos discusses works of art and also whether it is possible to identify the construction of an aesthetic attitude to art in the work of this crucial Byzantine philosopher. Of course, any discussion of “art” or “aesthetics” begs questions regarding the appropriateness of these terms for the visual culture of Byzantium. Rather than addressing this broad and complex issue in this brief essay, I will here focus on how these terms (or rather their Greek equivalents) make their appearance in Psellos’s writings.

Psellos’s aesthetic response to works of art betrays both a profound interest and pleasure in the physical and sensible qualities of things, as well as an intellectual indifference towards and a desire to overcome these very qualities. It is a primarily visual aesthetic, one that is rooted in both Christian and Neoplatonic assumptions. As such, it is bound to the differences that inhere to the divisions that distinguish the sensible from the intelligible, the material from the spiritual, and the human from the divine. As we shall see this aesthetic disposition leads Psellos to develop a consistent and hierarchal aesthetic that even as it delights in human creativity, privileges a beauty and a subject that precedes and overwhelms the work of art.

The key concerns in Psellos’s visual aesthetics are summarized in a letter addressed to an unknown recipient that reports on an encounter with a miraculous icon of the Mother of God in the monastery Ta Kathara. Let me begin by quoting this letter as a whole, before then unpacking the themes presented here in light of other works:

I am a most fastidious viewer of icons; but one astonished me by its indescribable beauty and like a bolt of lightning it disabled my senses and deprived me of my power of judgment in this matter. It has the Mother of God as its model and has been painted in her likeness. Whether it is similar to her (that supernatural image of beauty), I do not quite know. I know this much and just this much, that the corporal nature has been faithfully imitated by means of the mixing of colors. Yet the form is incomprehensible to me and is sometimes apprehended visually and sometimes conceptually.

I do not therefore write about what I have beheld, but what I have experienced. For it seems that having completely exchanged its nature, it was transformed into divine-like beauty and surpassed visual perception. Yet, because of this, she neither looks stern nor is she again decked out in a singular beauty; rather she is beyond both these measures and descends into knowledge only so much that, while her shape is not known, she astounds the viewer.
She has been depicted interceding with the Son and eliciting mercy for men, as is customary in both truth and images. Moreover, she entertains no doubts in her supplication nor does it appear that she laments over her request; rather, she calmly extends her hands in anticipation of receiving His grace and is confident in her prayer. The bolts from her eyes are miraculous in every direction. For she is divided between heaven and earth so that she might have both: both the one (i.e. Christ) whom she approaches, and the people for whom she supplicates.

At any rate this is what I grasped seeing the icon for the first time. After that, having astounded me, it surpassed my ability to see. Because of it, the monastery of *ta Kathara* is fortunate; more so than the earth is fortunate because of Edem.

This letter is brief, but it nonetheless presents a consistent account of Psellos's aesthetics. It tells us that Psellos claims to be a “most fastidious,” perhaps exacting viewer of icons. Having introduced his perceptual engagement with the image, Psellos then leads us towards the necessity of this “visual sense” being surpassed. For the beauty that has here astonished Psellos does not come from his perception of the shape presented by the icon, which is a faithful imitation in color of the Mother of God’s corporal nature, rather this “indescribable beauty” has disoriented Psellos, leading him to understand that beauty is not rendered by the visual and material shape found in the icon alone, but also requires a conceptual knowledge of the form that lies behind the shape. This knowledge becomes known thanks to the miraculous activity of the Mother of God. She changes the nature of the icon, so that “divine-like beauty” can become visible there. Psellos thus leads us from an aesthetic or sensible perception of beauty, to one that surpasses human visual perception and that is orchestrated by the subject of the work of art. As such, it is an aesthetics that offers a model that differs distinctly from our modernist and representational modes of describing and responding to works of art. It is a perceptual mode that is governed by surprise and astonishment, as the normal condition of the thing seen has been miraculously overwhelmed by the subject of re-presentation.

This is an aesthetics that is rooted in the differential play of intelligible beauty and sensible perception. A framework for our understanding of how this play unfolds in Psellos’s thought can be found in his *On Perception and Perceptibles*, his *On Beauty* and his *On Intelligible Beauty*. These reveal a debt to both the Aristotelian and the Platonic traditions that is found throughout Psellos’s writings and that betrays his adherence to a Late Antique conception of intellectual formation. These texts show Psellos deploying both an Aristotelian account of the senses and Plotinian accounts of beauty to address aspects of human perception and intellection. Although very different in their perspectives, these essays establish themes that recur throughout Psellos’s discussion of works of art. For example, in *On Perception and Perceptibles* Psellos follows Aristotle and Alexander of Aphrodisias in rendering a non-tactile account of human vision. As such, sight finds its cause in the subject of vision. It is the thing seen that moves the transparent medium (air) and that becomes manifest as a color impression upon the transparent and watery medium that is the eye. It is this emphasis upon the thing seen, on movement, change, and color that echoes throughout Psellos’s other texts and that underpins his accounts of human vision. In contrast, Psellos’s discussions of Plotinus’s notions of beauty allow him to construct a non-sensible account of an intelligible beauty. In these essays, Psellos examines the supernatural Beauty that descends from Intellect. His concern is, therefore, with that beauty that may reside in things but that, ultimately, has its origin in Intellect.
It is a beauty that is not of this world, even if it may descend and become manifest in this world. An echo of this is to be found in the *Ta Kathara* letter, where the Mother of the God: “descends into knowledge only so much that, while her shape is not known, she astounds the viewer.” As such, Psellos grants control over the descent into knowledge to the Mother of God herself. It is she who polices how she is to be perceived, only becoming wholly manifest when a miraculous event that she determines temporarily overcomes the division between heaven and earth, the intelligible and the sensible. Psellos thus shows an engagement with quite distinct aesthetic legacies, one determined by a human perceptual horizon, the other open to a Beauty that, strictly speaking, surpasses the aesthetic. Psellos embraces this double ground when he tells us that: “I do not therefore write about what I have beheld, but what I have experienced.” For him, the limits of human vision need to be overcome in order for the experience of divine things to take place.

The potential for conflict between these two perceptual modes, the intellectual and the sensible, recurs throughout Psellos’s works. It is perhaps most beautifully rendered in his account of a Crucifixion icon, where we find Psellos grappling with the problem of what can and cannot be seen in an icon. He begins by establishing the icon’s clarity and accuracy in rendering Christ’s human body. This is achieved by emphasizing the naturalistic quality of the painting and using a lengthy and specific evocation of Christ’s body to reiterate the precise and tangible qualities of the representation. Hence:

But there is something more here, or rather this is a very work of nature, so that the picture seems to be the product not of art but of nature. For the belly protrudes a bit from the rest of the body, and its colors make it appear not level with the chest, but it has distended as is reasonable. For the organs within it force out the belly, and the skin itself has been stretched at the navel. The heart, liver and whatever naturally branches from there, namely blood vessels and the <membranes> containing the lung or rather both lungs are concealed from the viewer. But if the entry point of the wound in his side had not already closed, we would perhaps have observed through it what I mentioned as if through a dilator.

This passage’s forensic quality serves to underline the point that one is being invited to see Christ’s actual body in the painting. It is a proposition that assumes the possibility of an accurate representation.

Although Psellos is at pains in his writings on art to establish the accuracy of any given rendering, he also always qualifies this understanding by offering doubts regarding the adequacy of such a rendering for a divine or holy subject. In this way, Psellos indicates that a complete presentation of the subject of the painting remains beyond painting’s grasp. For while the icon can present the visual aspects of this subject, other aspects of this subject can only be grasped by means other than the painting, whose material constraints need to be overcome. This familiar dualism is developed in an extraordinary and beautiful passage in the *Crucifixion* ekphrasis, which speaks of the impossibility of an adequate representation of Christ. Here, Psellos tells us that the: “whole image seems to be living,” and that: “But, just as beauty exists as a result of the opposition and harmony of limbs and parts, and yet often a woman is extraordinarily radiant as a result of entirely different causes, so it is in this case,” and that: “while this living painting exists as a result of component parts combined most felicitously, the entire living form seems to be beyond this, so that
life exists in the image from two sources, from art which makes a likeness and from grace which does not liken to anything else.” Psellos, while clearly attentive to the play and variety of the parts in the image, argues that these in themselves do not produce the living quality in the painting. Rather, this quality depends upon an understanding of the whole subject.

Given Psellos’s doubts regarding art’s adequate representation of its subject, he needs to examine ways in which these limits may be overcome. In the Crucifixion ekphrasis this is introduced by way of the concept of living painting. This was a quality that did not come from the craft of painting, rather:

God inspires with his grace not only creatures who possess reason but also images which lack life; an indication of this fact is the likenesses which often move, speak and behave with the power of reason towards those who observe them. These likenesses seem to be the product of the human hand, but God actually fashions them without our knowing it, if I may put it thus, and presents them in visible form by using the hand of the craftsman as his vehicle for the picture.

Clearly, then it is God’s grace that endows an image with this quality. For, it is thanks to God’s guiding the human hand that these images can become animate. This point is returned to at the end of the ekphrasis when Psellos remarks upon the accuracy of the painting and then attributes this quality to an: “oversight that is beyond the painter’s hand and that this overseeing mind had returned that painting to its prototype.” The introduction of this further origin for the work of art allows Psellos to explain the uniqueness of this icon when, in the lengthy passage quoted above, he says: “Yet I would not compare this painting to any other paintings, neither those set up by past hands or that represented the archetype accurately, nor those from our own time or from a little before that had made some innovations in form.” Thus, for Psellos, this painting, thanks to divine intervention, has escaped both the claims of tradition and the inventiveness of contemporary painters. Furthermore, the presence of this “overseeing mind” helps Psellos to account for his doubled understanding of the icon, one that draws attention to both the seen and the unseen possibilities in painting. This doubled quality is found in Psellos’s movement away from the claims to clarity on the part of the icon and towards an altogether more ambiguous account of the image:

Although this suffering brings him [Christ] in due course to death, the power that moves the hand of the artist also animates the body that has breathed its last. Thus he has been distinguished from those living among the dead, and from the dead who live among the living. For his veiled limbs are somewhat ambiguous, and the visible parts are no less doubtful. Just as art shrouds it also discloses both the lifeless and the living. This is true of his bloody garments, whether light or dark, as well as of the living dead presented on the cross and clearly suffering an excessive death, now living because of the accuracy of imitation – or rather, then and now in both manners. But there his life is beyond nature and his death is beyond pain. Here both are beyond the art and the grace that has shaped the art.

It seems, then, that even with divine intervention, the image can only offer a partial account of its subject. The icon may allow us to see an accurately rendered subject, but it will also permit us to know that we cannot grasp the whole in the work of art itself.

Psellos’s concern for the visibility of the painting’s subject extended beyond the question of its making. He was also very interested in the perception of the work. Once again, he was to argue that the viewer needed assistance in order truly to see the subject of the work of art. The problem
of perception can be found throughout the *Ta Kathara* letter. Even though this letter begins by remarking the fastidious quality of Psellos’s viewing, the limitations of this activity are soon revealed. This begins when the Marian icon astounds him with its beauty, threatening to disable his senses and his power of judgment. For while her shape is discernible in the icon, her “form is incomprehensible to me and is sometimes apprehended visually and sometimes conceptually.” Given this, Psellos chooses not to write of what he has beheld, but of what he has experienced. He thus tells us that he must overcome the sense of sight in order to see more fully. This is not an argument for widening the sensory horizon, it is rather an argument for surpassing this. The experience beyond mere beholding appears to have been one marked by a complete change in the object of vision and thus in the possibilities for vision. Thus Psellos writes: “having completely exchanged its nature, it was transformed into the divine-like beauty and surpassed visual perception.” The changing quality of the object of vision is crucial for Psellos. We have already noted that Psellos followed Alexander of Aphrodisias’s commentary on Aristotle’s *De Sensu* in identifying an affective model of vision, in which the thing seen changes the medium of sight. Similarly, for a divine or holy subject to be truly seen the medium that permits them to be seen also needs to change. Material representation by a human artist could depict the corporal nature of its subject, but it could not, where appropriate, convey the invisible quality of holiness or divinity. For this to become possible, the icon needed to change. This is what occurs in the icon contemplated by Nikolaos of the Beautiful Source, where the icon is transformed into the Mother of God’s “entire fleshly nature.” Similarly, the Empress Zoe’s Christ Antiphonetics icon changes color. Perhaps most crucially, Psellos is our only witness to a change in the miraculous Marian icon at Blachernae that signals the authentic presence of the Mother of God, thus validating the judicial process and decision brought before her.

An ethical aspect to viewing is a consistent presence in Psellos’s writings on art. He is interested, in particular, in the beholder’s preparedness to see. While this could be an intellectual preparation, it could also be understood in more broadly ethical terms. Hence, when writing his Blachernae discourse, Psellos notes that an illiterate woman in the crowd could still see the vision, even if she did not know the words of the hymns. Psellos returns elsewhere to the preparation of the one looking. This point is reiterated in a letter to John Xiphilinos:

> They [i.e. the ancient philosophers] attach the intelligible beauty to the souls based on the beauty around us; since the former is neither visible nor known in itself, they represent the prototype to us by way of likenesses. If it is then necessary to ascend to that prototype by means of knowledge, let us despise corporal beauty as the faintest echo of the perfect and close to matter; let good pursuits and good deeds and good words raise us up to the first Beauty.

Psellos also insists upon an ethical preparation for looking at icons themselves. Thus in another letter, Psellos warns his correspondent that a true vision of the Mother of God will not come to those who make frequent visits to the icon, but to those who “first and foremost [succeed] in modeling themselves upon the virtue of the higher ones.” This point is enlarged upon in his account of Nikolaos of the Beautiful Source, where the abbot is presented as a model of virtue. Psellos’s interest in the ethical spectator is in part a product of his model of ascent and descent. Ultimately, it is a model that exceeds the limits of painting itself, a fact that Psellos both recognizes and engages. For the icon, as a human product, can be a beautiful thing, appreciated for the skill of its manufacture, and even collected. Yet, for all these qualities, the icon remains limited. As the record of a human perception
of the visible world, it cannot embrace the invisible or the supernatural and therefore struggles to provide an adequate description of a divine or holy subject. This might lead Psellos to abandon the work of art as a lowly medium. But, he does not. Rather, he embraces the icon as a necessary point of exchange between man and God. The icon remains valuable as an expression of what man might know and as the site for encountering the astounding manner in which divinity, in its excess, can become present and visible in the work of art. It allows him to speak of the preparation of this viewer, but it does not lead Psellos to guarantee that such preparation will lead to a vision. This remains in the gift of the subject seen in and through the painting.

Given the above considerations, it is possible to argue that it is appropriate to speak of both art and aesthetics in regard to Psellos's writings on images. Neither term should be read in terms of their modern usage. Rather both should be read out of Psellos’s texts. There, art is to be understood as an instance of rational human making that is, in these examples, manifest in painted icons. This is a very broad understanding that falls in line with ancient thought. The specific work of these products is to translate human visual perception into artifacts that memorialize this perception by means of imitation. It is in this regard that we can then speak of an aesthetic. This is not the systematic or disciplinary study of art as an autonomous object of enquiry. Rather, it is a proposition that we can better understand Psellos's conception of art by drawing this close to his understanding of the senses. This then leads us to a Plotinian legacy in his account of beauty. For there is a beauty in the work of art itself, but this beauty is but a shadow of the intelligible beauty that exceeds both the work of art and the senses themselves. It would be wrong to interpret Psellos’s discussions of art and aesthetics in light of modern conceptions of these terms, but it would be equally wrong to deny the play of these terms in his texts and thereby ignore the possibility of this author's discourse on both art and aesthetics.
Psellos – Participant of the Anti-Latin Polemics of 1054?

It has been suggested recently (Lauritzen F. Psello – discepolo di Stetato? In: Byzantinische Zeitschrift 101, 2. 2008. S. 715—725; Idem. Stethatos’ Paradise in the Ekphrasis of Mt. Olympos by Psellos (Orat. Min. 36 Littlewood)? In: Византийский Временник, 70. 2011. P. 139—150) that Michael Psellos was a “true follower” (“un seguace fedele”) of his elder contemporary Niketas Stethatos. This point of view has been substantiated in the first line by the similarity between the opinions of Psellos and Stethatos in three questions: both of them argued that the human soul is being separated from the body immediately after death, that God limits all things without being limited by anything and that the evil doesn’t have its own substance. F. Lauritzen opposes the ideas of both authors on these subjects to the corresponding opinions of John Italos. The researcher notes also that Psellos described the mount Olympos in Bithynia in terms similar to these employed by Stethatos in his treatise about Eden – as a point of meeting of heaven and earth, as a place of spiritual pleasure and as an imperial palace.

Without entering here into a closer examination of the proofs produced by F. Lauritzen, I’d like to take into consideration another piece of evidence which, to my mind, could shed some light on the relationship between Psellos and Stethatos. I mean the treatise “On the Last Supper, that it happened one day before the Passover of the Law, i.e. on the 13th day of moon”. This writing has drawn attention of P. Gautier when he was studying the manuscript Vat. gr. 2220, datable to 1304–1305. The researcher noticed that the treatise on the f. 30v.–32, wich didn’t bear any indication of its author in the title, was there among different writings of Michael Psellos. P. Gautier observed also that this treatise as the neighbouring writing “How the souls of just men and sinners are being alloted after death” on the f. 36–36v. dwell on the subjects which have been studied by Psellos in his great cosmological work “De omnifaria doctrina”. Basing on this evidence, the researcher drew conclusion that the treatise “On the Last Supper” had been written by Michael Psellos (Gautier P. Un second traité contre les latins attribué à Théophylacte de Bulgarie. In: Θεολογία.1977. T. 48. P. 547–548).

These considerations gave reason to P. Moore to include the writing in his list of the works of Psellos. Soon afterwards the new catalog of the manuscripts of the library of the oecumenical patriarchate confirmed this attribution: the manuscript Panaghia 64 of the end of the 13th century contains the same treatise bearing the name of Psellos in its title (Moore P. Iter Psellianum. A Detailed Listing of Manuscript Sources for All Works Attributed to Michael Psellos. Toronto, 2005. P. 228; Catalogue des manuscrits conservés dans la Bibliothèque du Patriarcat oecuménique. Vol. 1 / Ed. M. Kouroupou et P. Géhin. Istanbul. P., 2008. P. 200).

The author of the writing argues that the Last Supper happened not on the 14th day of month, but on the 13th i.e. on the eve of the Jewish Passover. This chronology is based in the first place on the testimony of the Gospel according to John who affirms that the Jews were going to eat the Passover
on the day of the crucifixion of Christ. Psellos also remembers the Old Testament prohibition of eating anything cooked at the Passover meal. To his mind, the dish which the Savior dipped a sop in on the Last Supper (Joh 13, 26) was containing some cooked food (like a sauce), and in this case the supper couldn’t have been the Passover meal. The author adduces the Old Testament prescription to eat the Passover meal with loins girded, with shoes on feet and with staff in hands (Ex 12, 11). He concludes that all the participants had to do it while they were standing; Psellos opposes this prescription to the fact that Christ and his disciples were lying on the Last Supper (Mat 26, 20).

Then the author diverts his attention from the question of the chronology of the Last Supper and looks into eclipse during the crucifixion of Christ – an event mentioned in the Gospel according to Lucas (Luk 23, 44). Psellos mentions the description of this eclipse in the letter to Policarpos of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, who believed that the moon had then changed its course and gone backwards. The author refers to the same work when he is reasoning how God stopped the sun by the prayer of Joshua (Joshua 10, 12–13) and how God made it go back eastwards at the time of Hezekiah (Isaiah 38, 8). In the first two cases (eclipse during the crucifixion and the miracle of Joshua) Psellos reproduces the exact words of Maximus the Confessor in his commentary on the Areopagite. In the last case (the miracle at the time of Hezekiah) Psellos to some extent disagrees with Maximus because the “fifth turn” (τροπή) of the Sun’s course means for him the late autumn (μετόπωρον), and for Maximus that meant its miraculous course backwards.

Another source to Psellos was the treatise by John Philoponos “That the Last Supper of the Lord happened on the 13th day of moon one day before the Passover of the Law and that Christ with his disciples didn’t eat then the lamb”. Not only the titles of both writings indicate to their common character, but also their first lines where the Passover of the “Law and Figure” (τὸ νομικὸν καὶ τυπικὸν πάσχα) is opposed to the “true Easter” (τὸ ἀληθινὸν πάσχα). The Gospels are quoted practically in the same order in both treatises – initially Mat 5, 17, then Luk 22, 19–20, Joh 18, 28, Mat 26, 2, Joh 13, 1. From these citations the same conclusions are drawn, the same arguments are adduced and their wordy expressions are often the same.

The question of the date of the Last Supper got importance in the middle of the 11th century with the beginning of the Byzantine polemics against the use of the unleavened bread in the Armenian and Latin liturgy. In fact, if the Last Supper was not a Jewish Passover meal, there should have been used an ordinary leavened bread and not an azyme for the first Eucharist. Thus the Byzantine liturgical use of leavened bread in the liturgy gained a serious advantage over the Armenian and Latin use of azymes.

One of the first writings to discuss the problem of liturgical bread was the first letter of Leon of Ohrid to John of Trani, and there are some parallels between this treatise and the Psellos’ work. So, the beginning of the latter with an assertion that the Lord fulfilled and abrogated the Law of Moses remembers the words of Leon of Ohrid: “With the fulfillment of the Law … the azymes must be abrogated”. Psellos writes about a “shadow” (σκιά), i.e. the preliminary drawing which disappears when the final image in colors is painted; the same word is used by Leon of Ohrid when he asserts in his first letter to John of Trani that the Jews “dwell in shadow” and likens the Law of Moses to the shadow in his second letter.

But these parallels are scarce and the differences between both writings are more remarkable. Psellos doesn’t assert directly that Christ used the leavened bread on the Last Supper; he abstains
from direct polemics as he doesn't mention the liturgical use of Latins. The two authors date the Last Supper differently, as Leon believes that it began as a Jewish Passover meal on the 14th day of month. As the Psellou's dating of the Last Supper fitted the Byzantine polemical goals better than the Leon's point of view, it is not surprising that it got assumed by the later Byzantine polemists.

More clear are parallels between the Psellou's treatise (namely its second part) and the two polemical works of Niketas Stethatos – his fifth anti-Armenian treatise and the first redaction of his anti-Latin work “On the azymes”. According to both Stethatos' writings, the Lord didn't allow in miraculous way the full moon to occur on the 14th day of month which happened then on Thursday. In this way Christ prevented Jews from eating their Passover meal in due time. It is remarkable that this passage contradicts the dating sustained by Stethatos in both his writings little above where he affirms that the Last Supper happened on the 13th day of month. Obviously, it were this contradiction and poor evidence in favor of a “miraculous” interpretation of events which later forced Stethatos to give up this argument in the second, abridged redaction of his anti-Latin writing.

The arguments of Psellou and Stethatos differ not only textually – the first affirms only that the solar eclipse during the crucifixion of Christ had an extraordinary character and the latter writes that the full moon had been postponed by God for one day. At the same time, both authors are united in their desire to make a tie between the chronology of the Last Supper and the supernatural action of the Lord. It seems quite probable that one of them had been influenced in this question by other. In this case, who exerted influence and who was influenced?

As it has been noted above, F. Lauritzen assumes that it were the writings of the elder (Stethatos) who served as a source of ideas and images to the younger (Psellos). In fact, the latter could be borne about 20 years after the first. But if one diverts his attention from this difference in age between the two authors and regards their texts, other conclusions could seem appropriate.

First of all, there isn't any intrinsic tie between the two parts of Psellos' writing – the first one where the date of the Last Supper is discussed in plain terms and the second where the author dwells on supernatural events in the planets' course – topics which are very distantly related to the main subject of the treatise. These supernatural events are brought into consideration because the evangelist Lucas had mentioned the solar eclipse during the crucifixion of Christ and Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite afterwards had explained it as a consequence of an extraordinary course of the moon. Thus all this account seems to be for Psellos not so much an argument in favor of his dating of the Last Supper as a casual appendix to his writing. Quite differently looks the attitude of Stethatos who is so carried away by the idea of a supernatural force exerted on the course of the moon that he even doesn't take notice of the contradiction between two dates of the Last Supper he espouses in the same writings.

Then, it was not Stethatos but Psellos who indulged in astronomy as it is evident from his relatively extensive work “On the course of the year, cycles of son and moon, their eclipses and computing of the Easter”. Among other things, Psellos disagrees in this work with those who believe that the darkness during the crucifixion of Christ happened from an “occasional” – i.e. not supernatural – eclipse. This point of view conforms very well with one expressed in the treatise “On the Last Supper” and is substantiated by the fact that the crucifixion occurred at the Jewish Passover – consequently, at the time of the full moon when both moon and sun were in directly opposed parts of the firmament. It is true that Psellos writes here about only four “great turns” (τροπαί) of the
sun – spring, summer, autumn and winter, – whereas in the treatise “On the Last Supper” he counts
five “turns of the year”. But this difference in numbers comes from the mentioned dependence of
Psellos’ writing on the commentary of Maximus the Confessor who also counted five “turns”. On
the other hand, Psellos means under “fifth turn” not the miraculous course of the sun backwards
as Maximus did, but late autumn; he changes in this way an assertion of his predecessor according
to his own views. All these physical problems were far remote from the interests of a theologian as
Stethatos was.

To my mind, this evidence makes sense to believe that it was the Psellos’ treatise “On the Last
Supper” which suggested Stethatos the idea to use an argument of a supernatural interference in the
course of the moon in his reasonings about the date of the Last Supper. If that is true, the Psellos’
treatise should have been written not after the second half of 1053, because Stethatos should have
had enough time for the subsequent preparation of his “Fifth treatise against Armenians” and his
both anti-Latin writings. This dating conforms to the possible influence on Psellos from the first
letter of Leon of Ohrid which has been composed not later than in 1053 when a response to it
has been written by pope Leon IX or in his name. It is also possible that the common traits in the
writings of Psellos and Leon of Ohrid go back to the patristic heritage – e.g., to the treatises “Against
Jews” of John Chrysostomos.

It is difficult to tell if Psellos’ writing aimed polemics against Armenians, or Latins, or both
Armenians and Latins. As one can conclude from existing sources, the oral polemics against Latins
began in 1051 when the katepan of the Southern Italy Argyros came on a visit to Constantinople;
the anti-Armenian writings should have appeared in 1049–1053, when the catholicos Petros I
dwelt there. Probably, the question didn’t seem very important to Psellos as he mentioned only
the question of Filioque on a proper occasion later in his praise to the late patriarch Keroullarios
and passed over in silence other points of disagreement, including the azymes. The succinctness
of the treatise and the silence over liturgical differences with other Christians make one think that
religious polemics of the time didn’t interest Psellos very much – even if he consented to take part in
them indirectly. Being obviously much more interested in astronomy, he found the way to draw it to
the subject of the dating of the Last Supper. Seemingly, his reasonings on this occasion about cases
of divine interference in the planets’ course suggested to Stethatos the idea of divine interference in
the course of the moon at the time of Christ’s passion.
The Place of Poetry in Psellos' Literary Production

Psellos definitely wrote texts in verse, but is he a poet? The question is not as absurd as it first appears. As is well known, on many occasions Psellos provided his readers with explanations, justifications, and clarifications on the style, aims and intellectual programme of his writings. Through his works, we meet Psellos in various roles: Psellos the polyvalent teacher, Psellos the earnest historiographer, Psellos the skilled orator, and of course the most cherished self-representation of all, Psellos the philosopher. But Psellos the poet is conspicuously absent. Psellos never describes himself as a poet, he never compares his works with those of other poets, past or contemporary, and he nowhere reflects specifically on the poems he wrote.

Instead of the distinction between poetry and prose, Psellos' mental landscape is dominated by the opposition between rhetoric and philosophy, which not only corresponds to a distinction between disciplines of knowledge, but also between different types of discourse and even different lifestyles and cultural and social ideals. Poetry cannot claim to embody one of these.

In accounts of his own education, Psellos either totally ignores poetry (in his Chronographia), or states that he was impatient to leave the subject of poetry behind and to move on to the more attractive subject of rhetoric (in the Encomium for his mother). When talking about the competing teachers in contemporary Constantinople (in the Funeral oration for Xiphilinos), he reserves the Platonic derisory term pandemos (“vulgar”) for chairs of poetry. We have to clarify here that Psellos is referring to the education of poetry at school, comprising the reading and interpretation of Homer and the knowledge of ancient meters, which were parts of the grammatical curriculum. However, one cannot escape the impression that the reputation of poetry as a whole was influenced by this image of juvenility and lack of seriousness.

And yet, a corpus of several thousands of verses is transmitted under Psellos’ name. Michaelis Psellis poemata is the title of a hefty Teubner volume, edited by Leendert Gerrit Westerink. But the title is somewhat misleading. Half of the texts of that volume are marked as “spuria”. They are transmitted under the name of Psellos in the manuscripts, but Westerink dismissed Psellos' authorship of these poems on several grounds. Sometimes the manuscripts with an attribution to Psellos are clearly in the minority and are also otherwise not to be trusted in matters of author identification. Sometimes, a defective metrical technique excludes Pselian authorship. In other cases, Westerink pointed to incompatibilities with what we know of Psellos’ biography.

The fact that there were so many spuria is interesting in itself. Michael Psellos seems to have become a household name for especially didactic poetry, but also for entertaining intellectual invective.

Perhaps Westerink's firm distinction between “authentic” and “spurious” is not very helpful. Many of the poems considered authentic by Westerink, especially some shorter ones, are dubious themselves, as Psellos’ name is only transmitted by a limited number of testimonies (sometimes just one), which are not always that trustworthy.
But this does not affect the core of Psellos’ poetry. This consists, first, of some exceptionally long didactic poems: on the titles of the psalms, the Song of Songs, medicine and law. A group of shorter didactic poems forms a cycle, as Hörandner observed, ostensibly offered to the young imperial prince Michael. Subjects of these poems are grammar, dogmas, church councils, and canon law. A poem on rhetoric perhaps also belonged to this cycle. All of the major didactic poems except the one on medicine are written in politikos stichos. Furthermore, there are two poems dedicated to Isaac Komnenos, which, although not ranked among the “didactica”, have a didactic undertone as well. Rather well-known is the long funeral poem for Maria Skleraina, mistress of Constantine IX Monomachos. Psellos also wrote two remarkable invectives, a celebratory officium for Symeon Metaphrastes, and a paraphrase of Kosmas’ canon on Holy Thursday. Iambic trimeter, or dodecasyllable, is the preferred meter for these poems, but, remarkably, Psellos also wrote two poems in the form of the canon.

This poetic oeuvre reflects many roles and occupations of Psellos: as a courtier, as a combative intellectual, and, predominantly, as a teacher. Trying to cover all these genres and purposes would inhibit me from going into any detail, so I will focus henceforth on his didactic poetry, forming the bulk of his corpus in verse.

Westerink’s impressive apparatus fontium shows how Psellos in each didactic poem closely follows an existing source. His dependence on a single text is spectacularly, and perhaps even embarrassingly, discernible in the poem on the Song of Songs, as Luciano Bossina has shown. Psellos not only duly takes over the interpretations and even the wordings, of Gregory of Nyssa’s exegesis, but he also breaks off his own commentary at exactly the same place where also Gregory’s exegesis stops, flatly announcing that the Song of Songs has come to an end, while a significant part is in fact left uncovered. Psellos also fails to comment on the first four verses, which is due to some particularities in the transmission of Gregory’s text.

Psellos’ didactic poems can thus legitimately be described as metrical paraphrases, but they also clearly belong to the genre of didactic literature. The first person singular speaks as a teacher addressing a pupil, who is, with one exception, emperor or son of the emperor. At frequent intervals in the text, Psellos addresses this pupil, often exhorting him with imperatives such as “know”, “learn”, “hear”. He also anticipates questions from him, responds to his supposed amazement, and draws his attention to remarkable points.

But unlike the didactic poetry we know from Antiquity, Psellos’ poems cannot be seen as literary re-elaborations of their subject. They do not narrate, embellish, or amplify. They are in essence lists of explanatory glosses to difficult terms, lemmas, or textual passages that need interpretation. The only significant discursive operations, apart from providing a didactic setting, are: selecting and summarizing the existing material, and versifying it. In fact, these two operations are interrelated.

Psellos himself reflects on the purposes of his didactic poetry in the poem on medicine. Perhaps he felt a need to do so because at this point he had been explaining at length the colors and odors of urine. He states, with a traditional topos, that he wanted his colleague intellectuals to gain knowledge of the subject while being attracted by the charis of the meter. We are left with the question what this charis means exactly to Psellos and his public.

The politikoi stichoi poems also advertise their own qualities. Clarity and conciseness are the two most important. Combined, they result in the quality of “synoptical”: that is, enabling to have
at a glance an overview of the subject. The terms *synopsis*, *synoptikos* and *synopsisein* frequently occur in the poems, and *synopsis* is also found in the titles above poem 8 on law, and above the cycle beginning with the poem on grammar (poem 6). In the poem on law, this “synoptical” feature is also connected to the quality of *eutheratos*, “easy to catch”. The impression Psellos wants to give, is that his poems provide concise summaries, where you can easily find the answer you are looking for.

In the poem on rhetoric, he brags that he has summarized the whole discipline of rhetoric in one small roll. The sheer material aspect may indeed have played a role in the motivation to write in verse. After all, in poetry, the text is laid out line by line. Therefore, these poems are also visually structured as lists, dividing knowledge in small entries, vertically aligned. The metrical pattern moreover ensures that each of this entries is of equal length. One can easily imagine how this enhances the “synopticality” (“surveyability”) of the subject matter.

But the rhythm of the *politikos stichos* was of course mainly there to be heard. When we want to imagine the attraction of rhythm, the transfixing power that it could have on its listener, then we only need to turn to some of Psellos’ statements about the effects of his own eloquence. In one letter (Sathas 189), he describes how people dance, applaud, and are transported by his words, and notably by their enchanting rhythms. While all this can apply to prose as well, in this letter Psellos specifies that these musical qualities can be found in both prose and poetry.

Another letter (Sathas 187) reiterates the conceit of mixing philosophical thoughts with rhetorical charm. Psellos specifies that he “labours on rhythm in my words, and on metron.” In contrast to rhythm, *metron* refers more unambiguously to poetry. Also the context of this letter is interesting. Psellos is actually giving advice to a teacher about how to initiate a pupil into philosophy. Rhythm, and, as it seems, poetry specifically, can be engaged to make subject matter attractive, not just to a general public, but to an audience of students.

This brings us back to *charis*. In Psellos’ metadiscursive statements, *charis* refers to rhetorical charm, resulting in a pleasurable, and indeed sensual, reading experience, as Stratis Papaioannou has shown. Melody, harmony, and rhythm come up very frequently in connection with *charis*. To be sure, the kind of elegantly phrased, sophisticated prose also exhibits these features. But in Psellian discourse, the boundaries between poetry and prose collapse: poetic discourse is, essentially, a rhetorical pattern of rhythmical cola taken to the extreme. This eminently applies to the *politikos stichos*, the first widely used stichic meter solely based on accentual rhythm and not on arcane prosody. This meter does not satisfy the classicizing standards of the intellect, but the sensory experience of the ear.

One text gives us a surprising clue to understand Psellos’ reticence about his poetry and the expectations of his milieu towards *politikoi stichoi* and didactic poetry. This is a fragment from his funeral oration for Xiphilinos, at a point when Psellos portrays his friend’s rhetorical talents.

*In contrast to what most orators thought necessary, he did not divide rhetoric into different parts, nor did he compress its infinite power by turning it into something like a synoptic work, in similar fashion to those who separate the sea from the great waters; instead, he discovered all its effects and principles, and adopted these in his work, not by making a synopsis of its wealth for common people or lazy and indolent emperors, but by demonstrating its whole amplitude.*

Psellos praises Xiphilinos for not doing what he very obviously has done himself: making selective summaries for emperors. Even the vocabulary is remarkably reminiscent of the terms that
occur in Psellus’ didactic poems. The word *synopsis*, used twice in this fragment, was explicitly the quality his poems strive after. This gives us an idea of the criticism potentially leveled at Psellus’ didactic poems, which he here perhaps wanted to atone for. Compressing knowledge in *synopseis* is seen as a rejectable kneefall for the ordinary tastes and intellectual laziness of non-elite people.

This brings us to the imperial dedications of the didactic poems in *politikoi stichoi*. These are not straightforward, since the lemmata above the poems in the manuscripts disagree as to which emperor the poems are dedicated to. Most poems are dedicated to either Constantine Monomachos or Michael Doukas, depending on the manuscript, and poem 2, according to one manuscript, was even written for Nikephoros Botaneiates. One lemma, above poem 6, gives more circumstantial evidence: it specifies that Constantine X Doukas had ordered Psellus to write a synopsis of all sciences, for the benefit of his son, soon to become Michael VII Doukas. As Wolfram Hörandner has shown, the title pertains not only to poem 6, but to a cycle of didactic poems also comprising poems 3, 4, and 5, on dogmas, church councils, canon law. All these poems were also dedicated to Constantine Monomachos according to a significant number of manuscripts; one manuscript of poem 5 even mentions Psellus’ first name Constantine, which he had before he became monk. It thus seems that Psellus simply repackaged some poems initially written for Monomachos, in order to suit the wishes of the Doukas family.

One may wonder whether that wasn’t a little inconvenient. But then we perhaps overestimate the importance that emperors attached to the didactic poetry made by their court poets. When in his *Chronographia*, Psellus himself recounts his teaching to imperial pupils, he mentions how he enticed Monomachos with his learning, but if Monomachos’ interest would have gone beyond a short-lived infatuation, as it now appears, Psellus would certainly have mentioned this. His portrait of Michael VII Doukas, while otherwise full of panegyric praise, is rather disparaging about the scope of learning addressed by teacher and imperial student, when it comes to details. Michael only dabbled with average success in the writing of… poetry.

Are the didactic poems in fact written with an imperial audience in mind? The first poem, on the titles of psalms, has an interesting sublayer. One branch of manuscript has no imperial dedications, and also the addresses to the emperor in the poem itself are left out or replaced by addresses to *philologoi*. This may seem the work of a later redactor, so Westerink did not adopt those readings, but he was not aware of one remarkable manuscript. This is the *Clarke 15*, a splendid small psalter, preceded by some poems of a certain Mark the Monk, and also by a fragment taken from the end of Psellus’ poem 1. The readings in that fragment correspond exactly to the branch of manuscript concerned here. Importantly, *Clarke 15* is dated to 1078, which would mean that the branch of manuscripts without imperial dedication goes back to a version still made during Psellus’ lifetime.

We should thus not be led astray by the dedications. It seems obvious that the poems were already consumed by a non-imperial audience during Psellus’ life. I would suggest that he used them, with or without clear traces of imperial dedication, for his teaching of “normal” students as well. It is no coincidence that later compilers and readers avidly took to Psellus’ poems as convenient summaries of knowledge, even though they duly copied the imperial dedications. These added prestige to the author, but would certainly not inhibit the demand of a broader audience for metrical summaries of this kind.

The question of dedicatees cannot be seen separated from the question of meter. This is obvious enough when we think that the only poem not sporting any imperial dedication is also the only
poem written in dodecasyllables rather than *politikos stichos*. This is the poem on medicine, which, as Psellos clarifies, was written for friends, that is, grammaticians, rhetors and philosophers, in sum, members of the intellectual elite.

For them, the use of *politikos stichos* would be unacceptable. In these circles, it was not seen as a meter at all. Contemporary metrical treatises or manuals do not deign to treat the *politikos stichos*. Mauropous, teacher of Psellos, attacks someone who had written verse without meter, that is, *ametron metron*, undoubtedly intending *politikos stichos*. Niketas Stethatos uses the same phrase to describe the poetry of Symeon the New Theologian, purely accentual poetry neglecting prosody.

In front of his imperial patrons, however, Psellos vaunted the attractions of the meter and the simpler register that it entailed. It is in fact logical that Psellos, in his funeral oration for Xiphilinos, had put lazy and indolent emperors on a par with common people. Their literary tastes were the same.

It has often been conveniently overlooked that the didactic poems of Psellos form the first extensive corpus of *politikoi stichoi*, and contain the very first reference to the term *politikos stichos* in the poems themselves (namely at the end of poem on the Song of Songs). The attributes “popular”, “vernacular”, and the idea that *politikos stichos* is close to the rhythmical heartbeat of the real people, sit rather unwell with Psellos’ image of an elitist, disingenuous writer.

And, as the fragment from the funeral oration to Xiphilinos shows, they also rather sit unwell with the self-image Psellos himself wanted to impart. The poem on medicine was a first attempt to present knowledge in a respectable meter, but, as the failing beginning and end of the poem show, he probably never got round to completing a final version of the text.

The poems in *politikos stichos*, by contrast, are all finalized products. Packaging these poems as a gift was a viable strategy to gain favor at the court, and for the public at large, enhanced his image of imperial preceptor. They satisfied a very broad demand for simplified, summarized knowledge that used simpler language and could be performed orally in a rhythm that really entices the ear instead of trying to accommodate fossilized prosodic structures.

But in the careful construction of his self-image elsewhere, there was no need to draw the attention once more to the writing of summaries for indolent emperors, in a meter that commanded no respect in intellectual circles. For all of the thousands of verses that Psellos has written, he was still not, nor did he wish to be, a poet.
Michel Psellos, administrateur

Michel Psellos fut simultanément le grand intellectuel du XIe siècle, mais aussi un homme d'action. Il accomplit une magnifique carrière politique, certes en connaissant des moments de disgrâce. Il eut tout de même le temps de travailler au sein de l'administration impériale, comme un fonctionnaire ordinaire. C'est cet aspect des activités de Psellos que je vais examiner sous deux points de vue : Psellos gérant ses propres biens et Psellos au service de l'Etat. Pour en juger, nous ne disposons que de textes provenant de la main de Psellos et chacun sait que ce dernier avait une tendance marquée à l'autosatisfaction.

La gestion par Psellos de ses biens personnels ne fut pas toujours, semble-t-il, une réussite. N'ayant pas hérité d'une fortune familiale substantielle, sa richesse lui fut octroyée par les empereurs dont il fut l'ami. Il obtint un palais en viager et une grosse quantité de *nomismata*, mais il subit au cours de sa vie des pertes considérables. Un voleur lui déroba une importante somme en liquide, 300 *nomismata*, destinés à acheter une propriété, le laissant dans une « pauvreté philosophique ». Il fut également dépossédé d’une partie de sa fortune à la suite d’un procès perdu, lorsqu’il dut offrir une compensation financière à Epsilon Kenchrès, fiancé de sa fille, lorsque les fiançailles furent ensuite rompues sous le prétexte de l’inconduite du jeune homme.

En revanche, Psellos eut plus de succès avec la série de monastères qu’il avait obtenus des souverains en charistncrat. D’après sa correspondance, il s’est soucié d’investir intelligemment pour procurer des revenus à ces établissements. Ses placements avaient l’inconvénient de se porter sur des propriétés possédées à titre viager et cela explique peut-être que, sous Alexis Comnène, un petit-fils de Psellos en était réduit à faire appel à la charité d’un $ membre de la famille Kamatèros, par l’intermédiaire de Théophylacte d’Achrida.

Psellos fut aussi chargé de la gestion des biens d’autrui, comme épitrope de Théodore Alôpos, un proche collègue. Ce dernier était originaire de Rhodes et Psellos, après sa mort, écrivit au juge des Cibyrrhéotes pour que les enfants du défunt, sans doute mineurs, se voient restituer les terres et les animaux dont les voisins s’étaient illégalement emparés.

Psellos commença sa carrière publique comme *grammatikos* de l’empereur Constantin Monomaque. Ses qualités le firent remarquer et progresser au sein de l'administration. Il avait été très tôt initié au métier de fonctionnaire thématique, en entrant dans la suite d’un juge, lui-même issu d’une illustre famille de fonctionnaires civils, un Kataphlôros. Psellos fut juge du thème des Bucellaires, qui n’était pas le plus prestigieux de l’Empire, mais n’était pas trop éloigné de la capitale. On ignore à quel moment de sa vie se situe cet épisode et plusieurs hypothèses sont possibles. Il fut sans doute aussi juge des Thracésiens, poste plus glorieux. De ses activités de juge, Psellos retient que Môrocharzanès, l’un de ses successeurs comme juge des Bucellaires, n’a pas pu dénoncer un jugement que lui-même avait rendu après enquête, car Môrocharzanès n’avait pas sa compétence.
Il se montre également très sensible à l’excellent accueil que lui auraient fait les habitants de Philadelphie, lorsqu’il était revenu dans ce thème après y avoir un temps exercé la fonction de juge. Certains habitants se souvenaient de lui et l’entourèrent en l’embrassant, avant de lui présenter une demande d’intercession pour un allègement fiscal.

Rien dans l’œuvre de Psellos, notamment dans ses lettres, ne nous informe sur son activité de juge, les décisions qu’il a prises. En fait, Psellos exerça peu de temps en province. La majeure partie de sa vie, à l’exception de son retrait temporaire dans un monastère bithynien, il resta à la cour de Constantinople, où il se transforma en lobbyiste. C’est la facette de Psellos que nous connaissons le mieux, car la majeure partie de ses lettres concerne ses interventions en faveur de ses amis auprès de juges qu’il connaît, et en faveur des fonctionnaires envoyés en province qui, craignant les calomnies de cour, redoutent de perdre la faveur impériale, source d’avancement et de richesses.

Il fut aussi appelé à rédiger des chrysobulles diplomatiques qui exigeaient, outre la connaissance du protocole, le sens de la mesure et de la précision à propos des clauses concrètes. Nous n’avons pas conservé les chrysobulles que Psellos écrivit pour le calife fatimide pour le compte de Constantin Monomaque, mais, avec sa modestie habituelle, le rédacteur se vante, dans la Chronographie, d’avoir corrigé les formules trop humbles que l’empereur adressait au calife. En revanche, nous pouvons encore apprécier le talent de Psellos lorsqu’il rédigea le chrysobulle en faveur de Robert Guiscard, au nom de Michel VII Doukas.

Psellos fut assurément un meilleur spécialiste des affaires publiques que de la gestion de ses biens personnels.
Michael Psellos’ *Concise History*

“The *Concise History* is such a problematic work that its attribution to Psellos has been challenged, but ascribing it to someone else would create even more problems than accepting Psellos as its author.” With this sentence Warren Treadgold opened the chapter about Psellos’ *Concise History* in his book *Middle Byzantine Historians*. The question of authorship of *Concise History* is difficult to avoid, since it had emerged even before the work itself was published in 1990, and it is undoubtedly prevailing question in the whole scholarship on it. There is no need here to present again the history of this question in detail. It is enough to note that the editor of the text himself W. J. Aerts was the first who expressed the opinion that Psellos was not the real author of this work. In spite of Jakov Ljubarskij’ persuasive arguments in favour of Psellos’ authorship, Aerts’ position was accepted by many scholars. Thus, in influential general works such as *Lexikon der Mittelalters* and *Βυζαντινοί ιστορικοί και χρονογράφοι* by A. Karpozelos we read that Psellos is not the real author of the *Concise History*. However, attribution to Psellos gradually has been gaining ground since the article of J. Duffy and S. Pappagioannou, completely devoted to the question of authorship of the *Concise History*, was published in 2003. It seems that the profound analysis of the vocabulary given in this article left little room for doubt.

Regardless of who is its real author, the *Historia Syntomos* is an unusual piece of Byzantine Historiography that raises some interesting questions. Although it covers a long historical period as traditional Byzantine chronicles do as well, it is odd in the sense that it deals exclusively with Roman and Byzantine history, from the legendary foundation of Rome by Romulus and Remus to the reign of Emperor Basil II. Nevertheless, in regard to its interest for the Roman history, the *Historia Syntomos* is by no means isolated piece of Byzantine historiographical production. In the sixth century, Petros Patrikios wrote a historiographical work that Souda is referred to as *Historiae*, which has been transmitted to us only fragmentary, mostly through two works by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (*De Sentetiis* and *De legationibus*). This work covered the period from Julius Caesar to Konstantios II, who died in 361. His main goal was to collect and present material for Roman History, while by far less space is devoted to the history of New Rome. The reason for this one should probably search in the fact that no one had been writing about Roman history, at least in Greek, since the third century author Dion Cassius, who was Petros’ main source, while histories of the period from Julian Apostate to Justinian in Greek already existed (e. g. those of Eunappios of Sardis, Priskos, Zosimos etc.).

In this context one should also recall the work Περὶ ἀρχῶν τῆς Ῥωμαίων πολιτείας by John Lydos, a contemporary of Petros Patrikios. This work is not a history, but still it shows some historiographical features and very much deals with the Roman past. As Michael Maas pointed out, this Lydus’ work is organized around the idea of continuity of the Roman state institutions,
sometimes from Romulus up to the age of Justinian. Did Psellus also have in mind the idea of continuity between Old and New Rome while he was writing the *Historia Syntomos*? The answer cannot be simple, because on the one hand it is not clearly stated anywhere, but on the other hand there are some points that indicate such intention. First of all, such intention could be seen in the idea of writing a history that deals exclusively with Roman and Byzantine past, but also in some details. We are told, for example, that the emperor Konstas (ruled 641–668) who wanted to return the capital from Constantinople back to Rome, used to say that “one should rather honor mothers than their daughters”.

The interest for the Roman past reappeared in the middle Byzantine period, particularly in the tenth century in various writings of Constantine Porphyrogennetos (*De Sentetiis, De Legationibus, Excerpta*). In the eleventh century, apart from *Historia Syntomos, Roman History*, a work compiled by *nomophylax* John Xiphilinos, the nephew of the homonymous patriarch, is also concerned with the Roman past. This interest for the Roman past in Byzantium from the ninth to the eleventh centuries was situated in a wider context by Professor A. Markopoulos in his plenary paper presented in London ten years ago.

But, if one wishes to understand the literary context in which *Historia Syntomos* appeared, they should take into consideration the so-called imperial βραχέα χρονικά or Kaiserchroniken. The Kaiserchroniken list emperors, for each giving duration of his reign-time, and usually adding other pieces of information, such as the way of accession to or overthrow from the throne, or moral characteristics of the emperor. For example, according to one Imperial Short Chronicle published by Peter Schreiner Theodosios the Great was εὐσεβέστατος καὶ μισοπόνηρος, Theodosios the Younger εὐσεβέστατος, φιλάγαθος and καλλιγράφος, and Justin II δικαιότατος (p. 133). I think that the *Historia Syntomos* basically corresponds with this kind of historical writings in the sense that it also lists the emperors and provides a similar kind of information, and sometimes even in a similar way. That is why I argue that Psellus probably used one of many existing short imperial chronicles, extracting main information from it, especially the chronology. The structure of most chapters of the *Historia Syntomos* is as following: after the name of the emperor it is usually given his characterization in one short sentence; at the end of the chapter it is given duration of his rule, and sometimes how he died or was overthrown. The room in between is sometimes filled in with very short descriptions of important events, but we usually read about the character of the emperor. Actually, descriptions of events undoubtedly should help to achieve a persuasive depiction of the emperor’s character. And this is exactly what makes a difference between the *Historia Syntomos* and βραχέα χρονικά, and what at the same time is reminiscence of Psellus. What particularly is reminiscence of Psellus is that many emperors were not simply good or bad ones, but they showed a mixture of good and bad characteristics and deeds. One such case is the emperor Justinian, who was “παντοδαπῶν χρῆμα πράξεων, καλῶν τὲ φημὶ καὶ κακῶν”.

To conclude, the *Historia Syntomos* is an unusual work in regard of both its content and form, but it is certainly not an isolated and unlinked to other works of Byzantine historiography. In this paper I tried to approach the intellectual and literary context in which the *Historia Syntomos* appeared. Michael Psellus’ *Historia Syntomos* is the fruit of the increasing interest in the Roman past during the middle Byzantine period, but it also can be seen as the forerunner of Zonaras’ interest
in the Roman history. At least, we know that Zonaras used the *Historia Syntomos* as his source. The *Historia Syntomos* is linked to the so-called imperial βραχέα χρονικά. By adding short stories and depicting characters, he developed one very popular and extremely simple genre. The result of this is one piece of literature with strong personal stamp.
Hagiography

Let me start by saying that I am pleased and gratified to be included in this Psellos Roundtable with scholars whose work I admire and have used. I would also like to thank Frederick Lauritzen for organizing this discussion and for inviting me to participate in it.

To begin, I note with appreciation that our organizer has compiled and circulated over the years a list of publications on Psellos, including critical editions and interpretations of his hagiographical writings. I do not therefore intend to attempt a bibliographical survey of that topic. Instead, I will examine the scholarly resources and directions for new research that have emerged and developed since I produced my own critical edition of Psellos' hagiographical essays, *Michaelis Pselli Orationes hagiographicae* (Teubner 1994). What I have to say reflects my own experience but will also apply to other editors not only of Psellos' hagiographical texts but also of other categories of Psellos' immense literary output.

The Teubner series aimed to provide a comprehensive publication of Psellos' innumerable works in distinct categories like hagiography, philosophy, poetry, funerary orations, forensic compositions, etc. The collection of Psellos' hagiographical orations as conceptualized by L. G. Westerink includes eight *logoi* on various holy subjects. Only the *vita* of Auxentios and the encomion of Symeon Metaphrastes represent traditional hagiographical compositions, i.e. biographies of men and women who lived extraordinarily holy lives, although additional *vitae* and encomia may await identification and publication. For example, G. Makris recently edited an encomion of St. Panteleemon preserved in two 11th-century manuscripts and argued that Psellos authored that encomion as well as unpublished *vitae* of Sts. Kallinikos, Laurentios, and Prokopios (Kotzabassi and Mavromatis 2009). Thus Psellos' traditional hagiographical compositions represent two separate genres (the *vita* and the encomion) and also present the challenge of attributing anonymous works that resemble Psellos’ compositions to Psellos himself. Makris used now classic studies of Psellos’ literary style (Reinauld [1920], Böhlig [1956], Sevcenko [1981], and Ljubarskij [1978 and 2004]) as well as Kaldellis’ recent stylistic assessment (2006) in order to provide parallels for passages from the unattributed encomion of Panteleemon. It is difficult to provide definitive proof of such a stylistic attribution; Paschalides considers the encomion of Pantaleemon “securely” Psellos’ (Efthymiades 2011), while Kalsogianni (BMCR 2010.06.07) is less certain. Because the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* has expanded to include medieval texts, the prospect of assessing an anonymous work in terms of an author’s unconscious stylistic habits has become at least possible, based on solid philological evidence. Patterns of favored word usage and habitual word collocations can be examined and tested with the aid of the TLG. However, formulating productive searches for this rich resource is a significant challenge.

The remaining six hagiographical *logoi* in the Teubner hagiography collection illustrate Westerink’s recognition that the category “holy subjects” extends beyond saints’ lives and into
broader areas of Psellos’ thinking, such as reflections upon events celebrated in feasts of the Church. Four orations commemorate scriptural and liturgical events, i.e. the Presentation of the Theotokos in the Temple, the Annunciation, the Beheading of John the Baptist, and the Crucifixion, while an unusual historical oration describes the miraculous intervention of the Archangel Michael during Heraclius’ Persian campaign. This oration testifies to the power of holy individuals to affect historical events and to leave physical evidence (the immovable military cross in the Archangel’s church) as evidence of their supernatural activity. The Blachernae Oration is also an unusual item among hagiographical logoi. In it Psellos turns his attention to the functioning of the Byzantine court system and proposes a new method to decide vexed legal cases using a miracle in place of the normal and corruptible system of Byzantine courts and judges with special jurisdictions. The oration becomes in effect a detailed discussion of contemporary Byzantine legal practice and theory, which Psellos accomplishes by quoting and explicating fifteen separate Basilicas related to legal procedure and jurisdiction of courts (Oration 4. 498-603). Twice Psellos interrupts his catalogue of relevant laws to quote his own legal writings verbatim—On Divination by Shoulder Bones and Bird Flight (Philol. 8, 1853) at 522-24 and On the Division of Legal Actions (Weiss 1973) at 579-83. The oration demonstrates either that Psellos had near total recall for laws and his own legal writings or that these texts stood near his writing table as he worked. Psellos’ famous description in this oration of the miraculous lifting of the Virgin’s veil at the Blachernae Church, so well known to art historians, is incidental to Psellos’ primary purpose (Fisher 2012).

In short, Westerink’s rather elastic category “Orations on Holy Subjects” reflects his recognition that the Byzantines admitted spiritual reasoning into areas we consider secular, i.e. military history and legal theory. Teubner’s division of Psellos’ writings into volumes classified by generic subject matter is a useful organizational method, but it does not represent Byzantine categories of thought. For example, Hinterberger recognizes hagiographical elements in Psellos’ funeral oration for the abbot Nicholas and notes strong affinities between Psellos’ biography of his mother and a traditional hagiographical vita (Efthymiades 2014). Kaldellis moreover sees an ironic comment on the genre of hagiography in Psellos’ Chronographia. Although the rather eccentric Chronographia belongs to the genre of history, in it Psellos praises the notoriously self-indulgent Constantine IX Monomachos as holy or “divine” (theios); in Kaldellis’ view, Psellos may be subtly questioning the concept of a saint and warning his Byzantine audience to read with a skeptical eye his own heavily rhetorical hagiographical essays (Kaldellis 1999). Similarly, in a much admired analysis of Psellos’ Vita Auxentii Kazhdan (1983) noted the striking and even amusing parallels Psellus inserted to make the saint resemble the hagiographer himself (e.g., both loved to sing).

Despite Teubner’s rather procrustean classification system, critical editions of Psellus’ works are essential to our field, and Teubner makes editions available not only in individual volumes but also in a complete online set that may be purchased at awe-inspiring cost. For libraries reluctant to sacrifice shelf space and readers without ready access to a scholarly library, the online collection is a great step forward. Time will tell where it leads us. An emerging online venue for Byzantine texts and translations is the stable URL, where length is not a consideration and additions and corrections are easy for an author to make once a text is uploaded. Harvard’s Center for Hellenic Studies has given an electronic home to a few Byzantine texts, such as my own heavily annotated translations of Psellus’ encomion for Symeon Metaphrastes and of his oration on the Blachernae miracle (http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/5584). A Google search yields the site readily,
where the translation is available in full at no cost to readers and without restriction on the author regarding subsequent print publication. In fact, in addition to publication on the Center’s site, these two orations will be included in a volume of translations forthcoming from Notre Dame University Press and dedicated to Psellus’ writings on literature and art (ed. Barber and Papaioannou). Due to the constraints of publishing hard copy, readers of the Notre Dame translations will be referred to the notes in the online publication for the Greek text of passages that are discussed in detail in the print publication.

I have also found that online publication offers an editor or translator useful opportunities unavailable once a text is published in hard copy. The Center for Hellenic Studies allowed me to make a few changes to my translation and to include as a frontispiece on the site a high quality digital image of Psellus accompanied by his eye-rolling student Michael VII Doukas who requested the oration (Wikimedia Commons under Public Domain Mark 1.0). The image cost nothing either to me or to the online publisher but adds a visually arresting imperial context for Psellus’ work.

Online publication also provides resources that assist scholars greatly in producing a critical edition. Online manuscript catalogues are searchable, and manuscripts themselves are gradually coming online. Thus the tasks of locating and collating manuscripts is becoming easier, more efficient, and available to more scholars. Also, the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* has expedited immeasurably the task of compiling a *corpus fontium*, as I have experienced in the course of editing, annotating, and translating Psellus’ texts on the Blachernae miracle and on Symeon the Metaphrast. When I began editing these texts for Teubner, the *TLG* was available only in its very early stages, and a search of the full corpus could take hours. Nevertheless, pure gold was to be found. One of my fellow Teubner editors, for instance, was astonished to learn that the *TLG* had enabled me to identify the phrase “nets of <rhetorical> delights” (Symeon Metaphrastes lines 262-63) as a reference to Longinus’ fragmentary *Ars rhetorica*. Without the *TLG*, an editor relied upon verbal memory to identify references like this. However excellent, human memory is not a resource able to match the limitless potential of the *TLG*. As classical works first entered the *TLG* canon, we recognized the broad range of authors read and quoted by learned Byzantine authors like Psellus; with the addition of medieval texts, we continue to learn what Byzantine authors were familiar to Psellus and his contemporaries. For example, in the encomion to Symeon Metaphrastes (line 272) Psellus displays his own wide reading and vast command of obscure vocabulary by using the previously hapax *prosembibazein*, a rare word evidently coined by the patriarch Nicolaus I Mysticus in his correspondence to Pope Anastasius III (Ep. 32, on the fourth marriage of Leo VI). The future promises further revelations, as editions of Byzantine theological writings become available and enter the *TLG* database.

Although Google Scholar enables scholars to locate editions and translations rapidly and Google Books makes sections of valuable texts available online, we have not solved the problem of simultaneous labor on the same text by two scholars unknown to one another. The online registry of editions and translations in progress maintained by Alexandra Bucossi is an attempt to address this frustrating and wasteful situation, provided that individual scholars make use of it (greek.editions.translations@gmail.com). A stable URL as home for Bucossi’s valuable initiative is highly desirable.

Finally, I would like to outline the direction of my own current research in the hagiographical writings of Psellus. As an extraordinary intellectual and accomplished rhetorician, Psellus is not a
typical hagiographer, although Paschalides notes that he shares interests and qualities with other 11th-century scholars like Xiphilinos, Theophylact of Ohrid, and Maupou, and further that both Psellos and Mauropous entered the lively controversy that denied the possibility of recognizing new, i.e. contemporary, saints (Efthymiades 2011). Psellos contested this view by composing not only an encomion of Symeon the Metaphrast but also a canon for the Metaphrast, thus creating a sort of festal resource for celebrating a new saint. Was this aspect of Psellos’ hagiographical activity an initiative to gain sainthood for Symeon Metaphrastes, a scholar like Psellos himself? Since there was no formal route of canonization in Byzantium, this question has brought me to examine what process enabled the Byzantine Church to recognize a new saint. In the case of St. Symeon the Metaphrast, the process begun by Psellos took several centuries and very nearly founderer.

Michel Kaplan (1990) has sketched the qualities that characterize a saint by analyzing some ten saints of the Middle Byzantine period; I have relied upon his detailed and insightful work in order to compile a tentative list of qualifications for Byzantine sainthood. At this point in my research, the list is subject to reconsideration and revision.

First, a saint was a man or woman considered to be the recipient of extraordinary gifts from God and therefore the object of attention from followers; among these followers was an associate who recorded the events and miracles occurring during the saint’s virtuous life and even after his or her blessed death. Second, a public tradition honored and venerated the saintly person persistently through time by such means as the formation of a cult, pilgrimage to the holy gravesite, or commemoration during the celebration of the liturgy. Third and finally, the status of a saint merited the establishment of a special day of commemoration recognized in the liturgy of the Church and recorded in one of three forms of chronological records that contained material associated with the saints—the menologion, or collection of saints’ lives; the menaion or collection of liturgical texts used in celebrating individual saints’ feast days; and finally and definitively, the Synaxarion of Constantinople that consisted of a series of short notices describing the subject of each feast celebrated in the Great Church of St. Sophia. It must be noted that some figures achieved extraordinary status near to sainthood but never received that final elevation into the Synaxarion of Constantinople. The martyred 10th-century emperor Nikephoros II Phokas (963-69) is such a figure. Although the day of his death was commemorated for a time with a special office or akolouthia, his cult gained no official recognition in the Orthodox Church and soon disappeared (Dagron 2005). Although Psellos’ encomion and canon provided the faithful with a liturgical means to honor Symeon Metaphrastes, the two works did not survive together in the manuscript tradition.

The encomion apparently achieved some limited popularity, surviving in two manuscripts of the 13th century, one of the 14th and one of the 15th. However, Psellos’ canon for the Metaphrast barely survived at all, preserved only in a single manuscript of the late 13th or early 14th century as a part of an akolouthia for the Metaphrast. My current project seeks to determine whether the akolouthia incorporating Psellos’ canon was a composition of the Palaeologan period and effectively augmented Psellos’ compositions in order to provide a more robust resource for celebrating a feast in honor of Symeon the Metaphrast. The process of gaining holy status for the secular scholar Symeon Metaphrastes extended into the mid 15th century, when Mark Eugenikos composed the entry for St. Symeon Metaphrastes (November 28) in the Synaxarion of Constantinople and established in the calendar of the Great Church a feast honoring the “new” saint presented by Psellos some four centuries earlier.
The Letters of Michael Psellos and Their Function in Byzantine Epistolary Culture

Letters are normally preserved as coherent selections or larger collections in manuscripts. Modern editions mostly follow the classical approach of text editions that try to establish an archetypus. They often create the impression of a definitive and complete collection of one letter-writer; different stages of transmissions and variants in the wording of letters are abandoned into the apparatus criticus.

Although letters were originally exchanged they turned into literature; after being copied and stored by a learned audience they started a second life and sometimes they became model letters or were reused with slight modifications (Grünbart 2015).

New philology and digital edition techniques put special emphasis on textual variants and multi-faceted transmission. Scribes are no longer been seen as mechanically copying a text, but actively “reworking” and recycling it (Cerquiglini 1999 and Nichols 1990, 8). Variance is an inherent characteristic of medieval literature (Nichols 1990, 8-9). Cerquiglini and Nichols argue that each manuscript witness (“Textzeuge”) has to be treated as an equally important manifestation of medieval writing and as a characteristic usage of a certain piece of text. Both render traditional editorial methods unsuitable for these texts. Reading Byzantine letters the importance of variants become apparent because they are indicators of re-modelling and second-hand usage (see below). Another important issue of digital edition technique is that editors now deal with “documents” rather than “works” (Robinson 2013, 107), a premise that can perfectly adapted to Byzantine epistolography as well. A letter preserved in a manuscript is a unique document with an individual context.

In a project dealing with the Byzantine epistolary tradition in toto the ways of arranging collections and organizing letters in a single manuscript will be investigated. It should lead to a better understanding of Byzantine epistolary culture and the place of letter-writing in the educational system.

Problems of transmission become apparent in various cases. One of the most prominent examples is the correspondence of Michael Psellos. He belongs to the most prolific Byzantine letter-writers, his letters are preserved in many manuscripts (Papaioannou 1998 and 2013) and their new edition is expected eagerly (Papaioannou forthcoming). 515 letters are attributed to the scholar and politician (copied in 19 principals mss, and another 25 mss with individual pieces Papaioannou 2012, 301).

In an instructive article Stratis Papaioannou discussed the transmission of Byzantine letters (asking both how many manuscripts contain letters of a certain letter-writer and how many letter-writers are known by just a single manuscript, Papaioannou 2012, 291-295) and put special emphasis on collections of Michael Psellos (Papaioannou 2012).
The oeuvre of Psellos has turned into a classic some decades after the death of its composer (for Psellos’ Wirkungsgeschichte see Emmanuel Kriaras in Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft S XI, 1968, 1176—1179). This can be proven by theoretical statements of Byzantine scholars and by examples of reception or mimesis in the oeuvre of certain epistolographers. The grammarian Gregory of Corinth recommends a couple of models for letter-writings: Besides the canon of epistolographers flourishing in late antiquity he specifies and recommends Michael Psellos (Komines 1960, 128-129). The statement of Gregory can be confirmed by John Tzetzes, who discussion about him (Duffy 1998, Agiotis 2013) or by the praise of Michael Choniates who casts Psellos’ name together with Cato, Cicero, Arrian and Themistios (letter nr. 28 Kolovou).

But the works of the hypatos ton philosophon were not only venerated per se; there was also active involvement with them as they were both copied and reused. The anonymous excerpts and adaptations of Psellos’ Omnifaria doctrina in the famous Barocc. gr. 131 form a neat example (Pontikos 1992). It goes without saying that Psellos left traces in other genres like epistolography as well.

In the corpus of Euthymios Malaces, who belonged to the learned circle of Eustathios of Thessalonica, several letters are preserved that were taken from other letter-writers. The second letter in Bones’ edition is in fact a letter of Synesios with some minor changes, nevertheless the editor included it in the collection (Bones 1937). Letter 4 in the same edition can be identified as original Psellian or Ps.-Psellian composition. Malakes seems to appropriate an archetype for his own use (Gautier 1977, 105 nr. 13). The letter provides a classification: Δεητική, οἰκτοῦ δεόμενος (“a letter of request; a person who requires compassion”). It seems that Malakes’ version does not depend on an archetype (the Psellian piece being the second witness), but is in fact a reworked version of the original (the Psellian piece). Forms of address, lexicographic inventory and syntax have been altered, but the common material is striking (Grünbart 2003, 36-37). Paul Gautier noted the similarity between those two letters, but he revoked Psellos’ authorship.

Another example can be found in the sphere of Michael Choniates. 21 prooimia of letters have been published at the end of the edition of his epistles (Kolovou 2001, 288-291). Most of these pieces preserved in a Florentine manuscript. are borrowed from John Chrysostom, but one seems to have its roots in a Psellian original (Kolovou 2001, 289, l. 35-45, no notification of the similarity or provenance of the passage in the edition). It is a lengthy text comprising more than a prooimion of a letter. But exact reading shows small differences between these two versions while a further manuscript, not used by its editors Kurtz and Drexl, makes it clear that their edition did not base on the most reliable testimony. The manuscript nr. 508 of the Rumanian Academy of Sciences containing much unpublished material as the collection of the monk Hierotheos has not been taken into consideration. The Romanian and the Florentine manuscript (cod. Laur. Plut. 59,12) are more suitable for understanding the letter – the documents are presented in three columns:
It becomes apparent that the letter of Psellos served as model that was copied and slightly revised – the pieces are three documents used in different contexts. Psellos was kept as a model in the collection of proimia attributed to Michael Choniates (the last paragraph is missing). And it seems that the monk Hierotheos (3rd quarter of the 12th century; Grünbart forthcoming) re-used the Psellian piece with minor changes.

It becomes apparent that Byzantine epistolary culture was a vivid process of copying, remodelling and adapting predecessors’ letters into a new context. Traces of this habit can be found in the oeuvre of almost every Byzantine epistolographer. If we treat letters as documents and do not search exclusively for the original appearance of a message, that process can be visualized in a formidable manner. Michael Psellos will serve as prominent model.
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Michael Psellos on Rhetoric

The following investigation is focused on Psellos’ letters, in link with some of his discourses or opuscula directly relevant to the topic (such as his technical treatises, stylistic commentaries, or encomia of people endowed with special proficiency in rhetoric). The large corpus of Psellos’ correspondence offers indeed valuable material for the study of his views on rhetoric and the way he constructs his own image as an expert on the subject.

Quite a number of Psellos’ letters picture him as a rhetor active at the imperial court. In letters sent to various emperors, he presents himself as a demegoros, ready to compose encomia celebrating the virtues and high deeds of the emperor (KD 5 and S 3 to Romanos Diogenes, KD 29 to Konstantinos Doukas). He also repeatedly describes himself in the role of a lobbyist making use of his rhetorical skills to praise his addressees or support their cause in front of the emperor or other powerful personalities, sometimes successfully (he then congratulates himself on the efficiency of his eloquence: KD 48, S 8, S 156), sometimes vainly (he then complains about the inadequacy of circumstances and/or the deafness of the recipients of his discourses: KD 37, KD 49).

Psellos also appears as a teacher of rhetoric in some letters thus offering additional information to the autobiographical statements included in the Enkomion for his mother, the Letter to Michael Keroularios, epitaphoi for former pupils (Anastasios Lizix, or the referendarius Romanos), and in a series of oratoria minora (n° 18-25) or theologica addressed by Psellos ad discipulos. Psellos sometimes alludes to his work as a teacher, for instance in a letter to his fellow-student Romanos, where he speaks of two well-gifted (φυσεὶ δεξιοί) students with a passion for σχέδη: they have got through all the exercises Psellos had prepared for them and are asking for new ones, so that Psellos calls Romanos for help as a ταμεῖον σχεδῶν καὶ σίμβολον (KD 16). On the contrary, in a letter addressed to Aristenos, whose son was one of his students, he complains about the latters’ excessive fondness for Hermogenes, and pictures himself as a determined supporter of “ancient rhetoric”, that is a kind of rhetoric which Plato would not have dismissed, for it is “political, genuine, and little concerned with artificial beauty” (KD 224). We also possess some letters addressed by Psellos to present or former students, notably those written to a certain Kyritzes (KD 27 and 28, perhaps one and the same letter, and KD 210), characterized by their rather aggressive, polemical tone: Psellos is indeed discontent with Kyritzes’ attacks against philosophy and rhetoric and his preference for law studies, so that his letters offer a mix of reproaches, advice, and passionate advocacy of true rhetoric.

Psellos’ letters also include a rich amount of comments about his correspondents’ and his own style. The abundance of such descriptive material is partly due to the self-referential character typical of the epistolary genre, but it is a result as well of Psellos’ special concern with logoi – a concern testified by the place imparted in the Chronographia to remarks on the rhetorical capacities of all the actors of history. It is no surprise that Psellos, when complimenting his correspondents, regularly underlines the sweetness (γλυκότης) of their style, its grace (χάρις), and enchanting power
in line with the theory of the epistolary genre, which valued the very same features. More interestingly, in his stylistic comments, Psellos often makes use of technical terms, thus parading his expertise in rhetorical matters, for instance in KD 4, where he enumerates enthusiastically the various qualities of a friend’s letter (τὸν νοῦν, τὸ κάλλος, τὴν συνθήκην τῶν λέξεων, τὸν τῶν νοημάτων ρυθμόν, τὴν τῶν γραμμάτων ώραιότητα, τὴν τῶν στίχων ισότητα, τὴν ἀστείότητα τῶν συλλαβῶν, τὴν γλυκότητα); similarly, in a letter to John Doukas, evoking the latter’s praise of his own style, Psellos underlines the careful attention paid by John to every element of style, ἔννοια, λέξεις, σχῆμα, μέθοδος, ἁρμονία, ρυθμός, ἀνάπαυσις (G 5). Some letters even contain elaborate discussions on rhetorical questions, for instance KD 123 (to the krites of Aigaion), where Psellos, exploring the links between παρρησία and τέχνη, speaks highly of oblique, indirect (πλάγιος) logos, maintaining that, as far as discourse is concerned, straight blows are less efficient than oblique ones, inflicted with art (τέχνη). In S 174, in response to Nikephoros, nephew of the patriarch Keroularios, who had complained of the difficulty of his philosophical writings, Psellos vaunts the merits of ἀσάφεια, quoting as an example Aristotle and the Christian “philosophy”. In KD 45 (to John Mauropos) and S 11 (to Leon Paraspondylos), he develops considerations about the rules of the epistolary genre and the specificity of exchange through letters, whose aim (reflect the inner disposition of the writers) requires a minimum amount of art (the souls’ union, he says to Mauropos, is κατάτεχνος). Discussions of the kind are prominent in letters addressed to recipients with a professional interest in rhetoric: Mauropos, who had been Psellos’ teacher and is repeatedly called the father of his eloquence (KD 45, S 183), is a special partner for in depth exchanges about ρητορικὴ τέχνη (cf. KD 34, KD 105), and the three letters to a maistor of the rhetors published by Gautier (n° 18, 19, and 20) offer another striking example of rhetorical display, by means of which Psellos voices his intellectual complicity with the addressee.

Hermogenes was a cornerstone for the teaching of rhetoric in the Byzantine education system, and Psellos was inevitably familiar with his theories (in KD 31 he presents the “rhetorical method”, ρητορικὴν μέθοδον, as his “hobbies”, τὰ ἐμὰ παιδικά). He epitomized Hermogenes’ treatise On forms of style, and composed a didactic poem long of ca. 500 lines, offering a synthesis of four major works of the Hermogenian corpus, On issues, On invention, On forms, and the Pseudo-Hermogenian treatise On the method of force. But he also wrote epitomes of other ancient technical works by Dionysios of Halikarnassos and Longinos. He makes explicit references to these three theoreticians in several letters and/or other writings: Hermogenes is mentioned at least eight times (Chron. 6, 197 bis, Or. for. 3, Or. min. 8, Theol. I, 19 and I, 27, Poem. 7 and 68 [spur.], S 174, KD 20 [dub.], KD 224); Longinos is quoted seven times (Or. min. 8, Theol. I, 56, I, 75 and I, 98, Char. Theol., Rhet., KD 28), and Dionysios five times (twice in Theol. I, 98 and Char. Theol., once in Theol. II, 16). Isolated references to other more or less famous τεχνικοί include Thrasyamakos and Hegasias (Theol. I, 25), Nikagoras and Priskos (KD 28), Hadrianos of Tyr and Sopatros (Or. min. 8).

Psellos’ explicit allusions to Hermogenes testify his familiarity with both the latter’s biography (Chron. 6, 197 bis) and his rhetorical theories: he twice underlines the centrality of Demosthenes to the Hermogenian doctrine (Or. for. 3, Theol. I, 19) and also rightly comments upon Hermogenes’ high regard for clarity (S 174). In the above mentioned letters to a maistor of the rhetors, he makes repeated use of technical terms borrowed from Hermogenes’ On issues and On invention, speaking of κατάστασις (exposition) and προκατάστασις (pre-exposition), ἀνθροισμός (counter-definition) and συλλογισμός (assimilation); he quotes the Hermogenian definitions of ἐπιφώνημα, περίοδος
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and ἐπιχειρήματα, and successively paraphrases the incipit of the treatises On issues, On invention and On forms, by way of playful connivance with his correspondent. Most conspicuous is the influence of Hermogenes’ theory of forms (ἰδεαί) on Psellos’ stylistic judgments, heavily indebted to the Hermogenian terminology.

But the part played by Dionysios of Halikarnassos on Psellos’ aesthetic conceptions seems considerable too. His frequent use of musical images to describe rhetorical performances (e.g. KD 86, S 156, S 176, G 10), his many references to harmony (KD 222, KD 231, S 110...) may be a result of his close reading of Dionysios’ treatises, for Dionysios’ aesthetics is characterized by the importance given to the sonority of words: auditory impression is central in his appreciation of literary works, and he even defines the “science of political eloquence” as “a sort of music” (Comp. 11, 13). Dionysios’ contrasting description (Comp. 21, 3) of an “austere harmony” (αὐστηρά) and a “smooth one” (γλαφυρά) is recognizable in KD 45, where Psellos says to Mauropous that “the pursuit of smooth words” (ἡ θέρα τῶν γλαφυρῶν λέξεων) is undesirable in epistolary exchange, or in S 125, where he apologizes for the plain style of his letter, on the pretext that, living in a rustic environment, he has lost “any talent for smoothing” (... τι γλαφυρόν). Another image frequently used in Psellos’ letters and other texts dealing with rhetoric may have been inspired by his reading of Dionysios: that of a “theatrical” oratory, exuberant and vulgar, Psellos opposes to more decent and philosophical modes of expression (S 110: τῆς δημώδους ταύτης ῥητορικῆς... τῆς πολυτελοῦς τε καὶ θεατρικῆς // τῆς ἀφελοῦς καὶ σεμνοτάτης φιλοσοφίας... τῆς θεατρικῆς καὶ ἀκόλουθον // τῆς ἀφελοῦς καὶ σεμνοτάτης φιλοσοφίας). In Dionysios’ treatises the word θεατρικός is indeed often applied to smooth harmony, whereas it is completely lacking in the Hermogenian corpus. Similarly, Psellos’ frequent use of the adjective φυσικός to characterize simple style (KD 45, KD 135, KD 159) is probably reminiscent of Dionysios, where φυσικός appears quite often with the same meaning.

Considerations about kinds of style often interfere in Psellos’ letters with remarks about levels of style. In quite a number of passages, Psellos incites his correspondents, supposedly impressed and reduced to silence by his high rhetorical skills, to write him in the most simple style: the motif occurs prominently in letters addressed to ecclesiastics (KD 88 and KD 135, to the patriarch of Antioch; KD 267 and S 27, to monks), but also in letters to supplicants (KD 158), or friends (KD 136, KD 147, KD 264). In these letters Psellos urges his correspondents to write as plainly as they speak (KD 88); he often associates plain language with high spirituality (KD 88, KD 267, S 27), but also links disregard for the beauty of words with philosophical ethos (KD 158) or with old age’s disinterest in stylistic embellishments (KD 88). Other letters present a reversed picture, with Psellos apologizing for his use of low style in letters to correspondents some of whose are described as prominent intellectuals (KD 25, S 125); to explain his choice of a low register, Psellos puts to the fore his closeness to the addressee (KD 25, to his fellow-student George), special kairos making rhetoric undeserved or impossible (S 102, S 25, S 186) or, with typical Constantinopolitan snobbery, the deleterious influence of a rustic/barbarian environment (S 125, G 11). When exploiting such a “discourse of modesty”, Psellos sometimes recurs to a typically self-referential play of words by introducing the verb ψελλίζειν (“falter in speech”) or its compounds (ὑποψελλίζειν, παραψελλίζειν) as a pretence of simplicity/self-deprecating (S 3, S 152, KD 105).

In the various letters dealing with levels of style, the contrast between highbrow and lowbrow expression is often expressed through references to “Atticism”, meant to design learned Greek,
that is a language understandable only to the small part of educated Byzantines. Psellos contrasts ἀττικίζειν with ἁπλῶς λέγειν (S 11) and with κοινολεκτέιν (KD 91), he opposes “Attic language” (ἀττική τῇ γλώσσῃ) to “sincere and unelaborate” diction (ἁπλῶς καὶ ἀκατασκεύως), “simple expression” (ἀφελῆ) to “honey of the Hymettos” (S 125). He regularly parades his ability to practise Atticism (see S 145, where he boasts of twisting a crown ἐξ Ἀττικῶν συνηρμοσμένων λειμώνων for Andronikos Doukas). In G 15, alluding to his international reputation as a teacher, he ironizes with feigned modesty upon the exaggerations of his correspondents (Aemilianos, patriarch of Antioch), according to whom he teaches the “Attic language” even to the Arabs!

In a letter to a (perhaps different) patriarch of Antioch (KD 135), Psellos equates his Atticism with “Platonic” style, he opposes to the “evangelic sincerity” of his addressee. In KD 27, it is no longer Plato, but Demosthenes who is quoted as an example of Atticism, and contrasted with three Sophists of the classical times, Gorgias, Hippias and Polos. Gorgias and Polos are similarly associated in Theol. I, 98, where Psellos explains to students admiring philosophy alone why he is interested in rhetoric too, and in which kind of rhetoric: he does not intend imitating Gorgias, Polos and their kind, but authors practising philosophical rhetoric, like Dio of Prusa. Another reference to a similar Sophistic triad should perhaps be assumed in S 174, where Psellos opposes a vulgar, theatrical form of rhetoric to a modest one, and curses Λυσίας καὶ Πώλος καὶ Καλλικλέως, as representatives of the first style. The combination, in the present form of the text, of Lysias’ name with Polos’ and Callicles’ seems indeed quite surprising, all the more so since Psellos usually cites the Athenian logographos as an example of a simple, natural mode of expression, in line with the rhetorical tradition, which considered Lysias as a model of clarity: it seems therefore rather tempting to suppose that, at some stage in the transmission of the text, the name of Lysias inadvertently substituted for that of Gorgias, better fitted in the context.

Nevertheless, one must remark that Psellos’ view of “Sophistic” is somewhat fluctuating, for he twice quotes Gorgias’ name in a positive way, in Theol. II, 6 where, presenting Gregory of Nazianzus as a rhetor and a philosopher, he describes him ἐν πολλοῖς Γοργιάζων καὶ τριψων τῷ πλούτῳ καὶ τῷ κάλλει τῶν λέξεων, and again in letter S 182 where, boasting of his own rhetorical skills, he compares his style with Gorgias’ “grandiloquence” (μεγαλοφωνία). Psellos’ use of terms such as σοφίζεσθαι, σόφισμα, σοφιστικός is characterised by its ambivalence. To be sure, we can find quite a number of passages where he employs these words in a critical way, to describe stylistic affectation, often in contrast with plain, unpretentious style (KD 136, KD 264), and he occasionally associates Sophistic with a liking for dissimulation (cf. KD 185, where he puts τῶν σοφισμάτων on a par with τῷ παραλογισμῷ and τῶν ἐν λόγους μεταμορφώσεων). But he more often uses the term “Sophistic” to mean what we would call the “science of language”, when he wants to insist on the technical aspect of rhetoric (see in S 42 the equation between σοφιστική and τέχνη on the one hand, φιλοσοφία and ἐπιστήμη on the other hand). Consequently, Psellos does not hesitate to mention his “Sophistic” formation (τὴν γλώτταν ταῖς σοφιστικαῖς τέχναις ἐκάθητα), when he sums up his intellectual career in his famous letter to Michael Keroularios; he calls his chair of rhetoric in Constantinople a sophistikos thronos (S 189); and he also prides himself on his ability to combine philosophy and “Sophistic” (S 42).

If Psellos once compares himself to the Sophist Gorgias, he also identifies with other orators of the classical times, Lysias (Chron. 7a, 26), Aeschines (KD 27), and of course Demosthenes, praised by all the ancient theorists for his unsurpassable δεινωτής: Psellos even appropriates
several of the latter’s sayings, drawn from his speech Against Midias (S 139) and from his celebrated self-referential discourse On the crown (Or. min. 8 and 9). Such a role play mirrors Psellos’ well known versatility, for he successively endorses the persona of authors endowed with rather different rhetorical profiles, thus claiming his ability to succeed in every kind of eloquence. He often parades his stylistic flexibility, and describes himself ready to fit any of his correspondents' capacities and expectations, in exploiting the whole range of the literary spectrum, from the most sophisticated style to the most humble, from the most purist Greek to the most colloquial, even Barbarian language! Prone to identify with Proteus, he also compares himself to the titmouse (αἰγίθαλος), which imitates the voice of every bird it encounters (KD 135).

Psellos' adoption of a multiplicity of rhetorical models may be explained by his proclaimed dissatisfaction with any of them. Indeed, none of the orators of the classical Greece escapes Psellos’ criticism. In S 102, he blames Isocrates for resorting to stylistic embellishments right in the middle of difficult circumstances, regardless of the constraints of kairos. In his Encomium for John Mauropos, he finds fault with Lysias’ meanness, he scornfully contrasts with the grandeur of Mauropos’ style. In Theol. I, 98, Demosthenes in his turn is criticized for his uneveness, and proclaimed inferior to Gregory of Nazianzus, who is able to handle all forms of style, and thus outshines the ancient orator, as an eagle outshines a jay.

In adopting a polemical stance, Psellos aims at putting forward his independence of mind and advertising his own originality. Such a pretence appears clearly in the various passages where he disparages the ancient theoreticians of rhetoric, and boasts he will be able to complete, correct, or improve their doctrines (Or. for. 3, Or. min. 8, Theol. I, 98). It shows as well through the reluctance he sometimes expresses in following intellectual fashions (KD 224), and conforming to norms, especially in one of his encomia for Constantine Monomachos (Or. pan. 5), where he proclaims he does not want to imitate the orators who praise the emperor according to the rules of rhetoric (τεχνικῶς), for the observance of usual standards is in that case ἄτεχνον, inasmuch as the virtues of the laudendus are far above any standard. Psellos therefore professes to prove τεχνικώτερος by transgressing the rules of art (τούς τής τέχνης κανόνας).
Psellos’ Philosophical Works

One may consider an open question whether Psellos was a philosopher or not. Indeed it more or less depends on the definition one gives to the term philosopher in order to make him fit in it or to exclude him. What is certain is that Psellos was nominated consul of the philosophers, probably in 1047 (Lefort 1976). Even the term ὑπάτος τῶν φιλοσόφων is not very clear or how long he actually held such a position. Nevertheless John Duffy and Dominic O’Meara have rendered a great service providing two editions of his Philosophica Minora published by Teubner (Duffy 1992 and O’Meara 1989). These two volumes combine into more than five hundred pages of Greek text of Psellos’ philosophical works. Paul Moore in his Iter Psellianum of 2003 lists 171 philosophical works associated with Psellos. He divides them into four different sections according to their topics: a) general and logical b) physics and meteorology c) miscellaneous and allegorical d) psychological theological and demonological works. Of these 171 essays and treatises, 103 can be found in the two Teubner editions. This makes a very handy and useful situation. It is therefore possible to obtain an overview of his ideas through what is published without having to turn constantly to manuscripts. Psellos’ main eccentricity seems to be his interest in the Neoplatonist Proclus, as he explicitly states in the Chronographia 6.38. He prefers him over other Neoplatonists which are now more fashionable, such as Plotinus or Porphyry and his references to Iamblichus and Damascius are quite rare. Such a characteristic is useful to detect if works are spurious or not, with the proviso that not every text which mentions Proclus is necessarily by Psellos (one may think, for instance, that Symeon Seth mentions the Chaldean oracles and Proclus).

The two issues mentioned, whether Psellos is a philosopher or not and the authenticity of some of his work depends on the interpretation of his philosophical works. With the help of Paul Moore’s Iter Psellianum of 2003 one may indicate some points: there are 171 philosophical treatises. Of these 96 essays do not have a single article written about them. That is 56%. If one takes away the essays that only have one article written about them, that leaves 133 essays which have one article or none. That is 77% of essays. These articles frequently do not present discussions about the content, but only bibliographical notices which discuss questions of transmission, such as manuscripts. Therefore one may safely say that three quarters of Psellos’ philosophical works still need something written about their content from a philosophical point of view. Before focusing on what is missing one should turn to what has interested researchers until now.

The focus has been on essays discussing divination and esoteric readings (Phil. Min. I.32-36 Duffy), allegorical interpretation (Phil Min I.42-48 Duffy), Chaldean Oracles (Phil. Min II.38 O’Meara), the question of the soul described in the Timaeus of Plato according to Proclus (Phil. Min. II.4,6,29 O’Meara). These four topics reveal an interest of using Psellos’ texts as sources to study other authors. He is an important source for Porphyry’s allegorical readings of ancient myths. He is the main source for the text of the Chaldean Oracles; he preserves discussions on divination and
esoteric readings which probably derive from lost neoplatonic texts and finally he seems familiar with Proclus’ psychology. Moreover all these topics are discussed in other texts of Psellos. For example, in the text of the prosecution against patriarch Cerularios (Dennis 1994), there is much material on the Chaldean oracles which has not been employed to disentangle Psellos’ understanding of the topic. Westerink had used another essay of Psellos to establish the existence and content of a commentary of Proclus on the Enneads of Plotinus (Westerink 1959). This famous article however dismissed Psellos’ letters claiming that there could be no real interest in philosophy and therefore his letters on philosophical topics were ‘pure fiction.’ This antiquarian interest in Psellos’ writings with the sole aim of finding fragments of ancient thinkers seems to have guided some of the critical literature. Thus it appears that the interest in Psellos is driven by what he may yield as information about ancient philosophy. In a nutshell: quellenforschung and codicology have been a priority.

If one turns to Philosophica Minora I (Duffy 1992), such a tendency may explain why the essays on meteorological phenomena have no articles (Phil Min. I.20-29). Or his interest in the Prior Analytics of Aristotle (Phil. Min. I.8-15), or his interest in dreams (Phil. Min. I. 38) or Hades (Phil. Min I. 39-40). Surprising is the lack of interest in the logical question of the five voices (Phil. Min. I.51). This debate seems to be essential both in Psellos and Italos who discuss the topic and specifically the meaning of being and existence in relation to the five voices. The lack of study of these subjects may be because they are not interesting. However these are precisely the topics which are found in other authors of the time. The question of natural phenomena, in general about physiology, is clearly important to thinkers such as Symeon Seth and Italos, as well as religious writers. Logical questions are not only discussed extensively by Italos, but also by the Anonymous Heiberg in 1007 (Heiberg 1928). The status of Hades or Hell appears in other contemporary authors as well. Therefore it becomes clear that those texts which allow Psellos to fit in the intellectual milieu of his contemporaries are those which are left aside and may support the impression that he was unusually original compared to his contemporaries.

In the Philosophica Minora II (O’Meara 1989) edited by O’Meara, thirty one essays had no articles in Moore’s bibliography. It is striking that in this volume there are numerous treatises on the soul and especially on the connection between body and soul. Of 31 essays dedicated to this topic only 4 have articles, illustrating the lack of interest in Psellos’ psychology. The main recent exception being the study on the pneumatic body (Delli 2007). Of course his three essays on the Chaldean Oracles have been studied (Phil. Min. II.38-40) (most recently Seng 2013). However an essay on Assyrian wisdom (Phil. Min. II.41) has been left aside, as well as his study on sacrifice (Phil. Min. II.42) and on demons (Phil. Min. II.45) as well as the future (Phil. Min. II.46). The lack of interest in Psellos’ studies on the soul is striking since this can also place him better in the context of the eleventh century. If one thinks of the writings of Symeon the New Theologian and Niketas Stethatos, the question of the soul is important. Also the tale of Barlaam and Ioasaph deals with the soul. Moreover Psellos’ demonology needs more detailed study (see also Larionov 2011). One should not forget that Marsilio Ficino in the 15th century translated the De Daemonibus of Psellos into Latin and Coleridge quoted Psellos’ demonology in his Rime of the Ancient Mariner of 1797.

Therefore it appears that despite the edition of Duffy 1992 and O’Meara 1989 Psellos is somehow considered a repository of quotations of other writers. His interest in logic, psychology and demonology are left aside in favour of his preservation of Porphyr’s allegorical readings or the transmission of the Chaldean Oracles. Thus it is difficult to detect what is genuinely by Psellos
or not. In this context arose the debate around Psellos’ commentary to the Physics of Aristotle (Phi. 27 Moore 2003) published by Benakis in 2008. Golitzis (2007) argued that the commentary was by Pachymeres. The debate is important and interesting and reveals the need to study Psellos’ perception of Aristotle as well as his interest in physiology which seems to become prominent in the 1060s.

The question of ethics needs to be addressed as well. This brings one to the matter of a neoplatonic ethics versus an Aristotelian one. There is a doctoral dissertation on the question carried out by Denis Walter. It seems to be rather a central question in view of study of the various ethics in the 12th century but especially for the philosophical interpretation of the Chronographia which appears to be a study in people’s behaviour. It seems that studies in Psellos ethics are just beginning. Nevertheless the Chronographia has been a central focus for broader philosophical questions. It gave rise to the idea that Psellos had a secret humanist agenda (Kaldellis 1999) or even a neopagan idea of philosophy. On the other side Zervos (1920) had argued that Psellos fits within an orthodox framework. This is based on the modern notion of honesty or dissimulation in his official behaviour. There is also the question of his secret agenda, a view supported by his study of the Chaldean oracles, interpreted as an esoteric text. These questions are inextricably tied to Psellos’ orthodoxy and view of religion. On the surface, he does not seem to see any particular problem either with pagan philosophy or Christian theology and he often mixes the two and combines them in ways which are recognizable and typical of his taste. In terms of future research it may be useful to search for Christian religious questions in philosophical texts and philosophical discussions within Christian theology.

To conclude one may offer some questions pointing to possible avenues of research:

What interest does Psellos have in Proclus?

What does Psellos know about Aristotelian logic?

What does esoteric mean for Psellos?

Does Psellos distinguish between Christianity and paganism? And if so, at what level and to what extent?

Is Psellos interested in ethics?

Does he have an opinion about predestination, fate and time?

These are some of the topics which he seems to address in his essays in Philosophica Minora I and II. The question underlying them is whether he has an antiquarian interest or he is part of a philosophical debate with his contemporaries.
Die *Chronographia* des Michael Psellos als Werk mündlicher Prosa

Soweit ich sehe, hat Herbert Hunger als erster in „Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner“, darauf hingewiesen, wenn auch nur beiläufig, dass Psellos seine *Chronographia* wie auch andere seiner Werke nicht eigenhändig geschrieben, sondern diktiert hat. Hunger schreibt, dass Psellos „beim Diktieren seiner Werke die Umgangssprache mit einbezog“. Hunger hat auch die entscheidende Stelle zitiert, an welcher Psellos das *expressis verbis* sagt (*Chronogr.* VI 73,10-11). Er habe, so Psellos, bei seiner Darstellung vieles weggelassen, was die Verfasser von Geschichtswerken üblicherweise mitzuteilen pflegen, vor allem Einzelheiten militärischer Ereignisse, er habe seine *ἱστορία* auch nicht nach Olympiaden oder Jahreszeiten wie Thukydides organisiert, sondern sich auf das beschränkt, was er für das Wesentliche hielt: ἀπλῶς οὕτωσι τὰ ἐπικαιρότατα ταύτης (sc. τῆς ἱστορίας) ὑπαγορέυσας.

ὑπαγορέυω bedeutet hier und an den anderen Stellen, an denen Psellos das Wort gebraucht, ohne Zweifel „diktieren“. Mehrere dieser Diktat-Situationen werden in der *Chronographia* unter Gebrauch des Wortes ὑπαγορέω beschrieben: Basileios II. diktierte (ὑπηγόρεε) den Schreibern kaiserlicher Urkunden, was ihm gerade auf die Zunge kam. Konstantin VIII. diktierte (ὑπηγόρεεν) die kaiserlichen Schreiben mit einer solchen Geschwindigkeit des Diktierens (τῶν ὑπηγορευμένων), dass seine ὀξυγράφοι zu stenographischen Zeichen Zuflucht nehmen mussten. Der Volksaufstand gegen Michael V. traf Psellos selbst an, wie er gerade als Hypogrammateus kaiserliche Schreiben diktierte (ὑπαγορέυοντα). Konstantin IX. diktierte (ὑπηγόρεευεν) aus Misstrauen gegen seinen Sekretär Psellos seine Briefe an den Kalifen selbst. Die Gesandten, die Michael VI. zum Usurpator Isaak Komnenos geschickt hatte, trafen diesen an, wie er gerade ein Schreiben an den Kaiser diktierte (ὑπαγορεύοντα).

Im Umkreis der Regierungsspitze in Konstantinopel ist das Vorhandensein von Schreibern, denen man diktiert, eine Selbstverständlichkeit, und Psellos hatte wohl immer, seit seiner Stellung als ὑπογραμματεύς, Schreiber zur Verfügung, denen er diktierte und von denen er sich vorlesen ließ, so auch, nachdem Michael VII. ein literarisches Selbstportait verfasst hatte, welches er Psellos zur Verwendung in dessen Darstellung zusandte. Da las der ὑπογραφεύς Psellos das Elaborat vor, und Psellos hörte dem ἀνάγνωσμα zu (VII 175).

Die Unstimmigkeiten und „Fehler“, die Treadgold mit der spontanen Diktiersituation erklärt, sind allerdings nicht unbedingt einleuchtend, z.B. was die Abstammung von Basileios Parakoimomenos betrifft, die Psellos wohl eher absichtlich hinauszustilisieren hatte, idem er behauptet (13), der Parakoimomenos stamme vom selben Vater ab wie Basileios II. und Konstantin VIII. Die vielen Text-Irrtümer im *codex unicus* gehen sicher nicht auf das Konto des diktiierenden Autors oder seines Schreibers (für die phonetischen Fehler hatte man das schon vorher als Möglichkeit angenommen), sondern auf das Konto der Überlieferung und des inneren Diktats der Kopisten. Zweifellos richtig aber ist, dass „the organization of the Chronography is loose and episodic … like a series of stories told from memory“ (S. 298). So erklärt sich auch (von Treadgold in diesem Zusammenhang angeführt) die doppelte Erzählung von der Thronbesteigung Konstantins X. Dukas, deren zweite Fassung einerseits ein ganz anderes Bild von der Rolle vermittelt, die Psellos dabei gespielt hat, aber andererseits z.B. einen Vergleich Konstantins mit Achilleus bis in Einzelheiten der Formulierung hinein wiederholt, was bei einer Revision des Diktierten so niemals stehengeblieben wäre.

Schon Walter Ong hat in seinem Klassiker „Orality and Literacy“ von 1982 allgemein darauf hingewiesen, dass die Diktat-Situation auch orale Strukturen eines Textes begünstigt. Auf die Seite der oralen Strukturen gehören in der *Chronographia* die außerordentlich zahlreichen Rückverweise innerhalb des Textes. Ein typisches Beispiel liegt in VI 151 vor: Dort spricht Psellos von der Alanischen Prinzessin, die sich Konstantin IX. nach dem Tod der Maria Skleraina als Konkubine genommen hat mit dem Rückverweis ὡς μοι καὶ ἄνω ποὺ τοῦ λόγου λέλεκται. Dieses ἄνω ποὺ liegt gerade einmal 6 Kapitel zurück, wo Psellos mit identischen oder ganz ähnlichen Wendungen dieselbe Person und ihr Verhältnis zum Kaiser beschrieben hatte. Dort lesen wir auch den entsprechenden Vorverweis. Andere Vorverweise sind blind, so in IV 8, wo von der natürlichen Begabung Michaels IV. die Rede ist, in Rechtsfällen die richtige Entscheidung zu treffen, das ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ περὶ τούτων aber nicht eingelöst wird, oder in VI 43,11-12, wo Psellos ankündigt, von seiner unentgeltlichen Lehrtätigkeit zu sprechen, was er dann ebenfalls nicht tut. Typisch ist für die Vorverweise die ἀναμεινάτω-Formel, die Psellos auch in anderen seiner Werke und in der *Chronographia* vier Mal gebraucht: Ein bestimmtes Teilthema soll noch etwas warten. In dieselbe Kategorie gehören auch andere Überleitungen, die wie diese typisch für mündliche Genera wie z.B. das Märchen sind: In VI 65 sagt Psellos, er wolle noch etwas über die Kaiserin Zoe sprechen, solange (in seiner Erzählung) der Kaiser bei der Skleraina ruhe; das nimmt er VI 68 wieder auf: „Nachdem wir nun unsere Erzählung bis hierhin haben gelangen lassen, wollen wir sie wieder zur Sebaste und zum Autokrator zurückrufen und die beiden, wenn es denn gefällt, aufwecken und voneinander trennen.“ Das ist der leichte Ton des souveränen Märchenerzählers, der sich auch in überleitenden Wendungen wie εἶτα τί γίνεται oder εἶτα γίνεται ταύτα τοιοῦτον niederschlägt.

Spontan unterbricht sich der Erzähler an einigen Stellen mit der Bemerkung, er habe etwas vergessen: In den Ausführungen über Konstantin IX. möchte er über die Krankheit des Kaisers sprechen und schickt dem die Bemerkung voraus: „Was ich aber vor allem anderen vergessen habe zu schildern“. In Bezug auf Konstantin X. Dukas sagt er (VII 110): „Was ich jedoch oben vergessen habe zu berichten, das will ich jetzt, da ich mich daran erinnere, erzählen.“ Im Bericht über die Schlacht von Mantzikert (VII 141) hat die Formel „was ich vergessen habe zu sagen“ da, sie nicht als solche erkannt und falsch interpretiert wurde, zum Missverständnis geführt, Psellos habe an diesem Feldzug persönlich teilgenommen. Dort heißt es ὃ δὲ μὲ διελθεῖν: ἐλαθεί τοῦτον αὐτός δὴ ὁ σουλτάν ... συνὼν τῷ στρατεύματι („Was ich vergessen habe [zu sagen]: Ihm [sc. Romanos Diogenes] war verborgen geblieben, dass der Sultan in eigener Person … bei seinem Heer war.“).
Da die Herausgeber des Textes nicht verstanden haben, dass es sich bei ο δέ με διελαθεν um die Ebene des Erzählers und nicht des Erzählten handelt, hat Renauld (gefolgt von Impellizzeri) vor διελαθεν ein <ου> konjiziert, und alle Übersetzer (mit der einzigen Ausnahme von Ljubarskij, richtig verstanden hatte die Stelle auch Sykritus) haben übersetzt im Sinne von „was mir nicht, wohl aber ihm entgangen war“, und Eva De Vries-van der Velden hat dann ausführlich über Psellos‘ angebliche Teilnahme am Desaster von Mantzikert gehandelt.

Die orale Produktion des Textes durch den Autor Psellos korrespondiert mit den weitgehend mündlichen Quellen, auf welche Psellos dort zurückgreift, wo er nicht ohnehin selbst als Augen- und Ohrenzeuge seine eigene Quelle ist. Psellos ist wie in der Antike Herodot, Thukydides, Xenophon, Polybios und andere sowie in Frühbyzanz Prokop ein oraler Historiker, der sich fast ausschließlich auf sein eigenes Erleben und auf mündliche Quellen stützt. Er ist damit der erste byzantinische Historiker, der dies nach Prokop tut; nach Psellos ist es wieder fast die Regel, von Nikephoros Bryennios bis hin zu Dukas und Kritobulos von Imbros.

Psellos selbst wird nicht müde, auf seine mündlichen Gewährsleute hinzuweisen. Meistens geschieht das durch generelle Angaben wie ος ο λόγος έχει (über den Charakter Basileios' II.), λόγος ώστε (über die Gründe für den vorzeitigen Tod Romanos' III.), ος ο των πολλών λόγος (über die Liebschaften Romanos' III.), φασι γούν οι και τάλα πρός τούτο συνείροντες (über die Ermordung Romanos' III.), φασι γούν τινες των μη πάνω πρός το έκείνου γένος ευμενός έχοντων (über Michael IV., er sei den Einflüssen von Zauberern gefolgt), φασι γούν (über die jugendlichen Kräfte des Monomachos), άκοιομεν (über die Schönheit des jugendlichen Monomachos), ος δε έγώ πολλών ήκουσα (über die tapferen Taten des Romanos Diogenes bei Mantzikert) und Ähnliches. An nicht wenigen Stellen benennt Psellos seine Gewährsleute auch konkret: So habe ihm, dem πατήρ του λόγου, der bulgarische Prinz Alusianos selbst erzählt, dass Psellos ihm in Konstantinopel mehrfach begegnet sei, ihn aber in seiner Verkleidung nicht erkannt habe. Von der pathetischen Klagerede der von Michael V. verbannten Zoe hätten ihm später die Leute berichtet, die damit beauftragt waren, sie auf die Insel Prinkipos zu bringen. Für die Liebesaffäre zwischen Zoe und dem späteren Kaiser Michael IV. konnte sich Psellos, wie er sagt, auf die Informationen eines im Palast ein- und ausgehenden Mannes stützen, der die ganze Geschichte kannte und ihm, Psellos, den Stoff für seine Darstellung geliefert habe (άπασαν της βασιλιδος την έρωτικην ειδότος υπόθεσιν καμοι τας άφορμας της ιστοριας διδόντος).

Nur an einer einzigen Stelle erwähnt Psellos schriftliche Quellen, dort nämlich, wo es um die Jugendzeit Basileios' II. geht: ος δε έγώ των άρχαιολογούντων περι αυτων έξωγραφεων έκουσα. Für den späteren Basileios konnte er dann bereits wieder auf die mündlichen Einschätzungen seines Charakters derjenigen zurückgreifen, οσι ουν καθ' ήμας τεθεανται των βασιλεα βασιλεων. Zu Beginn des dritten Buches, wo mit der Herrschaft Romanos' III. Psellos' persönliche Kenntnis einsetzt, spricht er rückblickend auf Basileios II. und Konstantin VIII. nicht speziell von schriftlichen Quellen, sondern nur davon, dass er Romanos skizziert, ohne sich auf Dritte zu stützen, während er sich für seine Ausführungen über dessen beide Vorgänger auf fremde Quellen stützen musste (περι έκειων μεν έξ έτερων τας άφορμας εληφως είρηκα- τούτων δε αυτως υπογράφω, ου παρ' έτερων μεμαθηκως).

Falls es ein vom Redaktor später entferntes Anfangskapitel mit dem Tod des Ioannes Tzimiskes gegeben hat, wofür vieles spricht, kommen auch dafür schriftliche Quellen in Frage, natürlich in erster Linie Leon Diakonos, möglicherweise (aber nicht zwingend) gab es auch eine schriftliche Quelle für den Feldzug Romanos' III. gegen Aleppo.
Überhaupt nicht auf irgendwelche Quellen, weder mündlicher noch schriftlicher Art (obwohl alle Übersetzer es so verstanden haben), bezieht sich Psellos’ Bemerkung zu Beginn von II 2: τοῦτον τὸν ἄνδρα (sc. Konstantin VIII.) ὑπογράφων ὁ λόγος τοιούτον δηλοῖ. Hier bezeichnet ὁ λόγος, wie an vielen anderen Stellen der Chronographia ebenfalls, den Logos (die Rede, das Werk) des Autors Psellos, welcher ein Bild des Kaisers skizziert. ὑπογράφων ist natürlich auf λόγος bezogenes Partizip, nicht etwa nach Meinung Treadgolds (291 n. 97) ein genetivus pluralis, der dann die „writers“ meinen könnte, die hier als Quellen für Konstantins Charakter genannt würden.

Eine mündliche Quelle, die bis in die Lebenszeit Basileios‘ II. zurückreicht, ist auch Isaak Komnenos. Am Abend vor der krisenhaften Zuspitzung seiner Krankheit, so berichtet Psellos (VII 76), schien es Isaak besser zu gehen, er war in euphorischer Stimmung, erzählte viel und unterhielt diejenigen, die bei ihm waren, mit Bonmots, die er sicherlich nicht selbst (geboren ca. 1007) aus dem Mund von Basileios gehört hatte, sondern seinerseits aus mündlicher Tradition kannte. Zu diesen ἀποφθέγματα des Basileios, die von Isaak erzählt wurden, gehörte eventuell auch das, was er, wie auch von Skylitzes bestätigt, gesagt haben soll, als man den Rebellen Bardas Skleros nach dessen Kapitulation, vom Alter gebeugt und auf beiden Seiten gestützt, vor ihn führte (I 27): „Sieh da, den ich gefürchtet hatte, der kommt auf fremde Hände gestützt schutzflehend zu mir.“

Andere solcher Apophthegmata hat Psellos selbst gesammelt; von Konstantin X. Dukas hat er einen ganzen Cluster überliefert (VII 121).

Mündlichkeit, die sich in der Chronographia als Dialog präsentiert, hat Psellos hingegen, sofern er nicht selbst als Dialogpartner oder Ohrenzeuge beteiligt war, aus der geschilderten Situation heraus erfunden. Ein Charakteristikum dieses historischen Werkes besteht ja darin, dass in ihm die großen Reden, besonders die Feldherrnreden in der Tradition des Thukydides, fehlen. Farbe und Unmittelbarkeit gewinnt die Darstellung wie die seines literarischen Vorbildes Plutarch durch die Apophthegmata und eben die Dialoge, die Psellos auch dort einfügt, wo sie ihm keine fremde Quelle übermitteln konnte, wie z.B. die lange und lebhafe geheime Unterredung zwischen dem Orphanotrophos Ioannes und seinem Bruder, Kaiser Michael IV. (IV 20-22). Hier konnte es schlechterdings keinen Ohrenzeugen geben, und doch gibt Psellos das Gespräch so lebendig wieder, als sei er selbst dabeigewesen.


In allen solchen ErzählEinheiten, die Psellos selbst an vielen Stellen διήγημα bzw. διήγησις nennt (ebenso gebraucht er oft das Verb διηγοῦμαι) dominiert die mündliche Situation, und das wird auch dadurch deutlich, dass er seine Rezipienten niemals als ἀναγνώσται, sondern als

Für uns ist diese mündliche Praxis weitgehend verloren, aber nicht ganz, wissen wir doch ziemlich genau, wie die griechischen Schriftzeichen der byzantinischen Zeit in Laute umzusetzen sind, und für den Satzrhythmus haben wir zumindest für die Zeit ab dem 9. Jahrhundert die Vorgaben der Akzentuierung und der Interpunktion, vorausgesetzt sie finden so, wie sie überliefert sind, auch Eingang in unsere modernen Editionen.

Die Chronographia des Michael Psellos ist in besonderem Maße der zeitgeschichtliche Vermittlungspunkt zwischen der Oralität der Quellen einerseits und der Auralität des rezipierenden Publikums andererseits. Die fast auschließlich mündlichen Quellen sind durch das Diktat des Autors zu einem λόγος verarbeitet, der durch den oder die Schreiber mit Hilfe von Buchstaben, Akzenten und Interpunktionszeichen festgehalten wurde, damit er als akustischer Akt wiederbelebt und wahrgenommen werden kann, gleichgültig ob sich das im sozialen Kontext eines θέατρον abspielt, oder ob die Stimme des Lesers nur an die eigenen Ohren dringt.
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Thessaloniki played an important role as the second city of the Byzantine Empire and a major urban center of the Aimos’ peninsula. In order to interpret the city’s role during the 11th-12th centuries in the light of the excavation data and the evidence of the written sources, the social networks of the city and the trends of the urban society in the 12th century, the role of its port, the economic development and the administrative changes, the typology of the town and its structured space, its monasteries, churches, and the issue of the sponsorship of religious institutions in Thessaloniki will be presented.
Thessaloniki as Self-Administrated City in the Byzantine Empire during the 11th–12th Centuries

It is many times repeated in the Greek–Byzantine sources of the 14th century that basileus saves the cities of the empire or else that it is the first and foremost duty of basileus to save the cities of the empire. Hence it seems that the people of the 14th century conceived the empire as an entirety of cities, which was undoubtedly a true perception of the civic system of the towns in this century; it was then that the cities in Byzantine Empire had won to some extent self-rule having their own institutions of government, namely an assembly comprised through election of the rich landowning aristocracy who dwelt in Thessaloniki or “rentiers” from the upper class. The president of this assembly might have been the governor of the city, namely an imperial delegate. Byzantine center authority accepts the function of this assembly only under the rule of the emperor. Manuel II Palaeologus designated this assembly as «syllogos» or «vouleuterion». The later meant not only the meeting of this body but also the room where the meeting took place. Then it is clear that in Thessaloniki in the 14th century there was an institution of self-government that functioned in the framework of the centrifugal Byzantine quasi-feudal system. A similar situation is discernible in other cities of the empire in Serres, Adrianople, Monemvasia, and so on.

The existence and function of collective municipal institutions have not been a novelty of the 14th century. As it is accepted and has been described by the scholars, the towns of the Late Antiquity had preserved their self-government system during the first centuries of the Byzantine era till the 6th century or according to other views the self-rule system in the towns survived until the end of the 7th or yet the 8th century. As far as Thessaloniki is concerned municipal institutions, namely the curia and its members the curiales operated in the town during the 6th century (538-540 AD), as it is mentioned in Vita of Hosios David. Moreover, according to some scholars’ views based on hagiologic sources, namely Saint Demetrios’ miracles, the collective organ of the towns, the so-called decemprimi or dekaprotoi, although it is dwindled, it had survived in Thessaloniki until the end of the 7th century. In the same source, what is found is the information that in the same period of the 7th century there was official communication among the local authorities of Thessaloniki and the central government of the empire. The last information of decemprimi’ survivor in Thessaloniki is mentioned in the 8th century, when Theodor Sudites had visited the town.

During the “Dark Age” crisis the cities existed as (kastra) fortresses, mainly a center of consumption and resident of a bishop and his clergy together with the military commander sent from Constantinople and his staff, and the local “powerful” or archontes.

However at the first decade of the 12th (1112AD) century, the first signs of a collective responsibility of the citizens for their own affairs emerge in the sources. This sign is found in a document of Iviron monastery. It is about the affair of a certain Eudokia, daughter of a patrikios and wife of a protospatharios, who requested permission from Andronikos Doucas the doux and
praitor of Thessaloniki and Serres to sell part of her dowry. The affair has been traced and explicitly commented by Mrs. Chatziantoniou in her paper regarding the administrative role of the doux of Thessaloniki in this round table. A body of fifteen assessors (syndroi), consisting of local aristocrats and the superior of a monastery took part in the investigation of Eudokia's sale-affair accompanying the commissioned official, the logariastes of the doux. Hence, the commissioned official consulted or co-opted the local archontes of Thessaloniki in judicial decisions. Further information about meetings which took place in unoccupied sites in the Thessaloniki is found in the work of the arch-bishop Eustathios in the 12th century. Eustathios delivered his speech «Contra injuriarum memoriam» in the open air before the concentrated Thessalonians. The fact implies a collective spirit dominating in the town undoubtedly holding the local tradition. More of it is found in the work of the same arch-bishop; we are able to discern important social units, i.e. trade guilds, landowners, and rentiers, who without doubt were members of the municipal institution agora and vouleuterion, which also mentions the arch-bishop in his work.

Yet, it is worthwhile to notice an important case in the life of Thessaloniki, which implies the function of municipal authorities in the town. The case took place in a critical moment when the city was threatened by capture and sack by Boniface of Momferrat in 1204. The fact is well known. The inhabitants of Thessaloniki decided to surrender their city to Boniface, provided that he will preserve their institutions and customs, which they had been granted by the emperor. Niketas Choniates refers to one of these institutions and customs granted by the emperor. It was the tax exemption for the whole of the city. In comparison with the tax exemptions granted to Monemvasia and the privileged status of the town where the Venetian merchants had not been entitled with free transporting of their goods together with the fact that there was no reference to Venetian installation in Thessaloniki, we could assume the free regime of the two towns.

Evidently, it is an open question whether the Byzantine provincial towns did manage to evolve an autonomous institutional identity during the 11th or 12th century or are we really facing an exceptional case with Thessaloniki and Monemvasia. The former seems more possible. It should be more realistic to believe that the big city of Thessaloniki based on its privileges, its flourishing trade and manufacturing economy and its productive hinterland had gained a certain self-rule. In consequence, we could claim that during the late Byzantine period big cities surviving a tradition of the Late Antiquity and their Greek-roman past may be included in the framework of the Byzantine Empire as self-administration entities, the whole of which is found under the imperial control and supervision.

Thessaloniki played an important role as the second city of the Byzantine Empire and a major urban center of the Aimos’ peninsula. In order to interpret the city’s role during the 11th-12th centuries in the light of the excavation data and the information of the written sources, the social networks of the city and the trends of the urban society in the 12th century, the role of its port, the economic development and the administrative changes, the typology of the town, its structured space, its monasteries, churches and ecclesiastical institutions, as well as the issue of the sponsorship of religious institutions in Thessaloniki are going to be presented.
The Involvement and Institutional Role of the Doux of Thessalonike in the Civil Administration (The Second Half of the 11th–12th Centuries)

During the Komnenian times, a reform period was launched concerning military and civil administrative structures and institutions, both in Constantinople and the provinces. One such reform was the assignment of administrative duties to the *doux*, the military commander of the province (*thema*). Thessalonike is an interesting case study that allows us to investigate these institutional developments – taking into account, of course, that there were special political or war conditions in some geographical areas and, therefore, administrative particularities. It is a fortunate fact that fairly rich documentary material is preserved in the Athonite archives, especially until the early 12th century. Combining evidence from this material with testimonies from other sources, we can study the role of the *doux* of Thessalonike in the administration of the province in the second half of the 11th century and his subsequent evolution to a governor with mixed – civil and military – functions.

We should first mention that, since the early 11th century, the civil administration was in the hands of the provincial judge, the *krites/praitor* of the triple *thema* Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike. The *krites/praitor* supervised all civil officials, especially the *anagrapheis*, the *praktores*, the *kommekiaroi*, etc. sent from Constantinople to execute the fiscal duties in the province. Also, he often combined the office of *anagrapheus* or *praktor*. The *strategos*, *doux*, or *katepano* of Thessalonike exercised the military power in the district of Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike (i.e. between Axios and Nestos – occasionally, even beyond) and did not assume civil administrative authority. Of course, he remained the supreme official in the province as commander of the military forces. However, his hierarchical superiority in relation to the civil authorities did not entail him supervising or reviewing their operations. Interestingly, among the nearly sixty preserved or attested documents issued by officials of Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike, we come across only five occasions in which the *doux* of Thessalonike was involved in the administration of justice and none regarding the fiscal administration of the province.

As for the small number of judicial cases heard by the *doux*, they should be divided into two categories: those in which the litigants appealed to the *doux* for case review, and those in which the engagement of the *doux* was due to an imperial order.

The first group includes two disputes, both reexamined by the *doux* Nikephoros Botaneiates (1061-1062). On the one occasion, the legal affair had been settled by a *krites/praitor* before the litigants sought the *doux*’ judgment. In the other case, Botaneiates is cited to have reconsidered and affirmed a decision that had been executed by a *krites/praitor*, but, in fact, pronounced by an imperial decree (*lysis*). Theoretically, the first legal case should have been appealed to the courts of the capital. However, a party that was not satisfied with a previous decision would often resort to the court of a succeeding *krites/praitor*. In rare occasions (as it appears), they would seek a review
of their case by the supreme dignitary of the province, the *doux*. Once, it is also attested that the litigants even turned to the *kouropalates* and *megas doux pases* Dyseos Ioannes Komnenos (ca. 1057), apparently due to his chief military position in the western provinces and his personal prestige as the emperor’s brother. Indeed, a feature of the Byzantine administrative system was flexibility, which resulted in a faster, more convenient or effective arrangement of issues. Thus, the review of the first case by Botaneiates should not lead us to the conclusion that the *doukes* had already assumed a regular judicial role, i.e. hearing appeals of *kritai/praitores’* decisions. Neither does the second case permit such an inference. Here, the *doux*’ involvement was clearly over his powers, as the emperor’s decision is not to be reconsidered by any official. Apparently, Botaneiates’ dynamic personality must have led him to such an irregular interference.

The cases in the second group are different from those above, as the involvement of the *doukes* of Thessalonike was preceded by an imperial order. As we know, it was at the emperor’s discretion to commission the settlement of a dispute or the execution of his decision to any official of the central or provincial administration (even of different responsibilities), especially when they were prominent and enjoyed the imperial trust. Such mandates were given most often regarding important or protracted litigations or affairs that had attracted the emperor’s attention for some reason. These features distinguish the two disputes that Konstantinos X Doukas assigned to be settled by the aforementioned *doux*, Nikephoros Botaneiates. The same holds true regarding a third affair which was eventually settled by Konstantinos Doukas. The emperor notified the *doux* of Thessalonike, Theodoros Dalassenos (1062-1063) about his decision, evidently so that the latter would provide his help with its implementation. It is noteworthy that all cases involved long-standing litigations to which the emperor wished to give a definite solution. Obviously, he chose to address the *doukes* as the supreme officials in the *thema*, also taking into account their high prestige and imposing personalities. Moreover, the fact that all three cases concerned the Iveron monastery does not seem coincidental. It must have been related to Konstantinos Doukas’ further consideration for this foundation, which is attested in other circumstances, as well. His solicitude should perhaps be associated with the fact that Byzantium and the kingdom of Georgia sought closer ties at that time.

Nikephoros Botaneiates, who later acceded to the throne, demonstrated a similar concern for the monastery of Iveron. Besides, his wife was the Georgian princess, Maria of Alania, commemorated in the foundation’s Synodikon as a patroness, who had often pleaded the emperor in its favour. We should make a special reference to Botaneiates’ *chrysoboullos logos*, promulgated for Iveron in 1079. Along with the other concessions that he granted to the monastery, the emperor declared that the Iveritai’s judicial affairs would only be settled by the *katepano/doux* of Thessalonike and not by the provincial judge (i.e. *krites/praitor*), or the fiscal, or any other official in the province. The phrasing is rather ambiguous. One can understand the stipulation as restricting the authority of the civil officials regarding the Iveron monastery. Alternatively, it can be interpreted as expanding the jurisdiction of the *katepano/doux* so that the Iveritai would enjoy yet another privilege. In our opinion, the provision confirms that, until the late 11th century, the military leader of Thessalonike had not regularly assumed judicial powers, since his hearing of lawsuits is presented as an exceptional treatment of the Iveritai because of their foreign origin and language. At any rate, the date of 1079 can be regarded as a secure starting point regarding the *katepano/doux*’ official jurisdiction over civil affairs – at least as regards to a special group of litigants.
From the late 11th century, evolutions in the provincial administration (initially in Asia Minor and then in the Balkans) brought the civil power into the hands of the military commander, the doux. In the province of Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike, this change was slow to implement, probably because Alexios Komnenos had ceded Thessalonike (or only the right to collect public revenues from its district?) to kaisar Nikephoros Melissenos (1081-1104). The latter is attested as having heard a court case concerning estates in the west of the river Strymon, i.e. in the thema of Thessalonike. Simultaneously, there were concessions of fiscal sub-districts to the emperor’s brothers, the sebastokrator Isaakios Komnenos (enoria and episkepsis of Revenikeia and Hierissos) and the pansebastos, protosebastos Adrianos Komnenos (Kassandra peninsula). At the same time, the kritai/praitores and/or anagrapheis of Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike performed their judicial and/or fiscal duties in the triple thema. Also, in the late 11th century, kritai and anagrapheis tes Dyseos operated in a wider region, certainly including the themata of Thrace, Macedonia, Boleron, Strymon, Thessalonike (and others?). The pansebastos, sebastos Ioannes Taronites, who is attested as praitor and anagrapheus of the aforementioned themata in 1102, should probably be considered as one of these dignitaries. Finally, in 1107/1108, Alexios I Komnenos ordered his nephew (by marriage), Michael, the logothetes ton sekreton, to carry out the measuring (geodaisia) of the whole region of Thessalonike. In other words, there appears to have been an administrative pluralism in the district of Thessalonike.

The douxes of Thessalonike appear in the sources from 1112 onwards. They belonged to the upper aristocracy, most of them being related by blood or marriage to the imperial families. It is interesting to observe that the sebastos Andronikos Doukas is referred to as praitor and doux of Thessalonike (or doux and praitor of Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike) in 1112, whereas Konstantinos Doukas is mentioned as doux and praktor of Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike in 1118. Of course, the administrators were usually designated only as doux. Apparently, in this transitional phase, the addition of judicial or fiscal dignity to their title was intended to underline the administrative duties they had assumed by that time. Indeed, as we shall see, the douxes of Thessalonike regularly exercised the judicial tasks in the province of Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike. Also, one of their primary subordinates was a fiscal official, the logariastes, which confirms that they had responsibilities of that nature.

However, in contrast to the previous period, the 12th-century documentary material in the monastic archives of Mount Athos is rather scanty – especially from the reign of John II Komnenos onwards. Thus, we are not able to reconstruct a precise picture of the bureau for land registration and tax collection which, as a rule, had to be staffed by anagrapheis, energountes, praktores, paradotai of pronoiai, etc. On these issues, we are better informed concerning other provinces. We must assume that a similar situation applied in the case of Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike’s district. Even so, from the few documents preserved or attested, we can draw some interesting information about the administrative and bureaucratic practices of the period.

First, we shall refer to a sale document (praterion eggraphon) from 1112, preserved in the archives of the Docheiariou monastery. In this, it is stated that Eudokia, the daughter of a patrikios epi tou pantheou and wife of a protospatharios, requested special permission from the aforementioned doux and praitor of Thessalonike and Serres, Andronikos Doukas, to sell part of her dowry estate for poverty reasons. The approval was necessary, as the law prohibited sales of such properties. Since this was a legal issue, it refers to the judicial authority of Andronikos Doukas.
The *doux* commissioned the *protoproedros* and *logariastes* Elpidios Chandrenos to examine the truth of the allegations. From Eudokias’ petition (*deesis*), which is inserted in our document, it appears that it was rather common for the *logariastes* to have a role in juristic procedures. It is also interesting to observe that he was accompanied in the investigation of the case by a body of fifteen assessors (*synedroi*), consisting of local aristocrats and the superior of a monastery. In fact, he mandated them to question the woman and submit her written testimony to him. This is one of the earliest pieces of evidence for the participation of distinguished inhabitants (both secular and ecclesiastical) in legal proceedings – a phenomenon which occurred mainly from the 13th century onwards. Eventually, Eudokia was allowed to proceed with the sale. We are informed that, apart from the act of transmission of the estate (*paradosis*), she also had to provide the buyer (i.e., the monastery of Docheiariou) with an official copy of its registration to the provincial bureau (*isokodikon*). These documents could function as property titles. It is stated that the copy would be issued by the *doux* – a clear indication that he was in charge of the fiscal record.

We should also mention a judicial decision (*semeioma*) from 1162, which settled the dispute that had arisen between the monastery of Lavra and some *pronoiaioi* for an estate in the region of Langada. In relation to that issue, the document recalls a previous dispute with former holders of the same *pronoia*, whose *paroikoi* had trespassed on the monastery’s property. That case was tried in 1118 by the *doux* and *praktor* Konstantinos Doukas, mentioned above. To help with the reconciliation of the parties at that time, the *doux* ordered his *logariastes* to grant the *pronoiaioi* some nearby public land for their *paroikoi* to be settled. This information indicates that Konstantinos Doukas also had the management of the public lands. Clearly, he combined judicial and fiscal authority in the province.

Almost forty years later, Lavra faced problems with its neighbours anew. This time, the monks submitted a petition (*deesis*) to the emperor, who issued a relevant decree (*lysis*). According to it, the *doux* of Thessalonike, Ioannes Kontostephanos, was ordered to rectify their property rights so long as their claims were confirmed. It is noteworthy that the *doux*, in fact, assigned the *chartophylax* and *hypomnematographos* of the archbishopric of Thessalonike to carry out an investigation *in situ* and resolve the matter on his behalf. This commission shows the involvement of ecclesiastic officials in administrative procedures even before the fateful events of 1204 and the consequent confusion in the central and provincial administration. In this case, of course, the produced document was verified by the *doux*. It is also noticeable that the execution of the decision was entrusted to Heliopolos, a subordinate (*anthropos*) of the *doux*. This choice may be attributed to the fact that the decision also involved the transfer of the litigants’ *paroikoi*. Evidently, a forceful intervention had to be applied to achieve the relocation.

In a document from 1142, it is mentioned that the *nomophylax* Alexios Aristenos assigned his subordinate, the *protoproedros* Nikolaos Machetares, to confiscate (*schideusai*) a village in the district of Serres. The document (*praktikon*), drafted by his *anthropos*, was being kept in the local fiscal record. The exact capacity in which Aristenos acted is not defined. However, a letter of Theodoros Prodomos verifies that he was appointed to carry out judicial (and fiscal?) activities in the district of Thessalonike (i.e. Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike). According to J. Darrouzès, perhaps in the context of a broader mission, Aristenos continued to operate in the *thema* of Hellas. In any case, it appears that, to some extent, the administrative pluralism, mentioned above as a feature of the late 11th – early 12th centuries, is also traceable in the following decades.
Further information about the officials who were or could be operating in the province of Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike are also drawn from the *chrysoboullon sigillion* of Alexios III Angelos, promulgated for the Chilandar monastery in 1199. It designated that the monastery’s ship of 1000 *modioi* of tonnage would enjoy total tax exemption. Those who could have imposed burdens on Chilandar for its maritime activities are enumerated as follows: the *energountes doukes* (the reference to *strategoi* or *katepano* is evidently anachronistic), the *kommerkiarioi*, the *topoteretai*, or anyone else who operated in the coastal parts of the triple *thema* on behalf of the fisc. Here, the *doux* is clearly mentioned as a tax collector in his district. However, we cannot define his precise relationship with the *kommerkiarioi* and other officials levying the commercial tax and maritime charges (*dekateia, limeniatikon, skaliatikon*, etc.). It is plausible to assume that the latter had to present to him the imperial order assigning their duties, and that they would have been under his high supervision while executing their commission. Apparently, the same presumption goes for the *vestiarites* Leon Pepagomenos (1198), in whose presence the bishop of Hierissos handed over to Vatopedi the properties of the abandoned monastery of Chilandar on Athos, and the *vestiarites* Leon Sinaites (1199), who conveyed the above and other monastic properties to monk Sabas, founder of the Serbian monastery.

In closing, we should note that apart from the fiscal and judicial duties described above, the *doux* apparently had many other administrative tasks as the governor of Thessalonike. For instance, when archbishop Eustathios describes the Normans’ attack in 1185 and the fatally neglectful attitude of the *doux* David Komnenos, he mentions that the *doux* was responsible for the city’s provisioning in wheat as well as for the maintenance projects concerning the water supply system in the acropolis. Of course, these tasks were referred in relation to his supreme duty to ensure the protection of the city. Besides, we should not forget that the *doux* preserved his military functions, and although the forces he commanded could only serve constabulary and defensive purposes, he was expected by the emperor and certainly by the citizens to act accordingly.
Thessalonike in the Centre of Economic Developments under Komnenoi and Angeloi: Privileged Grants after 1081

The ascend to the throne of Alexios I Komnenos, following the bloodless overthrow of his predecessor, marks a point of continuity for the Komneni and, at the same time, the beginning of a new dynasty. The new emperor bears from the start the burden of responsibility to change many aspects of the state; but his reign is particularly sealed with the desirable stop of the descending economic course of the empire or, at least, the lacking state financial balance, when in fact there is dire need of facing foreign hostilities.

His successors, John II and Manuel I, distinguished as heroes on the battlefield, attempt simultaneously to cope with the financial demands of the time, while the bloody demise of the last Komnenian emperor is bound to unfulfilled financial promises.

The rest of the 12th century is dominated by the dynasty of the Angeloi, reprehensible in every way according to Byzantine historiography, both scholarly or popularized. The economic factor is prominent throughout the reign of the seemingly promising Isaakios II and his successors, during the consecutive changes to the throne until 1204, and even affects decisively the international relations of the empire.

Thessaloniki, as the second most important city in the Eastern Roman empire, and its surrounding region, as the closest to Mount Athos, do not just feature prominently in the incidents during the rule of the Komnenoi and the Angeloi, but are often found in the epicenter of important events and their consequences, as well as financial changes and developments.

In regard to the financial developments, which often coincide with, if not provoked by, historical circumstances, in this region of the empire as well as the rest of the Byzantine area, the implementation and evolution of institutions directly connected to the fiscal policies and social layering plays a key role among the parameters that constitute the financial reality of the period 1081 to 1204. It is mostly about the two primary socio-economic institutions of the late Byzantine period, which concern the grant of tax exemptions or the bestowal of assuming tax revenues, the terms respectively known in Byzantine sources before 1204 as ἐξκοσσεία (exkusseia) and πρόνοια (pronoia).

Of particular interest related with these institutions is the reign of Alexios I, for under his administration, as has been pointed out either in a positive or a negative manner, privileges in the form of economic benefits were widely granted. So, in the late 11th-early 12th century, while other institutions that grant personal privileges are lead to decline and extinction – I refer mainly to the χαριστικὴ δωρεὰ (charistike dorea) – the already known exkusseia appears to be thriving much more and at the same time we can discern the introduction and consolidation of a new institution, the pronoia.

The circumstances regarding the institutions, while the Normans or other enemies are warded off and state finances cause Alexios to take critical and sometimes painful decisions and choices, lead to some interesting thoughts about potential grant of such privileges in Thessaloniki and the surrounding area after 1081.
Indicative testimonies come from cases like Leon Kefalas, Adrianos and Isaakios Komnenos, Constantine Vourtzis, Nikephoros Melissenos.

The real data concerning grants to the aforementioned persons come from the surviving (in the Athonite archives) documents of the time in which the relationship or, at times, the negative effect to similar rights for monasteries is mentioned. We can trace the aftermath or rather the projection of this data within the relevant historical context in historiography, mainly in the work of Anna Komnene. However, the references to ‘donations’ in Alexias have probably a more broad sense of imperial grants, while the absence of familiar technical terms doesn’t confirm the nature of certain privileges like the ones discussed above.

The instances already discussed serve as confirmation that the grant of exkousseia to the extended area of Thessaloniki under Alexios I comes more to the advantage of laymen than ecclesiastical foundations. Obviously, everyone wishes to secure such a grant, but the emperor, unlike his predecessors and his successors, sparingly gives that privilege to the Athonite convents, except for the Lavra monastery.

On the other hand, while searching for similarities with the later known and widely implemented institution of pronoia, we can find some characteristics still evolving, but yet not grouped in one single grant so that one or all the aforementioned can be considered as early specimens of this institution. The recall of the grant, the praktikon of paradosis that succeeds the emperor's prostagma of the grant (Kefalas), the collection of predefined tax sums from the beneficiary instead of the tax collectors (Adrianos), are not sufficient to characterize those grants as pronoia, when at the same time the perpetual and full possession is stated or the beneficiary himself gives part of the granted privileges to other laymen (Nikephoros Melissenos).

It is rather obvious that I dealt with cases suggesting tendencies toward the evolution of politics of privilege (the earlier in Alexios I reign), possibly even an early occurrence of a new institution (later in his reign), as afterward matters are consolidated and we are no longer referring to a financial change, but to a constant implementation of exkousseia and to the first period of the institution of pronoia (under John II and Manuel I Komneni and the Angeloi).

It is possible, however, to conclude that during the entire period of the Komnenoi and the Angeloi, the canvas woven because of financial difficulties and the rather necessary restriction in the use of state money, is completed with the grant of state tax revenues as personal privileges to laymen. Under Alexios I, in particular, in the context of wider financial politics, including the nea logarike and the second debasement of the gold coin, even the sell of ecclesiastical valuables and vessels, great elective privileges were granted to serve the need of rewarding officials or distinguishing individuals important to the state. The area of Thessalonike offered sufficient examples of this particular imperial choice.
Les réseaux dans la société thessalonicienne du XIIe siècle

Nous avons analysé les différents réseaux dans lesquels s’inscrit Thessalonique au XIIe siècle.

Tout d’abord, Thessalonique, seconde ville de l’empire, était souvent le siège d’une résidence impériale prolongée lors des campagnes militaires, ainsi Alexis Ier Comnène et son épouse Irène Doukaina passaient quelques jours ou un mois ou même plus quand une campagne était lancée contre les Normands : en septembre 1105, l’empereur y établit son quartier général et l’impératrice l’avait suivie, de même en novembre 1107. Il n’est donc pas étonnant que Thessalonique puisse même à l’occasion être le siège de rencontre entre souverains comme il en fut lors des pourparlers diplomatiques entre Manuel Ier Comnène et Conrad à son retour de croisade en automne 1148. Que la ville fût symboliquement une étape vers la conquête de l’empire, en témoigne Basilakios, duc de Dyrrachion, qui dans sa révolte contre Nicéphore Botaneiatès en 1078 s’y retrancha avec son armée. Autre témoignage à la fois de l’importance que représentait Thessalonique politiquement et économiquement est la cession en pronoia par Alexis en 1081 de Thessalonique et sa région à son beau-frère Nicéphore Méliissènos qui briguait l’empire.

Les hautes fonctions administratives étaient de fait dévolues à la grande aristocratie impériale, issue des familles constantinopolitaines qui y tissaient leurs réseaux de parentèles. Nous pouvons mentionner Jean Comnène, sébaste, neveu d’Alexis Ier, Jean Kontostéphanos, neveu de Manuel Ier Comnène, David Comnène, petit-fils d’Anne Comnène, et son frère Andronic Comnène. D’autres, de moins haute extraction, étaient néanmoins des personnages qui comptaient dans le gouvernement de l’empire : c’étaient les hommes (anthrôpoi) de l’empereur. En ce qui concerne les archevêques, une étude minutieuse montre que le plus souvent ils sont issus de l’administration patriarcale, qu’ils sont des personnages connus notamment sur le plan de l’érudition et de la théologie. Eux aussi pouvaient à l’occasion faire de Thessalonique une ville de rencontre entre les représentant de l’Église orthodoxe et les légats romains. Néanmoins, il pouvait arriver que soit nommé un très important ministre, comme le fut Constantin Mésopotamitès, devenu opportunément diacre, puis promu archevêque, dont la carrière sous les Anges ne cesse d’étonner.

Les réseaux de patronage étaient naturellement issus des réseaux aristocratiques qui nés à Constantinople perduraient à Thessalonique. Eustathe de Thessalonique en est le plus remarquable exemple. Sa correspondance témoigne de ses liens permanents avec ses patrons d’hier : le Patriarche lui-même, mais aussi à ses collègues et amis comme Euthyme Malakès ou le grand hétériaire Jean Doukas Kamaïròs auquel il avait dédié son Commentaire sur Dionysios le Périégète et qui tenta de désamorcer le conflit qui opposait Eustathe à ses ouailles. À ce réseau appartenaient aussi ses anciens élèves et d’autres encore jusqu’à Serrès. On peut se demander par ailleurs si un personnage haut
placé n’aurait pas été à la tête de la commande du *Timarion* qui témoigne à la fois d’une connaissance approfondie de Thessalonique et d’un milieu constantinopolitain, et quel auteur connu aurait eu des liens à l’époque considérée avec la ville.

Il faut également, au delà des réseaux des élites aristocratiques, tenter d’analyser les réseaux de la petite aristocratie notamment militaire, relever les stratiotes pronoïaires en tentant de dater leur établissement, ainsi que les dignitaires de la classe inférieure, qui passaient plus inaperçus que les ducs ou les archevêques, mais n’en tissaient pas moins un réseau local. Il convient de se demander quelles étaient leurs relations avec les gens des corporations qui eux aussi étaient possessionnés dans la ville et avaient parfois de belles maisons.

Un dernier aspect est consacré aux moines et aux réseaux monastiques du XIIᵉ siècle et leur implication dans la vie sociale et politique.
Le lieux publics de Thessalonique

Dans son livre *Thessalonique au quatorzième siècle*, publié en 1913, O. Tafrali mentionne l’existence d’un Βουλευτήριον dans cette ville, en s’appuyant sur une mention faite par Manuel II Paléologue dans son «Oraison adressée aux Thessaloniens, quand ils étaient assiégés”. Dès lors plusieurs études parlent de ce Βουλευτήριον, sans pour autant préciser où il se situait dans la ville.

Mon but n’est pas de chercher le lieu exact où se tenait le Βουλευτήριον, qui me semble d’ailleurs être une allusion plutôt archaïsante employée par un empereur lettré. Ce que je me propose c’est d’examiner les lieux publics de Thessalonique liés à la vie politique de ses habitants.

Étant donné que l’espace urbain et son organisation se forment à partir des besoins de ces habitants tout en étant au nombre des facteurs identitaires et en même temps il est parmi les facteurs qui les définissent, je veux analyser le dialogue noué entre l’espace urbain et les thessaloniens qui exercent des fonctions politiques, c.à.d. les aristocrates et les mésoi. Dans ce cas, les lieux dont chacun de ces deux groupes s’approprie expriment la nature de son pouvoir au sein de la ville.
Urban Monasteries and Ecclesiastical Institutions in the Middle Byzantine Thessaloniki

The subject matter of the paper examines the phenomenon of the development of the urban monasticism in the middle byzantine Thessaloniki, or the urbanization of the monasticism. The topic is mainly based on the results of a research program that has been led in the Department of History and Archaeology during the years 2013-2014 under the title “The documentation of the Middle Byzantine Thessaloniki and the understanding of the urban development based on the archaeological remains and on the archives’ information”. The responsible of the program is the undersigned author and the working team comprised the lecturer Anastasios Tantsis and three postgraduate students of our Department. The program has been divided in two sections:

a. the forming of an electronic data base comprising 244 registered archaeological sites linked to the middle byzantine period
b. the iconic representation of the urban development of the middle byzantine city through 9 electronic maps comprising all the categories of buildings, remains and any written information that concern this period.

Thus the data base and the maps provide information concerning the general urban planning of Thessaloniki with the streets, the markets, the fora, the sections, the regions and neighborhoods of the city, the fortifications, the ecclesiastical and monastic institutions, the workshops and marketplaces, the hydraulic installations, the private houses and the cemeteries within the walls.

The registrations and the map, on which we will focus, represent the category of the ecclesiastical and monastic buildings regarding the topic of their considerable growth and their location in the most prominent sites of the city.

For the needs of our research we have focused on specific paradigms known either from the previous research or based on the results of the numerous salvage excavations, re-examined and re-approached under a different point of view. Through the virtual reconstruction of the city a new proposal for the middle byzantine topography is attempted by examining the development of the neighborhoods and especially of the region of Katafygi, the most renowned of all, which seemed to concentrate a considerable number of monastic establishments.

The flourishing of the monasticism in this period is a consequence of the end of Iconoclasm. Especially for Thessaloniki, a main factor was the neighborhood with the Holy Mountain and the close interrelations between them and the city that caused the establishment of monastic dependencies. In addition to that, many citizens used to dedicate their properties to the monasteries of the city, regarding them as a safe destination of their means of living. This phenomenon was based on ideological and practical principles of the proto-byzantine period, when the monasticism was gradually augmented.
From 9th-10th centuries onwards we regard the phenomenon, according to which non-residential sites of public or any secular use are transformed into monasteries. The most illustrious evidence comes from Panagia ton Chalkeon, that has been erected “on a previous profane place”. Especially, public spaces in the centre of the city around the main road, the ‘Leoforos’, are occupied by important monastic buildings. Fifty-three churches and monastic establishments function, either as new-ones or as previous that had been innovated during the “macedonian renaissance”. From those above-mentioned twenty-nine are conserved either integrated or in ruins as excavation results, though twenty-four are known only from the written sources.

Among them the most renowned, as the Monastery of Akapniou is, erected in the beginning of the 11th c. by Photios from Thessaly under the auspice of Basil the 2nd, hasn’t been identified yet. The proposed identification supported by the late Papazotos with the Prophet Helija hasn’t been proved satisfactory. Since most of the monastic property of Akapniou is cited in the centre of the city and due to the supported by the later research correlation to the Rotunda in the second millennium, I would rather stand for a central position of it. Moreover the illustrious monastery of Philokalliu, linked to the Serbian family of Nemanja from the late 12th century, still remains unidentified. The written sources mention churches as “Nea Ekklisia” in the last decade of the 11th century, the church “tou Kyrtou”, or Saint Nicolaos Palaiofavas among the mostly renowned.

From the abovementioned institutions only Saint Nicolaos Palaiofavas could be identified with the place of its post byzantine transformation, the Saint Nicolaos “o Tranos”, that has been destroyed by the great fire of 1917. Its place on the northeast corner of the previous Ancient Agora and near the road that led to the basilica of Saint Demetrius shows its prominent location.

From Ioannis Cameniatris, who describes his agonized pursuit by the Saracens in 904, we extract the unique registrations for a couple of monasteries and churches, as the nunnery of Akroulliou situated to the western part of the upper city and the church of Saint Andreas, situated close to the northwestern part of the city and nearby the walls. Its identification with a newly excavated cross in square middle byzantine monastic church with graves, in the upper town, seems uncertain.

In a most central part of the city has been estimated the location of the Prodromou monastery, mentioned in 946 from a chrysoboullon of the Iviron monastery. Its foundation is attributed to Constantinos Porphyrogennitos. The archaeological evidence identifies the Prodromou monastery to the ruins of a church with a burial chapel and aneiconic mural decoration, the so-called “iconoclastic church” of Thessaloniki. Its central place nearby the Leoforos caused the rapid conversion of the monastic catholicon to a mosque simultaneously with Panagia Acheiropoietos, namely in 1430. The contact of the Prodromou monastery to the everyday urban centre and life is testified not only by its location close to the Leoforos but also by the owning and handling of profane properties nearby, as houses and taverns which were facing on the main public road, according to the Iviron ms. no 52 of 1104.

Another enigmatical and non-identified –though mostly studied- institution is the “Katafygi”, which is mentioned in texts from 1100 onwards. The name is attributed to an ecclesiastical institution and thanks to its importance all the neighborhood has been named after as Katafygi and especially as “geitonia” or “regeona” according to the Constantinopolitan city division. As Katafyri occupied all the area of the ancient Agora and of the Christian Megalofores, it should be the most important region in the centre of the city nearby the “Leoforos” or “Mesi odos”. Otherwise, at least four ecclesiastic institutions have been erected all around.
From the same period there are written references for a 12th century monastery complex dedicated to the Mother of God and attributed to Ilarion Mastounis. The proposed identification of its location with the site of the post byzantine church of Megali or Trani Panagia near the southeastern walls, seems plausible. The church functions until today under the name of Nea Panagia.

Two other central monasteries that were functioned from the ninth century onwards were Agios Lucas and the nunnery of Agia Theodora. The first is mentioned in the Life of Agia Theodora in 818 and was located next to the Kassandreotiki Gate, eastwards and nearby the Leoforos and the “agora” «ό δή πλησίον τῆς ἀγορᾶς τῆς ἐπὶ τὴν Κασσανδρεωτικὴν ιούσης πύλην διάκειται».

Concerning Agia Theodora the information is much richer and it is supported by the excavation data. Located on the same horizontal axis of the metropolitan church of Agia Sophia, the nunnery of Agios Stefanos already existed in the first decades of the 9th century during the iconoclastic period and was later renamed as Agia Theodora, honoring the first myrrh-spouted female saint of Thessaloniki. The small three-aisled middle byzantine basilica keeps the characteristics of a small catholicon with a synthronon and a south aisled destined for burial purposes. The incorporation of the monastery into the urban life of Thessaloniki is testified by its everyday functions. In this institution the newly appeared phenomenon of myrrh-spouting is inaugurated in Thessaloniki, thus transforming the location into a sanctified urban place of pilgrimage. Moreover, the everyday life of Saint Theodora informs us about her responsibilities for providing all the necessaries for the nunnery from the marketplace: «ἐπὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐξιούσα … διὰ τὴν τῶν ὑνίων εὐθηνίαν. Καὶ μέγα φορτίον ἔλυσαν ἤ τινων ἄλλων ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑμίων φέρουσα διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς μέσον ἐβάδιζεν.»

A number of small monastic institutions have been excavated in the recent years. Among them we discern the anonymous church on Vyzantos street in the upper town, a small catholicon of the 11th century with a cross formed burial crypt.

For the most prominent of the church institution in Thessaloniki, the church of Panagia ton Chalkeon (1028) of the protospatharios and katepano Lagouvardias Christoforos, we support that it functioned as the catholicon of an urban monastery complex. It is located in the middle of the lower part of the Byzantine city, near the main road, very close to the ancient forum and the byzantine “Megalophoros” and integrated in the famous region of “Katafygi.” The cross-in-square type with the condensed dimensions, the strong architectural similarities with renowned middle byzantine constantinopolitan monasteries and the private character of the building allude to relevant burial and monastic institutions in Constantinople, founded by supreme officials and used from their owners as private places for burial and monastic purposes, deprived of any public or parish use.

The Middle Byzantine church of Christophoros is the result of a substantial donation on behalf of an imperial official, who imitated the imperial dignitaries of Constantinople, during an epoch of prosperity. The stable status-quos lead to the realization of big public works in Thessaloniki, such as the renovation of the fortifications and the erection of private monasteries founded by illustrious donors. Panagia ton Chalkeon, as part of the so-called “Macedonian Renaissance,” functioned without interruption for four centuries and enjoyed renovations that only a large independent monastery, in a predominant position in the city, could have had.

Consequently the middle byzantine urban scenery of the city gives a very dense covering with ecclesiastical establishments and monasteries incorporated to the urban life either in the low or in
the upper city. Very revealing is the same picture that we gain from the medieval Constantinople as well, where new monastic establishments of the middle byzantine period occupy central sites correlated to the administrative and commercial life of the city. As a matter of fact the combination and the parallel development of the two big byzantine cities are obvious.

The abovementioned features constitute strong elements for the exaltation of the monastic activity within Thessaloniki, as it is otherwise proved by the texts of Kameniatis and Eustathios archbishop of Thessaloniki, and also by sporadic mentions in the saints Life of Theodoros Stouditis, Sainte Theodora and Saint Gregorios Dekapolitis, who reveal us the image of a city plentiful of monasteries in the most frequented and prominent locations parallel to the commercial urban life.
Sponsorship of Religious Institutions in Thessaloniki and Its Periphery during the 11th and 12th C.: A Synthetic Approach

The last years of the Macedonian dynasty witnessed an increase of interest from the court’s part for sponsoring new monastic foundations especially within Constantinople. We get a glimpse of this activity following the deeds of Romanos Argyros and Constantine Monomachos, both husbands of the infamous Zoe, niece of Basil II.

Whereas Basil II is known for his austerity and the fact that few ecclesiastic foundations could be connected to his benevolence, Zoe’s husbands founded two of the most famous middle Byzantine institutions in the Capital. Although the buildings only survive in ruins, what we know from the historic record is enough to inform of the grandeur endowed to them by their sponsors. Romanos founded the Perivleptos monastery while Constantine's foundation was the Mangana Monastery dedicated to St. George.

It is precisely this emphasis to the overall size and lavishness of the institutions that makes the study of these cases of court patronage so important for the development of the institution in later periods. From what survives we get that the katholika in both institutions were quite large. In fact, it seems that these churches were domed but not of the cross-in-square typology which limits the overall size. They were domed structures raised in platforms, an indication for the desire to create institutions that secured visibility and through them also for the sponsors’ activity of piety and benevolence.

Both churches have been cited as possible models for the roughly contemporary Hosios Lukas’ main church which fortunately survives almost intact albeit with no clue to a secure dating or possible sponsor connection. Hosios Lukas has been credited among others to Monomachos. His patronage of religious architecture got quite infamous and he is credited with trying to overcome the achievements of Justinian, at the time considered one of history’s greatest patrons especially of churches.

When Psellos accuses Manomachos for trying to outdo Justinian, he is referring both to the size and the lavishness of his foundations. Monomachos is associated through fact or legend with the construction of the Nea Moni Katholikon in Chios, a fact that tells more about his legend and the way religious sponsorship was viewed in the periphery and less about the actual connections and political activity of its founder.

Interestingly though this church is characterized by the alteration of a cross-in-square design in a way as to get a far larger dome. Visibility and size go hand in hand and can account for the need to create a bigger building associated with imperial patronage with political overtones. After all the church has an octagonal base which provides the missing link between Hosios Lukas and Constantinopolitan architecture.
Monomachos’ patronage extended to the Holy land and especially Jerusalem matching thus Justinian’s activity in Palestine. It seems that both Constantine and Romanos followed the example of imperial patronage as a means for strengthening their political position.

Following the end of the Macedonian dynasty, their affinity for religious patronage was continued both by the Komnenos and the Doukas family that struggled between them for domination of politics at court and the throne. Key political figures of the period appear as sponsors of religious institutions and whatever might have been their motives the result is a completely altered landscape of ecclesiastical institutions and buildings in the Capital.

Indeed, it is mainly the churches of the last part of the 11th and the 12th c. that still dominate Constantinople, proving the flourishing of ecclesiastic patronage of the time. Most of them have been identified with known institutions from the historic record. Others remain obscure, yet they feature prominently due to their size and apparent importance. Many more are known from the sources but apparently no longer exist or no remnants of them have been found.

The core of the Katholikon of the Chora Monastery was constructed for Maria Doukaina, mother-in-law of Alexios I, while the church identified with the Katholikon of Christ Pantepoptes is what is left from the institution founded by Alexios’ mother Maria Dalassena. It has been already noted that both women used their monasteries as a safe setting far from the men-guarded-palace to develop their plotting and intrigues that brought their favorite Alexios to the throne. Most of the Komnenoi are known to have sponsored monasteries in the Capital, some of them fairly prominent like the Evergetes and the Pantokrator. Ecclesiastic institutions founded in the capital became a very prominent habit of the court until Manuel Komnenos decreed that none of his relatives should practice it again, an act that proves the political importance of this activity.

In Constantinople, apart from the known institutions, or the ones that have been securely identified, there are others that have been dated to the 12th c. through archaeological investigation either through their inscriptions or stylistically. These include the church known as Kalenderhane Camii, the Kilise Camii, the Gül Camii and the main church of the Pammakaristos monastery, also linked to the Komnenoi through epigraphic evidence.

Far from the capital there are some churches linked to sponsorship from the court like Isaac Komnenos’ foundation of the Kosmosoteira in Thrace and the small church of Saint Panteleimon in Nerezi (near modern Skopje) also linked to a Komnenian patron. These help illustrate the way this activity appeared in the periphery.

In the rest of Macedonia several churches could be ascribed to the 12th c. although this is far from certain. They include the metropolis of Serres, several smaller churches in or around Kastoria and the wider area of northwestern Macedonia (including the area around Florina, Prespes and Aiani). Similarly, some of the churches of Mount Athos could be dated to the same period. Further to the north in present-day Bulgaria and Serbia several churches are dated to the same period, none of them as big or lavish as those in Constantinople.

It is thus very peculiar to find that in Thessaloniki the record for church buildings for the 11th and 12th c. is surprisingly small with only one church, the Panagia Chalkeon, dating to the 11th c. There are other small churches found through rescue excavations and dated inconclusively to this period but far from being certain they are of little architectural importance too. Another church linked to Thessaloniki is the one found today in Chortiates that has been dated to the 12th c. for stylistic reasons.
Therefore, we can only wonder on the difference in the situation found between the Capital and Thessaloniki. Does this have to do with the development of urban monasticism and the way this was implemented? Another of this round table’s papers deals with this issue in Thessaloniki. It seems that there is no record of important monastic foundations in Thessaloniki apart from the famous Monastery of Akapniou linked to Basil II. Of course there were other monasteries in Thessaloniki at the period, but what was their place in the urban tissue, what was their size and prominence is a question yet unanswered. And since Panagia Chalkeon represents the only securely recorded aristocratic foundation one wonders if it was an exceptional case both with regard of its placing to the city’s center and its prominence. But is this all there was?

The lack of clear indications for religious institutions of the 11th and the 12th c. is all the more mysterious when compared to the abundance of conspicuous evidence for the Palaiologan period. Thessaloniki’s cityscape is still dominated by 13th and 14th c. churches. Although most of them are unidentified the historic record points to prominent individuals and members of the court who resided in Thessaloniki at the time and most probably acted as sponsors for them. This could well mean a change of status quo for Thessaloniki between the Komnenian and the Palaiologan period but this seems only natural given the dramatic changes brought about by the first part of the 13th c. and the view we get from the sources.

The absence of church architecture from Thessaloniki dating to the 12th c. is yet more puzzling if we take a look at central Greece and the Peloponnese. The catalogue of churches dated to the 11th and mainly to 12th c. is more than impressive both for the cities and the countryside in central Greece and the Peloponnese. In Athens and Attica alone there are around 40 churches that have been ascribed in modern scholarship to this period, some of them quite impressive like the Sotera Lykodemou, the Kapnikarea, the Hagioi Apostoloi of Agora etc. The same is true for the Peloponnese where impressive churches like Areia Mone in Nafplion, the so-called Hagia Sofia in Monemvasia and the church at Christianoi in Messenia have been dated to the 12th c.

Since the study of church architecture has developed more or less following art-historical methodologies and rarely taking into account issues of historic context (social-economic-institutional etc.) it is not surprising to find such great differences that have not been addressed either by archaeologists or historians. Moreover, we lack a synthetic view of the 12th c. that would explore aspects of material culture and social history juxtaposing the capital against the peripheries.

Returning to Thessaloniki we know from the sources that there was already a prominent athonite presence in the city mainly through acquisition of numerous properties (houses, orchards and workshops) by Mt Athos’ monasteries. Unfortunately, we know little of their actual extend and if there were other monastic dependencies connected to them including church buildings.

Therefore, compared to Constantinople, Thessaloniki’s urban image with regards to church architecture offers a far more intriguing aspect between the two distinct periods. During the 11th and 12th c. Constantinople’s prominence as a place for imperial and aristocratic religious patronage is unmatched by Thessaloniki’s record. On the contrary during the 13th and the 14th c. this statement is reversed. Thessaloniki becomes a city of monastic institutions whose presence is apparent through the high level of church architecture still surviving to prove that. Not that Constantinople lacks Palaiologan religious patronage but it extends mainly to already existing institutions and not new buildings like in Thessaloniki.
Religious patronage is an activity that requires funds that will produce no economic outcome. The 12\textsuperscript{th} c. in Constantinople leaves the impression of an aristocracy both willing and able to sustain such projects. The image we gain from the historic record for a vibrant economy relates well with this picture. It also points to a surplus of assets gathered at the hands of aristocratic landowning families including the imperial family who could afford such lavish extravagances. This doesn't mean that Thessaloniki was a poor city at the time. It is probably the reflection of a different socio-economic structure reflected in the absence of prominent religious patronage.

On the other hand, turning back to the state of research regarding south Greece this image informs our knowledge of the status of Thessaloniki differently. Apparently south Greece, especially Attica and the larger region including Boeotia and Corinth, had a flourishing economy during the 11\textsuperscript{th} and the 12\textsuperscript{th} c. Yet it is far from certain that any of the surplus created from production, processing and trade of goods remained in the hands of locals or was absorbed through heavy taxation towards the capital and the hands of the court.

It is much more probable that the peripheries of the Byzantine state were heavily exploited through taxation during the 11\textsuperscript{th} and the 12\textsuperscript{th} c., a fact that is reflected in the period's sources coming from these areas. On the other hand, if we turn our attention to imperial or aristocratic patronage in the provinces during this period, from Thessaloniki's Panagia Chalkeon to the Kosmosoteira in Thrace, Saint Panteleimon in Nerezi, the Nea Moni in Chios, the Katholikon of the Patmos monastery or churches built in Cyprus, most of them are not as impressive and monumental as those ascribed to the same period in central and southern Greece, where usually they are credited to local initiative.

From the above brief survey of religious sponsorship in the 11\textsuperscript{th} and the 12\textsuperscript{th} c. we can deduce that it was a favorite practice for the aristocracy and the court and in rare cases it reached to the periphery. Thessaloniki's mysterious lack of prominent church institutions dated to this period reflects the situation of a highly centralized economy exploiting any surplus created by local economies through heavy taxation from the Capital. This is reflected in the lavishness of church architecture of the 12\textsuperscript{th} c. created there.

On the other hand, the point observed for 11\textsuperscript{th} and 12\textsuperscript{th} c. Thessaloniki help us rethink the situation of church architecture in central and southern Greece where a great number of ecclesiastic institutions (some rivaling those in Constantinople) have been ascribe for stylistic reasons to this period.

It seems we are in need of a different approach in order to asses better the period's architectural production. Sponsorship and study of its sources offer an excellent starting point.
Retour au port de Thessalonique

Il faut toujours semer derrière soi un prétexte pour revenir, quand on part
(Alessandro Baricco, Océan mer)

Au cours de l’été 1185, vers la fin de la période comnène, une expédition militaire attaque la ville : les Normands l’assiègent par terre et par mer. Enfin, ce sera par les remparts orientaux qu’ils péntreront en ville. Mais ils avaient aussi essayé d’attaquer par le côté Sud, en portant leurs navires au plus près des fortifications maritimes. Voici ce que nous dit Eustathe : « Du côté de la mer il n’y avait pas de lutte : le secteur près de la muraille n’était pas rempli d’eau, car on était en été, la mer n’arrivait pas jusqu’aux murs et il n’y avait pas d’eau profonde à proximité des fortifications ». Pendant l’été donc la mer n’était pas assez haute pour atteindre les fortifications maritimes, et il ne s’agissait pas de marées, mais de la vase qui s’était déposée, d’autant plus que la base de ces murs avait été rongée par la mer ; en effet la situation n’était pas la même au début du Xᵉ siècle : lorsque les pirates sarrasins s’en prirent à la ville le 29 juillet 904 (encore pendant l’été), ils parvinrent avec leurs bateaux près des murailles : en construisant une sorte de pont suspendu avec les mâts et les rames des bateaux, ils se hissèrent à hauteur des murs et pénétrèrent en ville. Le stratège avait essayé de les empêcher de s’approcher des fortifications en jetant en mer des sarcophages, ce qui voulait dire que le niveau de l’eau n’était pas très élevé, mais la navigation devait toujours être possible. En mars 1430, les Vénitiens, maîtres de Thessalonique, fuirent la ville siégée par les Ottomans, en passant par le tzérembolon pour atteindre leur navire. C’est justement le tzérembolon qui nous interpelle.

La fausse hypothèse selon laquelle le tzérembolon était une jetée se prolongeant dans la mer avec la forme d’un coude n’aurait pas mérité d’être discutée, si un récent article parlant du port de Thessalonique n’y avait fait référence. Eustathe de Thessalonique, dans son Commentaire à l’Iliade, nous dit clairement que le tzérembolon était un collecteur portant les eaux usagées dans la mer, et que les Thessaloniciens l’appelaient de la sorte, au lieu de συριγγέμβολον : le mot était écorché par les κοινολεκτοῦσι dans la forme συρέμπολον / τζυρέμβολον. D’ailleurs le mot désigne un ὑπόνομος qui porte les eaux usagées hors des forteresses, et les Actes du monastère Saint-Jean-Prodrome sur le Mont Mnélecée mentionnent un tzérembolon dans le kastron de Zichna. L’identification entre le tzérembolon et le διατείχισμα par lequel (selon Jean Anagnostès) les Vénitiens fuirent la ville en 1430, est le fruit d’une mauvaise interprétation : c’est justement par le tout-à-l’égout que les superbes Vénitiens se sauvent, tels des rats. L’existence d’un collecteur débouchant à proximité du port est d’ailleurs confirmée par le récit de Camitiatès : la population captive amassée près du port souffrit de la soif à un point tel que certains buvaient l’eau sortant des égouts : « nous étions tous accablés par la soif ; nous priâmes alors ceux qui nous surveillaient de nous laisser boire au moins de l’eau qui coulait à cet endroit … cette eau, qui provenait des latrines de toute la ville, était capable de tuer sans mal ceux qui la buvaient ». 
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Mais au-delà de la question onomastique, reste avant tout à déterminer si une jetée existait et quelle était sa forme. Le plan dressé par A. Strucken 1905, suivi par tous les chercheurs, présente une jetée en forme de coude, qui s'étend vers la mer, à partir de l'angle SO du port. Mais aucune trace physique ne nous permet d'affirmer sa présence, à l'exception d'un bout de mur, qui a été mis à jour dans l'angle SO du port. Faute de fouilles archéologiques et avec le triste constat que la muraille maritime fut détruite en 1870, nous ne pouvons donc que proposer des images virtuelles, en essayant de respecter ce que les sources nous disent.

Peu nombreuses sont les certitudes sur lesquelles nous pouvons fonder nos réflexions. Le port avait été construit au IVᵉ siècle par Constantin, lequel voulut y placer une flotte imposante lors de sa guerre contre Licinius. On dit que Constantin avait « creusé » le port, même si nous pouvons imaginer qu'au lieu d'effectuer cette opération compliquée, il aurait pu faire remblayer la côte, de façon à ce que le port se trouvât à l'intérieur par rapport au rivage. Tout au long de la mer il y avait des fortifications, et deux tours surgissaient de part et d'autre de l'entrée du port. Ces fortifications n'étaient pas si imposantes, ou tout au moins étaient-elles en mauvais état au début du IXᵉ siècle, lors de l'attaque des pirates sarrasins. D'ailleurs, déjà en 619, lors du siège par les Slaves, l'accès au port n'était pas protégé, ce qui obligea les habitants à construire des défenses provisoires.

Nous disposons également d'une description rapide du port dans le récit sur la prise de Thessalonique par les pirates en 904 : Caminiatès nous dit que sa forme est carrée : « Un port remarquable de forme courbe a été creusé, qui offre une entrée profonde aux navires : le port n'est pas troublé par le remous que provoquent les vents et le mouillage est à l'abri des vagues. Un architecte a séparé le port du reste de la mer : par le biais d'une digue, il a contrarié l'impétuosité des flots ... la mer ... s'élance vers la terre ferme, mais elle est arrêtée par cette digue ... l'eau fait un cercle magnifique, et le courant est poussé de part et d'autre vers la ville ... Le port est carré et présente quatre coins ».

Bien que les écrivains mélangent souvent des images rhétoriques à la réalité, les renseignements fournis par Caminitès sont très précis et correspondent à la topographie du port au début du Xᵉ siècle, avec une forme arrondie (au Nord), tout en présentant une physionomie rendue carrée par ses quatre coins, et une digue artificielle qui empêche la déferlante des vagues.

Comme il est fort peu probable que des travaux aient été entrepris dans la période qui précède le Xᵉ siècle, au vu du contexte économique et en raison du fait que les murailles maritimes, selon le même Caminiatès, se trouvaient en mauvais état, nous pouvons imaginer que le port avait la même forme au VIIᵉ siècle, époque du Recueil des Miracles de Saint Démétrius, lequel nous parle du siège que les Slaves infligèrent à Thessalonique.

Les Slaves se servirent des monoxyla, petites embarcations par lesquelles ils essayèrent de pénétrer dans le port et de débarquer sur les quais, au cœur même de la ville. Les habitants avaient construit des remparts de fortune en bois, et fixé sur terre des pièges pour empêcher les ennemis de s'approcher. Les Slaves se partagèrent en deux groupes, l'un attaquant près de l'ekklésiastikè skala, l'autre se dirigeant vers le port. Or, le problème est que nous ne savons pas où se trouvait l'ekklésiastikè skala : il est possible que celui-ci était un petit port secondaire situé dans la partie est du rivage de la ville, en correspondance et en relation avec l'ancien palais impérial, ou bien un endroit du « port de Constantin », donc sis dans l'angle Ouest de la ville. Je serais plutôt de l'opinion selon laquelle la première solution est la bonne. Les deux groupes de Slaves conviennent un sort différent : les monoxyla
des premiers s’entrechoquèrent dans le remous de la bataille et coulèrent en entraînant la perte des hommes qui se trouvaient à leur bord. Quant au deuxième groupe, qui se dirigeait vers le port pour entrer directement dans la ville, « à cause du grand élan les navires débouchèrent à l’extérieur (du port : ἀποστομωσάντων en séchouant à l’extérieur sur la plage, car les Slaves ne parvinrent pas à les retenir ». Il me semble que le mot utilisé indique bien que les monoxyla « débouchent », qu’ils sortent d’un canal ou de la bouche d’un canal, vers l’extérieur, avant de terminer leur course sur la plage, où ils sont rattrapés par les citoyens sortis des fortifications, et tués.

Cela nous donne l’image d’un port devant lequel se trouvait une digue (comme nous le dit Caméniatès), digue dessinant une sorte de canal entre la mer, le port et le rivage. Les Slaves, qui vinrent avec leurs chaloupes de la partie orientale de la ville (comme le texte nous le précise précédemment), s’enfilèrent dans ce canal ou bras de mer artificiel et au lieu de virer sur la droite pour entrer dans le port – dont l’entrée était rendue difficile par la présence de bateaux d’obstruction disposés par les Thessaloniciens – ou sur la gauche pour reprendre le large, ils allèrent tout droit, séchouant sur la plage qui se trouvait à l’Ouest. Par conséquent, la digue était parallèle au port et éventuellement aux fortifications maritimes ; elle devait avoir deux entrées, l’une orientale et l’une occidentale. Mais jusqu’où cette digue allait-elle vers l’Est ? Est-ce qu’elle arrivait jusqu’à la tour orientale, à l’emplacement d’où surgit aujourd’hui la Tour blanche ? Je le soupçonne, mais seules des fouilles pourraient nous le dire. Enfin, de quelle largeur était le canal se trouvant entre la digue et les murs ?

Imaginer la présence d’un canal qui séparait la mer des murs maritimes permet de mieux comprendre certains indices présents dans les sources, comme par exemple l’expression de Caméniatès « la mer … est arrêtée par cette digue … l’eau fait un cercle magnifique, et le courant est poussé de part et d’autre vers la ville » ; ou encore le fait que, lors de l’attaque des pirates en 904, les Grecs essayèrent d’empêcher les navires ennemis de s’approcher de la ville en jetant des sarcophages : ils les jetèrent dans le canal, car la mer arrivait jusqu’aux murailles. Ce canal pourrait avoir été envahi par la vase au cours des siècles, et à l’époque commène, comme nous le dit Eustathe, il n’était plus navigable pendant l’été. En 1430 il ne devait pas être accessible, car les Vénitiens passèrent par les égouts avant de rejoindre leurs navires, lesquels devaient mouiller au-delà de la digue.

Il y a encore un détail qui mérite d’être présenté. Dans le XIVᵉ θαῦμα du plus ancien recueil des Miracles de saint Démétrius, les Slaves attaquent encore une fois du côté de la mer pour entrer dans le port. Voici le texte : « les machines les plus puissantes et en grand nombre y furent transportées par les ennemis … ils envisagèrent de poser sur la mer la plate-forme de bois (τὴν ξύλινον γῆν), grâce à laquelle ils pensaient pouvoir pénétrer dans le port de la ville, et qui fut rejetée à la mer et détruite par un artifice de Dieu seul, et non d’un homme ». L’auteur s’adresse à un public qui connaissait probablement les événements. Mais lorsqu’il parle de la plate-forme de bois, fait-il référence à une invention des ennemis, à une machine de guerre qu’ils avaient porté jusqu’au port et dont les habitants impressionné se souvenaient, ou bien d’une plate-forme qui se trouvait déjà sur place et que les Slaves détachèrent de son point d’ancrage pour la pousser vers le port ? Certes, le fait que les ennemis aient pu emporter des machines de guerre nous fait pencher pour la première lecture. Cependant, il se peut que la « terre de bois » ait été une plate-forme déjà présente sur place, ce qui nous donnerait une idée des aménagements du port devant permettre le transport des marchandises entre la jetée, les quais et les navires mouillant à l’intérieur.
Le port de Thessalonique joua un rôle essentiel durant toute l'histoire de la ville byzantine, mais il demandait des entretiens constants. Faute de moyens, la vase le rendit peu praticable, puisqu'à l'époque comnène il apparaît à sec pendant l'été. Après les Byzants, les Ottomans enterrèrent le port, et à sa place fut construit un quartier, aujourd'hui τά λαδάδικα, seul quartier construit à l'extérieur de la ville jusqu'à la fin du XIXe siècle.
City and Society in The Capture of Thessaloniki by Eustathios: Realism of the “Earlier Renaissance” versus Idealization

The Treaty of Eustathios, Metropolitan of Thessaloniki, on the capture of Thessaloniki by the Normans of Sicily in 1185 has been discussed for the literary genre to which it belonged and has been evaluated in the context of the rest of Eustathios’ works for the new literary and aesthetic style it displays. Various literary genres have been detected in the work. Elements of the threnos or of an epitaphios logos for the city’s sufferings have been discerned; similarities with an enkomion have been detected; characteristics of an invective (psogos) can be recognized in the attacks to the emperor Andronikos I Komnenos (1183-1185) and to David Komnenos, son of Manuel Komnenos, the military commander during the siege; and also the genre of apologia has been proposed (Angold, Odorico) with which Eustathios attempted to dissociate himself from Andronikos and David, after Andronikos’ deposition and death in disgrace. In this case, Eustathios would have been primarily concerned with his own future in the new dynasty. The emphasis of the apologetic tone of the text could be explained partly by Eustathios’ need to declare his distance from Andronikos in order to favorably approach the new emperor, and partly to avert any renewal of hostile actions by his flock in Thessaloniki, caused in the past by his attempted reforms of the Church. The latter explanation is based on the epilogue of the text.

In the preface of his Treaty Eustathios explains his goal in writing the account of the capture of Thessaloniki. He distinguishes his work from narratives of city captures written by historians (πόλεων ἀλώσιες ἱστορούμεναι) who were not eye witnesses of the events, and who occasionally display a theological point of view, embellish the style with ekphraseis of places and monuments, and whose account is not accurate. He, as eyewitness, will incorporate all these stylistic elements to a lesser degree, and he will focus on the catastrophe (μόνῳ πλεονάζειν ὀφείλων τῷ πάθει). Thus he will produce an emotional text. Since clergymen reduce the mourning for catastrophic events, consequently, he will adjust the language of his text accordingly. Being a clergymen he will use other narrative techniques (συγγραφικὰ εἰδη) with restraint and of course he will not use rumors. The account will begin with the description of the catastrophe because the nature of the event itself requires a treatment in a tragic fashion (τραγικεύσασθαι). Then, when the pain is relieved and the author of this disaster is condemned, Eustathios will narrate the events in a style sometimes simple and sometimes polished. At the end Eustathios will conclude as a historian by presenting the sins which caused these disasters (κατὰ μέθοδον διδασκαλικὴν). This treatment of his subject is appropriate to the time the treaty was read and published, namely the holy days of fasting. Thus, the text will end in a kind of ecclesiastical instruction (ὡς αποτελευτᾶν τὸν λόγον εἰς διδασκαλίαν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν) appropriate to an ecclesiastical author.

Indeed, the work displays various narrative techniques, some fully and others less developed. The refined style of the author adheres only partly to the rhetorical tradition, for the dominant feeling is passion, expressed in various ways in the text. The term pathos is recurring. The work will
necessarily start from the disaster (ἀρξεται δὲ ὁ ὑποτεταγμένος λόγος ἀναγκαίως ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάθους).

Strong images of human sufferings illustrate the degree of the catastrophe and give a tragic tone to the narrative. One such example is the description of people caught by a gate, crushed by it, with their bodies half in and half out of the gate. The scenes of the pillage of the city by the Latins and the sufferings of the citizens are realistic, tragic and detailed. It is surprising that in tragic descriptions of human sufferings Eustathios intentionally inserts fanny scenes to ridicule individuals and also to offer a moment of relief from the intense emotions aroused by the tragic narrative. He explains that he chooses to mix a little sweetness with a bitter sequence of the account. For example, David’s behavior is characterized as ridiculous (γελοῖον) when he is compared to a bucket going down a well on a cord, to a barnyard fowl at feeding time, and to a woman.

Eustathios reveals the causes of the capture of Thessaloniki: the bad administration at Constantinople and at Thessaloniki, the emperor Andronikos and the military commander David, whose destructive acts affected the inhabitants of Thessaloniki. David is depicted as idle, and preferring to perish together with Thessaloniki for fear of Andronikos. For this reason, in a lengthy account, Eustathios relates the conspiracy after the death of Manuel Komnenos and the ascent of Andronikos to the throne, and his changed behavior once he became emperor.

Although Eustathios was a conservative ecclesiastic, he expresses a new spirit by recognizing “novelty”, which was unacceptable in the Byzantine political ideology. In the description of the mob of Constantinople the leaders of the mob are condemned as wicked men, eager for revolution, and popular demagogues. Yet the concept of “novelty” is appreciated as a natural inclination of human nature. People are fond of novelty (φιλόκαινος) desiring new events (καινῶν ἐμβάντων) and expecting that time will revive people by a new stimulus after another (ἐγκαινίζειν). Although in all his works Eustathios appears a devoted man of the Church and promoted strict monastic rules in a changing society, his view on human nature and historical development were very “progressive”. He is the first to praise the political system of Venice as the closest to the “mixed constitution” of the Roman Empire, and in an oration (1180) in praise of the public banquets on the occasion of Emperor Manuel’s son betrothal, Eustathios promotes the idea that innovation and progress are necessary.

When the enemy surrounded Thessaloniki and the fleet entered the harbor, it was clear that there was no way out of the siege. Eustathios admits his personal weakness because of the fear he felt; he wanted to leave the city and save himself. But he held back and decided to stay because the military commander did not want Eustathios to be saved, and because the people declared that they would not stay should the metropolitan decided to leave. Personal feelings caused by the fearful and agonizing events are intertwined with an attack against David and his obligations to his flock.

Eustathios offers very perceptive images of Thessaloniki’s social classes. The upper class was concerned for its own safety, while the lower class was left to defend the city. The behavior of members of the upper class is criticized: the wealthy citizens left the city, hired common people and took them with them, thus depriving the city of its defenders. Similar is the behavior of Constantinople’s wealthy inhabitants during the siege by the Crusaders in 1204. Those who remained in Thessaloniki to fight were not people of the upper and middle classes, but thieves and brutes full of savagery. Their passion for their city became uncontrollable as they were thirsty for battle and hungry for barbarian flesh. The role of the social classes in defending the city is reversed. Eustathios draws an image of a society in crisis.
Eustathios inserts in his account detailed descriptions of cloths, a trend known from other authors in the 11th and 12th centuries, when cities were developing and the middle class begun to prosper. Appearance played of course important role in investing the members of the upper class with prestige, and dignity. Eustathios’ descriptions of clothes are used as a means to ridicule. David wore breeches and sandals of the last fashion and a strange red hat. This hat was of Iberian fashion with many folds and fitting closely in the lower part except for the front where it broadened to protect him from the sun. This description undermines David's military ability. Also the detailed description of the Latins with short hair and shaved, and with different dresses and impressive hats, aimed at ridiculing them in the eyes of the Byzantines.

In the description of the siege and its aftermath the social order is eloquently subverted with strong images of destruction, death and sacrilege mingled with hilarious scenes.

The Treaty on the capture of Thessaloniki offers information on the city's topography: the acropolis entrance, the eastern tower, gates, the gate of the Asomatoi, the Golden Gate, a tower over a gate, the lower city, a cistern on the acropolis, a building Zavareion, the church of St. Nicholas, a house in which it was believed that St. Demetrios lived, the “brotherhood of the Myrobletes” which organized a litany of the Virgin's icon and defined the stations, the agora, the hippodrome, dirt roads, description of the house in which Eustathios was kept captive (two storey, with a garden and a small bath), church bells, a hostel of the Church.

The central theme of the work being the military events during the siege and the city's capture, their description is detailed and passionate. It also reveals the behavior of specific groups (military units, wealthy citizens, common people, and clergymen). Lastly, it includes the personal views, behavior and feelings of Eustathios. The wealth of Thessaloniki and its power is stressed in the narrative: golden and silver items with double or multiple layers of gold and silver, books, fine, silk and flimsy fabrics, aromatic and sophisticated products. Such accounts give Eustathios the opportunity not only to mourn for the lost wealth and beauty of the city, but also to contrast Thessaloniki's urban life with that of the invaders. Eustathios comments that all these fine products which Thessaloniki's urban population enjoyed were not appreciated by the Latins who, being barbarians, valued only iron objects.

Eustathios ends his account with an epilogue, as in tragedies and for his didactic purpose defines the sins which caused Thessaloniki's pillage: the oldest sin envy, arrogance, slander, big lies, avarice, slander in the courts, high interest for small loans, ephemeral friendship, hard punishment for those who committed small errors, disrespect and mockery of the sacred things, and perjury when contracts were annulled. In this list of sins, most of which are found in other ecclesiastical works, one can easily discern reference to Eustathios’ personal concerns and bitter feelings because of his flock's hostility in the past. The tragedy of Thessaloniki has been artfully turned into a personal issue; the didactic message at the end of the work became a reminder of his personal sufferings by his flock and the sufferings of the inhabitants a punishment by God. It has been suggested (Angold) that the reason of the clash between Eustathios and his flock was his mission, upon arriving from Constantinople, to impede trends of independence from the central administration, a phenomenon well known in other cities of the empire, as well as attempts of the metropolitan to impose on the city's life an ecclesiastical view instead of the very secular festivals and communal activities. It is important to note that in Eustathios' works is found reference to the “assembly” (ἀγορὰ) or council-chamber (βουλευτήριον), the council
(βουλῆ), and of men who manipulated these urban bodies to take power in the cities. This is a unique reference in the sources of this period. Eustathios not only had discerned this development but he was innovative in pointing to it and did not stick to the traditional views of Byzantine society.

In Eustathios’ Treaty we discern passionate images of the city, full of realism as projected through the personal experience of the author. The narrative of the text tracks the direction of the social and economic change of Byzantine Thessaloniki in the 12th century which resembles that of Italian “Earlier Renaissance” texts. Some of the main characteristics of this period are the following: political cynicism emerges, political ferocity rules; religious language and morality explain the historical events and assess political action by the standards of sin and virtue; the power and effect of money are expressed in a cold and direct way, revealing new perceptions of a new rising class of merchants; personal relations and feelings are depicted in public settings, and are marked by a sense of absence of barriers between private and public life; the discourse is marked by personal allusions and personal invective in a climate of distrust and passion; humor and laughter drain anxiety.

Overall the text displays realism instead of idealization, which is dominant in traditional rhetorical works of city captures. Therefore the text expresses the trends of the new society in the 12th century, marked by a great development of the urban communities and tendencies of self determination, by the ideas and taste of the emerging class of merchants, and by the commercial contacts with the Latins.
Thessalonike during the 11th Century

Thessalonike, along with the rest of the Byzantine Empire, experienced great changes during the 11th century, which resulted to the glorious era of the Komnenoi. Unhappily, very few traces of the economic growth and the artistic activity of the town have survived that could allow safe considerations. Therefore, an overview of the artistic production of the region will be offered on the basis of the existing data and the textual evidence.

Taking as a starting point the only surviving monument of the 11th century in town, the church of Panagia Chalkeon (1028), which offers a safe chronological basis, it will be attempted a review of several matters related to the political and religious changes. It is about a monument that, due to its exact dating and the attested political and social identity of the donor, offers useful tools for the attempted study. Moreover, its function and the conditions of its erection foreshadow several significant features of the Middle-Byzantine architecture. Besides the reasoning of the construction, and the use of the church, the importance of its wall paintings and its architectural features, the presentation will discuss the role and the office of the donor, let alone his relation to Italy and Constantinople.

After all, Panagia Chalkeon illuminates several important factors of the historic evolution of the 11th century Thessalonike, which have not yet been entirely studied.
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Reapproaching Iconoclasm. New Perspectives and Material

The issue of Iconoclasm re-appeared intense in the last fifteen years on the foreground on the occasion of cultural destruction and devastation of figural representations by paramilitary forces in Afghanistan (March 2001) or by the ISIS explosion of the burial place of the prophet Jonah (Sunni mosque of Yunus, 25/7/2014) and the destruction of Palmyra (August 2015). In these cases vandalism appeared as a secular Iconoclasm.

Iconoclasm in the Byzantine Empire remains in several aspects a puzzling issue. Therefore new conferences, modern studies, new archaeological material and new proposals intend to offer more satisfactory explanations of such a crucial controversy spread inside and outside of the Byzantine Empire.

New Conferences and Studies: During the last fifteen years a new boost was given to a better comprehension of Iconoclasm through related organized symposia and the new studies, which were published. The publications were concentrated in two main branches: the relevant Sources and new aniconic Monuments.

The Sources: Most of the sources regarding Iconoclasm derive from Iconoclasm opponents and final winners of the dispute, while information in several hagiological texts was proven to be either inventions and legends, or later interpolations and embroideries attached by iconophile/post-iconoclast writers. The critical edition of such texts provides today the researcher with new tools in order to investigate and conclude the reasons of birth and spread of Iconoclasm in the Byzantine Empire. On the ground of hagiographical texts, as the Vita of St. Steven the Younger
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several theories were constructed and places, as Cyprus\textsuperscript{6} and Crimea were falsely considered in the international bibliography as iconoclastic shelters, even after the publication of the critical edition of hagiographical texts\textsuperscript{7} and relevant studies\textsuperscript{8}.

A considerable work has to be done towards the non-Christian sources mainly of the East (Arab, Persian etc.) and their related information, where many remain unpublished, as well as critical editions of the already known Islamic sources. Characteristic case offers one of the often cited iconoclastic Edicts, the one issued and attributed to caliph Yazid II. of 721, which some scholars today consider it as an anti Islamic invention of later Christian writers of the last quarter of the eighth century\textsuperscript{9}.

**The Monuments:** Further archaeological material mainly from the Greek islands (Crete, Naxos\textsuperscript{10}, Cyprus), Asia Minor\textsuperscript{11} and Cappadocia\textsuperscript{12} was published in the last years revealing more churches with aniconic decoration. As considerable obstacle for their dating to the period of Iconoclasm remained an article of the late Greek Prof. Demetrios Pallas in the 23rd volume (1974) of the *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik*. In that study a monument of vital importance was published, namely the chapel of St. Paul in Akamatra on the island of Ikaria. The aniconic interior of the church was dated due to its three inscriptions at the beginning of the 12th century, according to Pallas. This monument became the cornerstone of his theory, which was interpreted as an aniconic painting trend in the Byzantine Empire during the 11th and 12th centuries. The international echo of Pallas' theory turned his view into an established rule, according to, several aniconic decorations of byzantine churches were dated in that period. Some years ago this well established theory of Pallas was revised by Klimis Aslanidis and the palaiographer Agamemnon Tselikas\textsuperscript{13}, as it was proven that what Pallas had interpreted as a 12th century inscription was actually a misreading of a 17th century inscription. Consequently all monuments with aniconic decoration, which were dated in the 12th century on the ground of Pallas' theory, need to be redated.


\textsuperscript{7} *La Vie d’Étienne le Jeune par Étienne le Diacre* (ed. M.-F. Auzépy), Aldershot 1997.


\textsuperscript{11} See for example the aniconic decoration in recently published monuments of Ephesus: N. Zimmerman, “Die spätantike und byzantinische Malerei in Ephesos”, in: *Byzanz, das Römerreich im Mittelalter* (ed. F. Daim, J. Drauschke), Mainz 2010, Part II., 615-622 and spec. 631-2, fig. 15 with previous bibliography.


\textsuperscript{13} Kl. Aslanidis, «Η χρονολόγηση του ναού του Αγίου Παύλου στην Ακαμάτρα Ικαρίας» *ΧΑΕ, Περιλήψεις 33ος Συμποσίου Βυζαντινής και Μεταβυζαντινής Αρχαιολογίας και Τέχνης*, Αθήνα 2013, 27-28.
Crimea and Cyprus were two remote territories of the Byzantine Empire, which mainly due to forged hagiographical sources were believed that Iconoclasm never reached them. Research projects and new studies demonstrated that the historical and archaeological material in these places delivered several arguments, which actually confirm that Iconoclasm reached and remained dominant in these border places of Byzantium. The Crimea-project\(^\text{14}\) of the Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseum in Mainz offered new material and reexamined older references confirming the stable byzantine exercise of power in that region during Iconoclasm\(^\text{15}\). The publication of new aniconic material from Cyprus and the interpretation of the older theories’ motivation\(^\text{16}\) display the iconoclastic image of Cyprus.

Churches in Cappadocia with aniconic decoration, which were dated by some scholars after Iconoclasm on the ground of the above mentioned study of D. Pallas need now to be revised\(^\text{17}\). On the other hand discovered cases of church decorations with two layers, where the older one was adorned with geometric crosses and then was covered by figurative scenes (e.g. St. Barbara in Korama/Göreme\(^\text{18}\), Tokali II. church\(^\text{19}\), chapel in Koron\(^\text{20}\)) need more convincing argumentation, if someone does not want to connect them with Iconoclasm. It is not easy to accept the argument, in order to reject their dating during the Iconoclastic era - that the aniconic decoration of cave churches in Cappadocia was made due to the low costs to paint crosses instead of figures and because “minimally trained painters might well favor crosses and geometric ornament”\(^\text{21}\). If it was so, why such a phenomenon would occur only in Cappadocia, especially when the most of the painters of that era were the monks themselves? And how these poor painted churches afforded such a rich sculptured decoration, which acquired much more skilled masons? And why the supposed poverty of these churches stopped just after Iconoclasm, when they were decorated with figures? How can we compare the small crosses of the masons on the wall of the churches for protective reasons\(^\text{22}\), with a whole iconographic program with geometric crosses decorated with precious stones and long inscriptions? And what happened in Cappadocia during Iconoclasm? Didn’t this controversy reach Cappadocia, although the bishops of the area were elected and stayed under the jurisdiction of the Iconoclast bishop of Ephesus?\(^\text{23}\) From these questions


\(^\text{15}\) Chotzakoglou, "The cultural network of Cyprus-Constantinople-Euxeinos Pontos" (note 8) 195-6.

\(^\text{16}\) Ch. Chotzakoglou, "Iconoclasm (726-787 and 813-843) and Art in Cyprus and its theoretical basis: a critical approach according to the Sources and to the monuments of the island", in: Κυπριακὴ Ἁγιολογία. Πρακτικὰ Α΄ Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου (ed. Th. Giagkou, Rev. Chr. Nasses), Hagia Napa-Paralimni 2015, 527-566 (in Greek).

\(^\text{17}\) Epstein, “The ‘iconoclast’ churches” (note 6) 105. The argumentation of Epstein is followed even in details by Jolivet-Lévy, “De l’aniconisme en Cappadoce” (note 12) although many arguments of Epstein have been revised by the modern state of research, as e.g. the interpolations in the Vita of St. Stephen the Younger regarding Cyprus and Crimea, the issue of veneration of relics during Constantine V. or the theory of Pallas. See Brubaker-Haldon, Byzantium (note 5) 89-90, 211, 227-8; 234-9, 300-302; Aslanidis, «Η χρονολογία» (note 13); La Vie d’Étienne le Jeune (note 7); Chotzakoglou, "Iconoclasm" (note 16).


\(^\text{19}\) Jolivet-Lévy, "De l’aniconisme en Cappadoce" (note 12) 130-131.

\(^\text{20}\) N. Thierry, "Portraits funéraires inédits de deux officiers byzantins morts au combat sur les frontiers de la Cappadoce" DChAE 30 (2009) 169-176 and spec. 170-1, fig. 2, 5.

\(^\text{21}\) Jolivet-Lévy, "De l’aniconisme en Cappadoce" (note 12) 129 repeats the arguments of Epstein, "The ‘iconoclast’ churches" (note 6) 105.

\(^\text{22}\) Jolivet-Lévy, "De l’aniconisme en Cappadoce" (note 12) 131 repeats the arguments of Epstein, "The ‘iconoclast’ churches" (note 6) 106.

it is clear that we need to give more satisfactory answers regarding the monuments in Cappadocia or even to explain, why Cappadocia did not obey to the imperial iconoclastic policy, if we insist to disconnect their aniconic decoration from the iconoclastic movement.

**Old questions and New Perspectives:** On the occasion of the recent publications of monuments situated mainly in the Near East we have to acknowledge, that the present interpretations are not satisfactory for several cases. If we accept the theories of a non iconoclastic Cappadocia we need to explain why geometric crosses were overpainted by images (e.g. chapel near Koron)\(^{24}\). If we accept the iconoclastic feelings of the Muslim Arabs in Syria, Jordan and Palestine we need to explain on the one side the defaced ancient statues e.g. in Petra and on the other hand the preserved half-naked images of the painted monuments (e.g. Qusayr ‘Amra) of the Jordan desert\(^{25}\). The late father Piccirillo\(^{26}\), as well as other scholars\(^{27}\) used the term “iconophobia”, in order to explain, what happened to figural mosaic presentations mostly in Jordan. The defaced presentations were explained by several scholars as the work of local Christian artists\(^{28}\) triggered by an external source in an iconoclastic environment of Byzantines, Melchites\(^{29}\) and Umayyads\(^{30}\).

But what about the factor of Sunni and Shia in the court of the Umayyads, Abbasids and their successors? Did the gradually formation of these main strands of Islam towards images played a role? It is the same question repeated in the Seljuk Empire of the late byzantine period, where anyone has the impression that no Islamic prohibition towards images was existing. If someone tries to interpret the Islamic beliefs of the 8th and 9th centuries on aniconism with the argumentation, that: “the real evil was not imagery per se, but representations of living creatures, including human beings”\(^{31}\) how can we explain the Umayyad coinage of the 7th century, with figural representations of the Caliph himself?\(^{32}\) What caused the fluctuation of the Sassanian figurative iconography on the Islamic art? Did Iconoclasm in the Muslim Arabs begun as a mean in order to differentiate them from the Byzantines and ended up gradually as a component of a new Arabic identity of the Near East?

Regarding Iconoclasm in the Byzantine Empire many of the issues were lately rephrased: what was questioned was not the existence of images during the eighth and ninth centuries, but rather if they were allowed to be venerated\(^{33}\). Another point is whether the adoration of images existed

\(^{24}\) Thierry, "Portraits funéraires" (note 20) 170-1.


\(^{32}\) E.g. the first Umayyad coins and the new dinar was struck by the Umayyad caliph Abd al Malik (693) with his portrait. The same caliph struck further dinars in 697, where all traces of figurative representation were disappeared: Wijdan Ali, *The Arab contribution to Islamic Art from the 7th to 15th centuries*, Jordan 1999.
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before around 70034, where opinions are divided35. Were Paulicians, Monophysites and Armenians iconoclasts? Different opinions have been also supported36.

In the frame of the Round Table “Re-approaching Iconoclasm. New perspectives and new material” the re-evaluation of the written and material evidence related to the period of Byzantine Iconoclasm will be considered. New material (metalwork, textiles and frescoes) will be presented (Ch. Chotzakoglou, Fl. Karagianni, M. Martiniani-Reber). The contribution and the role of the Church (high clergy and monks) (El. Kountoura-Galake, J. Haldon), Theology and the role of the audience (L. Brubaker) will be examined. The nature and motivation of Iconoclasm as an imperial policy of Leo III. and its impact will be discussed (Rev. Panteleinon Tsormpatsoglou), while the issue on the effects of the imperial policy to the Byzantine Court and the society will be also investigated (J. Haldon).


La question des textiles de luxe à l’époque iconoclaste

Si un corpus de textiles d’époque iconoclaste a pu être suggéré parmi les soieries de luxe conservées dans les trésors des églises d’Occident dès 1966, il n’en demeure pas moins que de nombreux points restent à élucider. Il reste à déterminer si les artisans du textile ont créé à cette période des ornements adaptés à la doctrine iconoclaste et le cas échéant quelle place ont pris ces motifs qui ont peut-être survécu aux époques suivantes. Les raisons qui permettent d’attribuer ces tissus à l’époque iconoclaste sont des données historiques se rattachant, soit à la date de leur arrivée dans l’église qui les abrite, soit à celle de la cérémonie durant laquelle ils ont pu être utilisés. Ces données doivent être perçues comme des points d’ancrage d’une chronologie de l’art textile byzantin qui reste cependant encore incertaine.

Le corpus des soieries attribuables à la période iconoclaste

Dès 1966, en effet, Donald King publie un article dans lequel il énumère et classe les tissus proche-orientaux arrivés à l’époque carolingienne en Europe occidentale où ils sont toujours conservés. Il y distingue trois groupes dont seuls les deux premiers intéressent notre propos, le troisième étant composé de soies post-sassanides qui ont été jadis attribuées à l’Asie centrale (région de Boukharâ), mais dont la production a dû être présente sur un territoire islamique bien plus large. Les soieries d’origine byzantine sont distinguées par la couleur de leur fond rouge ou bleu foncé. Pour cette étude, nous avons préféré mettre l’accent sur les motifs iconographique des soieries.

L’influence orientale sur le décor textile byzantin est visible dans de nombreux exemples qui se distinguent cependant des soieries post-sassanides. Ces dernières ont été parfois incluse dans la production iconoclaste alors qu’elles ont été réalisées hors de l’Empire byzantin. Toutefois, il est vrai qu’elles sont arrivées en Occident à cette période, peut-être par le biais du commerce avec Byzance. On sait qu’un siècle plus tard, la vente de tissus islamiques est attestée à Constantinople par le Livre du Préfet, de même que la connaissance précise de ces textiles l’est par les enluminures du Ménologe de Basile II.

L’étude de Donald King reste toujours d’actualité, même si le corpus qu’il a établi s’est étoffé de nouvelles trouvailles. Cet ensemble augmenté servira de base à notre étude des soieries d’époque iconoclaste.

Les scènes de chasse

Une série de soieries est ornée de cavaliers-chasseurs de fauves, autrefois désignés comme des amazones ; on en connaît de nombreuses variantes différençant par le style ou par la nature de la proie. Certaines sont polychromes, tandis que d’autres plus simples sont bicolores. Quelques-unes ont formé le décor appliqué de tuniques trouvées à Achmim, en Égypte. Certaines peuvent être datées par des indices historiques aux VIIIe-IXe siècles et l’une d’entre elles, conservée au Metropolitan Museum of Art à New York, offre même une inscription arabe en caractères coufiques, révélant la concurrence entre artisans byzantins et arabes. On ne connaît guère le mode de diffusion des décors qui pouvait se faire au moyen de dessins colorés.
La célèbre soierie trouvée dans le reliquaire de saint Austremoine à l’abbaye de Mozac montre la version à la fois la plus simple et la plus aboutie de ces scènes de chasse. Sa composition dans laquelle prédominent les lignes verticales s’oppose à celle des soies « aux amazones », beaucoup plus dynamique, à base de diagonales. L’empereur chevauchant un cheval qui s’apparente davantage à celui d’une statue équestre qu’à un véritable animal, soumet un lion de sa lance. Selon la tradition, cette soierie aurait été offerte à l’abbaye de Mozac, en 761, par Pépin le Bref qui l’aurait lui-même reçu de Constantin V, empereur iconoclaste. Cette datation n’est cependant nullement assurée, et André Grabar la contesta d’après des critères stylistiques, attribuant cette soierie à la période macédonienne dans un article publié en 1956.

Un groupe de soieries à fond bleu foncé montre la chasse dite de Bahram Gour où l’on voit un cavalier chasseur casqué tirant sur un lion attaquant un onagre. L’histoire du souverain sassanide auquel est attribué cet exploit apparaît dans la Chronique de Tabari au IXe siècle, l’auteur indique que le roi fit représenter cette scène dans un de ses appartements. C’est précisément au IXe siècle que sont reliées les nombreuses versions connues de ces soieries. Le suaire de saint Calais, conservé dans la ville éponyme, a sans doute été utilisé lors de la translation de ses reliques par Francon II (816-832) ou en 837 lorsque des moines dissidents de l’abbaye voisine d’Anisole emportèrent à Saint-Calais les objets les plus précieux. Une autre version doublet l’autel d’or de Volvinius à Saint-Amboise de Milan, réalisé vers 835 ; au trésor de la cathédrale de Sens, un fragment est associé aux reliques de saint Philibert, sans doute apportés là au moment de la construction de Saint-Philibert de Tournus. À la bibliothèque de Saint-Gall, dans la reliure d’un manuscrit carolingien furent découverts des fragments d’une étoffe semblable. Tous les indices de datation portent à attribuer ces soieries à la période iconoclaste. La question de la région de leur production demeure même si la majorité des spécialistes tendent à la situer à Byzance plutôt qu’en terre islamique.

Des représentations de chasses à pied peuvent être attribuées à période iconoclaste. L’une provient de la reliure de l’évangile de Santa Maria Lata attribué au dernier quart du IXe siècle ; comme Laura d’Adamo l’a déjà noté, les neuf fragments qui constituaient la doublure d’une reliure d’évangéliaire sont vraisemblablement une réutilisation et ont donc connu un premier usage. Ils sont ainsi antérieurs à la reliure. Ils montrent chacun, sur un fond bleu, un chasseur à pied s’attaquant à un fauve dressé. L’incertitude due aux lacunes de la soierie quant à l’existence d’un diadème sur la tête de ce personnage ne permet pas de l’identifier à l’empereur, à la différence de l’autre soie conservée au Vatican qui, elle, montre bien deux figures impériales redoublées coiffées du stemma surmonté d’une petite croix.

Ce grand fragment offre bien, inscrit à l’intérieur de grands médaillons, une chasse à pied impériale double composée de deux empereurs byzantins de chaque côté d’un arbre de vie en forme de palmier dattier ; armés d’une lance, ils attaquent l’un un lion, l’autre un fauve ocellé. Oiseaux et chiens complètent la scène. Il a servi de couverture de coussin dans le reliquaire des « sandales de notre Seigneur », rattaché au pontificat de Pascal Ier (817-824) autrefois au Sancta Sanctorum.

Les autres représentations impériales

Un portrait impérial du trésor de la cathédrale de Sens, fond vert, décor rouge (actuellement présenté sur l’envers pour une meilleure lecture), pourrait appartenir à la période iconoclaste. Ce serait dans ce cas un unicum, car si la chasuble de saint Ulrich qui présente également un portrait impérial en samit de soie incisée semble plus récente, elle est datée du milieu du Xe siècle.
Divers tissus montrent la victoire symbolique à l’hippodrome comme celui de la châsse de Charlemagne à Aix-la-Chapelle, actuellement partagé entre le trésor de la cathédrale de cette ville et le Musée national du Moyen Âge et des thermes de Cluny. Certaines étoffes du trésor d’Aix-la-Chapelle auraient appartenu à Charlemagne et ce suaire pourrait avoir été placé dès son décès en 814. Un autre tissu de ce type vient de la châsse de sainte Landrade et de saint Amour de Münsterbilsen, actuellement au Musée du Cinquantenaire de Bruxelles, tandis qu’au Victoria and Albert Museum se trouvent deux autres variantes, l’une venant de la châsse d’un évêque de Verdun, l’autre du reliquaire de saint Hippolyte à Sainte-Ursule de Cologne dont les reliques furent rapportées de Rome au IXe siècle. Le fragment de Verdun pourrait être rattaché à l’un des événements les plus remarquables de l’histoire de la cathédrale de cette ville, l’incendie qui la détruisit en 740, sous le pontificat de saint Maldavée. Après avoir lancé la reconstruction de l’édifice, Maldavée part à Rome, puis à Jérusalem pour se procurer de nouvelles reliques destinées à sa nouvelle cathédrale. Il revient à Verdun en 754 et trouve celle-ci presque achevée.

La soierie aux Dioscures provient de l’église Saint-Servais de Maastricht ; son iconographie unique dans le décor textile la rattache aux courses de l’hippodrome, lieu où était disposée leur statue. On a pu relier l’étoffe à la translation des reliques de saint Servais qui eut lieu en 726 qui semblerait ainsi la dater du début de la période iconocaste.

**Diverses représentations**

Un petit fragment de la cathédrale de Toul offre probablement une image d’Europe et de Pasiphaé sur un fond rouge qui serait accompagné du buste de Zeus en médaillon. Il provient de la châsse de saint Amon de Toul dont les reliques furent l’objet d’une translation en 820.

Des chevaux ailés richement ornementés et cravatés figurent sur une soie ayant été utilisée pour couvrir le coussin de la croix du pape Pascal 1er (817-824). La composition en registres horizontaux superposés, alternativement dirigés vers la droite ou vers la gauche rappelle étroitement l’art textile sassanide. Seules la variété et la vivacité des couleurs, l’importance des espaces ides qui mettent en valeur le fond rouge, ainsi que le caractère très décoratif de l’ensemble, notamment les fleurons et les palmettes du corps des animaux permettent de conclure à une production byzantine.

Toutes les soieries examinées proposent une iconographie non chrétienne, composée de figures impériales, de chasseurs, de victoires à l’hippodrome ou encore d’animaux. Il convient donc de se poser la question de la place des scènes de l’Annonciation-Nativité qui leur sont contemporaines, appartenant au groupe des soies fond rouge déterminé par Donald King. Elles proviennent toutes deux du Sancta Sanctorum. Ces deux fragments sont de deux tissus différents bien que semblables, l’un fond rouge teint au kermès (Annonciation), l’autre (Nativité) à la cochenille polonaise. On a pu démontrer qu’un fragment appartenant au trésor de l’abbaye de Baume-les-Messieurs présente aussi une Annonciation. Ce tissu a pu être rapproché des reliques de saint Florence, parvenues à Baume depuis Évreux au IXe siècle, faisant partie de cette translation, ou ajouté lors de la cérémonie accompagnant la translation à Baume. Ces représentations religieuses sur des tissus qui appartiennent au groupe des soieries à fond rouge déterminé par Donald King et daté des VIIIe-IXe siècles sont sans doute explicables par une production ayant eu lieu entre 775 et 813, période de retour aux images.
Les sources historiques occidentales et orientales

Les sources byzantines sont toutes postérieures et en conséquence iconodoules. De plus, elles sont peu dites sur la nature des textiles, se contentant souvent de mentionner la présence d’or. Les sources islamiques contemporaines sont rares et pas plus précises à cet égard. Un auteur contemporain, Ibn al-Farra’ insiste sur la valeur marchande et reste muet sur les ornements textiles. Il témoigne de l’arrivée d’un ambassadeur envoyé par Théophile (829-842) au calife al-Mu’tasim (833-842), accompagné de présents dont quarante étoffes brodées d’or, chacune longue de 40 coudées et large de 20 coudées. Apparemment ces étoffes devaient être des laizes.

La source principale est occidentale ; le Liber Pontificalis, cite de nombreuses étoffes comportant des représentations chrétiennes à l’époque iconoclaste, en particulier sous le pontificat de Léon III (795-816). Le texte témoigne aussi sous le même pontificat de l’emploi de griffons et d’éléphants et autres motifs zoomorphes inscrits à l’intérieur de médaillons circulaires. Ce sont bien là des décors textiles précurseurs de ceux qui prédomineront à la période macédonienne. Sous Grégoire IV (827-844), le Liber Pontificalis mentionne des ornementations mêlant animaux et iconographie religieuse, lions et Résurrection, griffons et Nativité. Les images religieuses étaient sans doute brodées ou appliquées. À la même époque sont mentionnés des hommes et des chevaux qui sont certainement des scènes de chasse.

On ne doit cependant pas perdre de vue la possibilité qu’une partie des représentations chrétiennes a pu être rajoutée en Occident, et même à Rome, par broderie ou par application et que les animaux ou scènes de chasse constituaient peut-être seulement le décor du fonds sur lequel étaient cousus des panneaux brodés.

Le Liber comporte de nombreuses mentions d’étoffes brodées ou tissées d’or dont on peut avoir une idée par des témoignages conservés, mais plus tardifs. Ces derniers tirent-ils leur origine de ces soies d’époque iconoclaste ? on peut citer des soieries brodées d’inspiration byzantine conservées en Italie : la chape de Boniface VIII (1294-1305) à Anagni, et celle en soie ornée de perroquets de la cathédrale de Vicenza, offerte en 1259 par Louis IX. Toutes deux sont des soies rouge vif brodées d’or.

Comparaisons des décors textiles des VIIIe-IXe siècles à des ornementations peintes aniconiques

Une étude sur la relation entre les textiles et les décors aniconiques publiée en 2015 a permis de de comparer des décors ornementaux, médaillons, rosaces, à des motifs textiles, parfois antérieurs à l'iconoclasme, comme les feuilles garnies de festons, connues dès les VIe-VIIe siècles. Certains ornements peints sont similaires, offrant des dispositions identiques à l’intérieur de médaillons parfois entrelacés. Les coloris employés reprennent ceux des soieries, sans doute grâce à des modèles communs, alors que les pigments minéraux des peintures murales sont par nature différents des teintures végétales et animales des textiles. Ce sont des décors relevés sur les peintures murales à Saint-Jean d’Aïdiasou, Saint-Artemios de Sagri, et Sainte-Kyriaki d’Apiranthos, attribuées à la période iconoclaste qui fournissent les comparaisons les plus pertinentes. Des motifs analogues sont également présents dans plusieurs églises de Cappadoce, en Grèce, à Saint-Procope dans le Magne, à Saint-Nicolas de Mirambello, en Crète, ou encore à Episcopi en Eurytanie.
Conclusion

On pourrait presque parler de témoignages de l'absence à propos des textiles iconoclastes, puisqu'à la différence des autres périodes de l'art byzantin, nous n'avons pas de représentations figurées qui documenteraient leurs décors en les replaçant dans leur contexte. Seuls les fragments conservés en Occident et datés par des mentions de cérémonies, ou autres événements qui leur sont rattachés, ainsi que les sources écrites sont en mesure de nous livrer des informations. Or, nous avons vu que les textes byzantins et arabes contemporains mentionnent majoritairement des soieries comportant des fils d'or pourtant absents des soieries que nous avons conservées.

Si tous les exemples du corpus présentés dans cet exposé appartiennent certainement aux VIIIe-IXe siècles, on ne peut garantir qu'ils aient tous été fabriqués sous le règne des iconoclastes, des soieries comme celles l'Annonciation et de la Nativité n'en faisant sans doute pas partie. Néanmoins, on constate dans ce corpus un accent mis sur la personne de l'empereur et de ses victoires symboliques à la chasse ou à l'hippodrome. Les rares images religieuses restent concises à la différence des cycles des époques précédentes. Nous apprenons aussi des descriptions du Liber Pontificalis que des motifs devenus emblématiques sous les Macédonienne, sont déjà bien présents durant l'iconoclasme ; sans doute, cette époque a été déterminante dans la gestation des décors textiles.
Monastic Politics and Vested Interests in the Inter-Iconoclastic Years: Myths and Realities

While it is generally assumed that there was a solid and obdurate monastic opposition to imperial iconoclasm during the eighth century, until we get to the period of the council of Nicaea in 787 there is not much evidence to support this contention. There certainly was a core of opposition to Eirene’s and Tarasios’ policy, although it was both limited in numbers and in effect, and it was the iconophile hagiographical and historiographical tradition that lay behind the established view of a much longer-term monastic opposition. There is no evidence for any monastic opposition to the synod of 754, or to the policies of Constantine V in general, before the events of 765/766, when the monk Stephen was killed and a number of higher-ranking military personnel were executed for plotting against the emperor. In spite of his later reputation, monks were numbered among Constantine V’s entourage and supporters; many are supposed to have abandoned their vows in return for state positions and titles and the accompanying emoluments; and his ‘persecution’ of monks seems to have been both limited and directed at particular individuals or groups. Needless to say, we can debate the fragile evidential basis for most views of Constantine’s attitude to monks and monasteries, but the absence of anything other than broad generalizations about persecutions does not speak well for the veracity of the iconophile interpretation.

More importantly for this forum, there was no unified monastic ‘party’. As soon as we read through the acts of the council of 787 we can see that there were at least three loose groupings or factions before the council: a group of hardliners who refused to attend the council; those who wished to bring about a change in imperial religious policy, but who would accept the readmission to the church of former ‘iconoclasts’; and those who would make no compromise at all. Apart from these – the great majority from the metropolitan region – there may also have been monks who were either active supporters of established imperial policy, or relatively apathetic with regard to images, about whom we know nothing.

While there is evidence to suggest that there were a number of committed iconoclasts among the higher clergy, there is little convincing evidence that there was any particular group explicitly opposed to imperial iconoclasm, at least until the months preceding the holding of the abortive council of 786 and the more successful gathering of 787. Only when the empress Eirene had made her position clear did the iconoclast clergy waver, and the acts of 787 show that the great majority of iconoclasts rapidly adapted themselves to the new situation. Iconoclasm was and remained throughout its history an entirely imperial phenomenon, with few roots in popular opinion and with only the vested interests of those dependent upon the emperor or unreflectively loyal to the ruler (although this must often have been the great majority) as the basis for its continued existence. But so long as it remained the official policy of the government and of the emperors, it retained the loyalty, passive or not, of the great majority of the empire’s subjects.
So in thinking about the issue of who was iconoclast or not, and why, it is worth examining briefly the issue of the effects the imperial policy had on relations between the various elements involved, in particular of the relations between emperor and court, on the one hand, and society at large on the other. The response of the clergy at large, and the response of certain monastic circles, is especially relevant, as is the response of the wider world - the church in Rome and the other patriarchates in particular. So far, it would appear that both support for and opposition to iconoclasm depended very much on closeness to the court and the emperors themselves. It reflected, in other words, the degree of dependency of those who were willing to support iconoclast notions upon the emperors and their court. But why did individuals or groups oppose or publicly object to iconoclasm? Until now, it has generally been seen as a question of conscience - those who opposed imperial policy did so because they had a particular view of, or understanding of, sacred images, and they saw iconoclast ideas as a fundamental challenge to their understanding of orthodox belief.

I want to suggest some other, or at least, additional, motives that may have been at play. After all, if many of those who were most loyal to imperial policy acted as they did because of their relationship to the emperors, might it not be equally true that those who opposed imperial policy were also motivated by reasons other than the purely theological?

Was an individual's choice in taking up the monastic vocation, and more importantly, in taking up a position of authority and leadership in metropolitan monastic circles, also one way of facilitating real influence upon, or opposition to, imperial policy, whether in terms of religious issues strictly speaking or in respect of policy issues more broadly? Courtiers and state officials in the army or other aspects of the administration depended for rank, function and position more or less directly upon the emperor, and were thus entirely bound to support imperial policy, at peril of losing their jobs, or their heads. Bishops were almost as closely bound to the imperial court, through the patriarchate, and could offer little opposition (or could not hope to get away with it, as the plots of 765-766 illustrate). In contrast, monastic communities had a greater degree of freedom and were protected or shielded to a degree at least by convention and popular piety. It is certainly very clear from the council of 787 that the monks had no intention of sitting quietly until matters were resolved; yet although they had an overtly 'political' agenda, insofar as they wanted the question of readmission of iconoclast bishops to be at the top of the list for discussion, they were tolerated by Eirene (even though she excluded them from the final meeting in the Magnaura), perhaps because they had dissolved into factions, which could easily be separated and dealt with - as indeed events, as steered by Tarasios, demonstrated. The sudden decision to enter a monastery on the part of such a high-ranking fiscal official as Plato of Sakkoudion, for example, and that of his equally well-placed nephew Theodore shortly afterwards, may well be a little more complex than has usually been assumed.
Purity, Power and Audience

The Byzantine image struggle – Iconomachy – was about many things, most directly whether or not religious portraiture was legitimate in a Christian context. There were also, however, two very strong sub-texts to Iconomachy. The first concerned religious purity: the need to be orthodox, to regain favour as God’s chosen people. This formed the basis of arguments (though, obviously, different vantage points) by both Iconoclasts and Iconophiles. The second sub-text was, however, more one-sided, and centred on issues of control and power: should ecclesiastical authorities control access to God? The iconoclast position that the only true image of Christ was the eucharist, and that scripture was to be valued over icons as a route to God, removed power and control from ordinary people while strengthening the authority of the priesthood.

These two sub-texts are very clearly expressed in the Horos (definition) of the iconoclast council of 754, which repeatedly stressed the importance of the church as an institution. The churchmen’s desire to take control of spiritual leadership – to remove people’s personal relationship with saints, channelled through relics and icons, and instead to insist that people used the clergy as their intermediaries – is reiterated throughout the document as we can reconstruct it today. The 754 council evidently wanted to move from a bottom-up theology, in which priests were not necessarily the central figures, to a top-down theology, in which the church controlled people’s access to the sacred. Hence the council rejected all sources of spiritual authority outside the church (including images as sites of the ‘real presence’ of saints) and decreed that the clergy were the only authoritative intermediaries between the sacred and humanity. As a corollary to the rejection of images and the promotion of the clergy, the council stressed the importance of the spoken or chanted word, in other words the liturgy.

One important consequence of the ways that both of these sub-texts played out in the iconoclast literature was that the pro-image faction, too, needed to up its theological game to ensure that the purity and orthodoxy of its own positions was inviolable. Because the cult of images was, in itself, driven by practice (we hear about, or have archaeological evidence of, the practice of venerating icons much earlier than any theological justification of that practice) rather than by theology, the churchmen’s official pronouncements – for or against the veneration of icons – inevitably had only limited relevance to the devotional practices of ordinary people.

The tension that this situation created is evident from, for example, the writings of Theodore of Stoudion, who both insisted on the materiality of an icon (the worshipper prays not to the wood but to the saint), which detached the image from its prototype, and, in another famous text, praised the selection of an icon of St Demetrios as a child’s godfather. I would argue that this is a tension of our own, modern, making, and that we need to remember that theory and practice – like images and texts – do not need to be, and indeed cannot be, purveyors of identical concepts to identical audiences.
Remarks on the Iconography of Metal Works of Art and Coins of the Iconoclasm Period

As very often is pointed out, the Iconoclastic controversy influenced dramatically the evolution of Byzantine art of the 7th-9th centuries since on one hand it caused the changing of the iconographical types and on the other hand it is combined with a reduction in the production of works of art. The cross, as symbol, has been identified with the Christian faith and became dominant sign and motive in Christian art, even from the early Christian era. Due to the extra role it undertook during the Iconoclasm period, it could be expected that the number of crosses, either pectoral or processional, would be increased. On the contrary, the existed material shows that the number is very limited, especially compared with the enormous widespread of analogous crosses and mainly of the reliquary-crosses type during the middle Byzantine period (10th-12th c.).

Among the few examples of the iconoclasm period, and definitely between the most interesting and important pectoral crosses attributed to the iconoclasm period, is a cross which belongs to a private collection (Collection of G. Pilichos - Athens). It presents a unique synthesis of medallions with emperors depicted at the four edges of the arms of the cross. Although no inscription accompanies them, there is no doubt that the presented figures are emperors because of their depiction with diadems of the characteristic Isaurian type which consists of two curved dotted lines close together and surmounted by a frontal cross. Furthermore, the figure on the right wears diadem with pendilia and holds a scepter with a cross on the top whereas the one on the top wears a helmet indicating his military identity. In the centre of the cross no scene, neither the Crucifixion is depicted. There is only a special formation of a smaller cross which initially included some additional holy material or more likely, a precious stone in its interior.

There are undoubtedly a lot of questions regarding the iconography and the use of the specific copper cross, in which no holy figure is depicted. This “holy” absence and the depiction of imperial figures instead, indicate the iconoclasm period. Due to the lack of analogous works of art, the only comparison can be made with similar depictions in coins. The study of the iconoclasm coins has shown that Leo III Isaur, like Heracleius, in an effort to restore political stability exercised a strong dynastic policy, which is also reflected in the coinage of the rest of Isauroi. Under the influence of this policy, the members of the imperial family and the co-emperors are depicted often on both sides of the coins, or combined with crosses. Probably the specific cross expresses exactly this creeping struggle between the emperor and the church about throne-sharing with God, and imprints the official policy of exclusion of portraits of holy people in worship and in art.
IDEOLOGIKES PROUPOTHESEIS TIS EIKONOMACHIAS

H prouistoria kai ta peristikata tis anarrrhsews ston throno tis Léontos Γ’ (717) den fwtizoun to ideologikó tou parathlon. H anameixeí tou sta thrskeuentika prágmata den suniosta prwtotupia, dióti polú prin apó tis epoxh tis eixe ginvei apodékto o autokrátora na eche prwteúonta lógo stin diamórfwsi tis ekklhsiastikis politikis ton krátoucs.

Oi plhrorofies apó toucs sughrronous kataadieknýoun óti entelw as anaítia kai se anúpopto chróno ekdhlwthke ws eikonomáchos o Léos. Oi theoloiqés apoýseis tou éthan polú aplóikes kai filodóxhes synáma, nómiçe óti éthan o néos Oýias pou ezébaile meta apó 800 chrónia to khalkino fídi apó ton Naó tou Solomónntos (Basil. Δ’ 18, 4).

Oi sughrroni katevnhsan kai antimeítwpisan tis Eikonomachia ws miá kaiotomía ton Léontos theoloiqik chraktíra. Oi opoies epidráseis sthn Eikonomachia einai fainomenoilogikés, dióti oi diaforóres pou chwrízan ton Xristianismó apó ton Ioudaismó kai to Islám éthan ontologikés.

H ápou pou òti hè Eikonomachia eixe skopó na apoteléssei to óchima miais aplousterhsthes theoloiqías prokeiménou na protseghisónoun oi omdades ton arierikwn tis Anatolís osos kai an fainetai gōntevnikh, tósso den sthnizei sta gegovnta. Dióti to Islám doússe me tis emiwmh tou tíschan tis Armdnwn dén éthan eikonomáchoi. Oi Paulikianoi ektois ton eikówn apérriptan kai ton stauro kai oi Mounofístites dén éthan eikonomáchoi.

H istoria tis Eikonomachias apó tis genhs tis éws tis ekpnoi tis sunvdeita me ta anaktora kai tis autokratikí prwtoboulia. O Léos Γ’ eixe mia aplh skgeh, na epibállei tis òrthodóxia» ópws autós tis kataanouúse. As me xehnoúme tis prwtoboulies, ton Hrapkleíou, ton Varðán -Filipikíou.
“Golden Necklaces”: The Participation of Cypriot Bishops in the Seventh Oecumenical Council (787)

Constantine Archbishop of Constantia of Cyprus took part in the Seventh Oecumenical Council held in Nicaea in 787. He was accompanied by five more Cypriot bishops. Archbishop Constantine maintained a prominent position throughout the proceedings of the Council, as per ecclesiastical hierarchy due to its autocephalous status. Constantine of Constantia was taking the floor immediately after the Patriarch of Constantinople Tarasios who presided over the Council. He constantly agreed and repeated exactly what the previous speaker had said in order to advocate the restoration of the cult of icons and reject Iconoclasm. The presence of Cypriot bishops in the Second Council of Nicaea was highly appreciated by eminent personalities of the Byzantine Church, who were the vigorous promoters of the iconophile issue by fostering Orthodoxy. Patriarch Nikephoros (806-815) who was a close collaborator of Patriarch Tarasios (784-806) and as imperial commissioner had an active role in the Council referred to the piety of “the old and new churchmen” from Cyprus. Theophanes, in all probability another participant of the same Council, in his Chronography speaking about the contemporary Patriarch Paul (780-784) of Cypriot origin, characterised him as “eminent due to his immanent rationality and conduct”. As religious controversies in Byzantium often included political process the aim of this paper is to examine the reasons that the Cypriot bishops were called the “golden necklaces” of the Church. The focus will be on their role in the formation of Orthodox percept formulated by the second Council of Nicaea in which the delegation from the eastern Patriarchates was quite limited.
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Introduction

In the study of the art and material culture of the Latin states in the southern Greek mainland and the islands the view prevailed, until very recently, that the presence of Westerners only marginally influenced the artistic activity of these regions. This perception played a crucial role in shaping the research interests and perspectives of scholars. Thus, for example, the few surviving Crusader architectural works were approached merely as examples of the western architectural tradition and studied in isolation from all other buildings of the same period in the region. On the other hand, Romanesque or Gothic elements adopted in the local ecclesiastical architecture, were characterized simply as “western influences” and considered to be limited only to specific morphological details that did not alter the “purity” of the Byzantine architectural forms.

Similarly, in the case of monumental painting contact with the art of the West was identified only in minor details, usually iconographical themes of a pragmatic nature, that did not affect the “Orthodox” character of Byzantine iconography and style. Any iconographical element that was “different”, “novel” or “foreign” in the pictorial production of these areas was considered as the result of the contact with Western art, without any specific historical analysis or comprehension of its sources. The obvious explanation of Western domination was enough to interpret these pictorial details that escaped from the norm and were described generally as “Western influences”.

This approach has been revised and recent studies view the artistic production of these regions as an entity. Thus, Olga Gratziou in her book on the ecclesiastical architecture in Venetian Crete (Η Κρήτη στην ύστερη μεσαιωνική εποχή. Η μαρτυρία της εκκλησιαστικής αρχιτεκτονικής, Herakleio 2010) investigates both Venetian buildings and Byzantine churches; she examines the co-existence of these two communities differing doctrines and tries to trace the mechanisms that lead to the emergence of the new composite world in the Latin East.

A similar turning point has taken place in the study of the Frankish Peloponnese, especially/primarily in its northwestern part, where the Latin presence was dominant. The recent excavations in the castle of Glarentza, the research and restoration works at the castle of Chlemoutzi, the doctoral dissertations of Demetrios Athanasoulis on the ecclesiastical monuments of Elis (Η ναοδομία στην Επισκοπή Ωλένης κατά την μέση και ύστερη βυζαντινή περίοδο, University of Thessaloniki, 2006) and of Eleni Barmparitsa on the finds of the excavations at the St Francis basilica in Glarentza, the castle of Chlemoutzi and other Latin-held sites of Elis (Η μαρτυρία των μεταλλικών αντικειμένων από τα κάστρα Χλεμούτσι, Γλαρέντζα και άλλες θέσεις της φραγκικής Ηλείας. Όψεις της ζωής των Φράγκων του πριγκιπάτου της Αχαϊας, University of Athens 2014), have brought to light rich new material and offered a holistic view of the material remains of the region. In their contributions in
the present round table the above-mentioned researchers continue to investigate these problems along the same lines. Olga Gratziou presents the first results of a corpus of sculptures from Venetian Crete, Demetrios Athanasoulis focuses on hybrid forms of the ecclesiastical architecture in Argolis and Corinthia, while Eleni Barmparitsa examines further material from the Peloponnese, focusing on issues illustrating where local traditions meet those of the Latin newcomers.

New material has come to light through excavation and restoration works in Messenia in the southwestern Peloponnese. In his present paper Michalis Kappas re-examines three Orthodox monasteries and discusses the evidence of Latin patronage in their 13th-century wall decoration, offering new interpretations and shedding light on a region, where the integration of the two cultures was gradually taking place.

In the round table we will also examine the policies of the Latin religious orders, which were activated in the East in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade, as is well known from past research. Nickiphoros Tsougarakis' present contribution sheds new light on the orders' activities in Frankish Greece in relation to papal policy, which seems to have been more tolerant in the thirteenth century than was previously assumed. The author argues, however, that the Latin religious orders did not pursue a single policy and that certain of their members seem to have followed an agenda of confrontation towards the Greek rite.

Art production played an essential role in the missionary activities of the religious orders. Echoes of their preaching, and more generally of the teaching of the Latin doctrine have already been traced in the iconography of Byzantine monumental art, sometimes as confrontation, reaction and response, sometimes as acceptance and parallel development. The contributions of Sophia Kalopissi-Verti and Anastasia Drandaki shed light on these two different aspects of the dialogue between Byzantine painting and Latin doctrine.

Vicky Foskolou assembles and studies the scattered and fragmentarily preserved samples of wall paintings of Latin patronage, focusing on issues of identity, political agenda and social status of the Latins in southern Greece.

Since our approach to the artistic production and the interrelationship between Byzantines and Latins is based not only on the political circumstances but also on social conditions, as well as on financial and trade activities, the discussion will not be limited only to the Latin-held regions of Greece, but will also be extended to the Byzantine state of Epiros. Based on a diverse set of visual evidence, from coins and objects of the minor arts to church architecture, sculpture, and mural painting, Leonela Fundić aims in her paper to investigate the conditions under which artistic interrelations between the Byzantine State of Epiros and the Latins occurred.

We hope that the contributions of our round table, based on the archaeological, artistic and textual evidence, will shed light on different aspects of the co-existence between Byzantines and Latins on the Greek mainland and the islands in the 13th-15th centuries and will contribute to our better understanding of the various manifestations of the interrelationship between the two different ethnicities and cultures.
Church Architecture in Argolid and Corinthia after 1204

Abstract: The paper focuses on a group of churches erected in the Argolid and Corinthia which display Byzantine architectural types combined with Gothic morphological features. Morphological characteristics and the quality of construction vary within this group depending on the availability of materials and the donors' financial status.

A large number of noteworthy monuments were erected in Corinthia and the Argolid during the crusader period. The Panagia church founded by the Latin archbishop of Corinth Willhelm von Meerbeke in the plain of Argos is undoubtedly the most important. A group of small churches with common characteristics might be regarded not so much as the work of a single workshop, but as belonging to the same idiom that developed after the mid-thirteenth century.

These buildings display three types of ground plans: the two-column cross-in-square (six examples), the peculiar compressed cross-in-square with arms of different width (four examples), and the cross-vaulted (4 examples). The four two-columned churches feature unusual half-barrel vaults over the west corner bays.

The north-eastern Peloponnesian idiom incorporates sporadically Gothic morphological characteristics, such as capitals and sculptural reliefs. Moreover, it is strongly influenced by contemporary Gothic monuments of the Peloponnese, with features such as the wide use of ashlar masonry or the door and window frames carved onto the ashlar masonry. The monolithic lunettes with their carved dentil courses of the Koimesis and Taxiarches churches at Sophiko are most characteristic in this respect. The half-columns cut into the masonry on the corners of the eight-sided domes of Taxiarches at Larisi and the Transfiguration at Tarsina should be attributed to the very same tradition. The churches that illustrate this local idiom share several other features: the glazed bowls are imbedded not in the masonry, but in cavities carved into the ashlar blocks; the arched window openings have a recessed solid lunette that limits the height of the rectangular window below.

At the same time, morphological features and the quality of construction vary within this group depending on the availability of materials and the donor's financial means. Thus the churches of the Hypapanti at Sophiko and Hagios Georgios at Berbati have semi-circular apses and cylindrical domes. In fact, the Berbati building strongly resembles Middle Byzantine examples of the conservative style.

In general, however, Late Byzantine Peloponnesian architecture favours experimentation and innovation. The highly original dome with its eight-concave-sided drum, invented by the master builder of the Hagios Nikolaos church at Malagari, Corinthia, is undoubtedly the product of such circumstances.
Aspects of Everyday Life in the Frankish States of Greece

Abstract: In the Greek urban centres under Latin rule a sort of hybrid civilisation developed during the late Middle Ages, characterised by mutual cultural exchanges which resulted from the coexistence of different ethnic groups. Everyday life was marked by the preparations for war, business activities, consumption habits, particularly of those belonging to the upper classes, as well as burial practices.

Medieval culture, as it is known in Western Europe, is generally considered to have been introduced into Greece by the Franks, in 1204. The Franks took advantage of the governmental structure of the Greek territories and the local population in their attempt to support the standard of living had been accustomed in their places of origin. The establishment of mutually beneficial relationships between the conquerors and the conquered and the economic growth resulted from the long-term integration of the two cultures.

The standard of living in Frankish urban centers is co-examined through the archaeological finds, the iconography and the written sources. Therefore, the research is focused on the customs and the way of life of the upper social strata, whether Latins or natives, as the lifestyle of the productive classes in the base of the social pyramid is only occasionally reflected. In the context of this presentation, we will attempt to underline certain features that can be interpreted as the results of coexistence.

In the urban centers of the Latin states there lived Frankish lords, merchants and craftsmen, ordinary people and soldiers. Land property and agricultural production was the basic source of wealth and status for the Frankish invaders who sought to preserve a racial, linguistic and territorial diversification from the indigenous population. The castles served as the conquerors’ control bases. Operating as administrative and military centers, storehouses and supply stations, they were symbols of status around which the life of the feudal lord and his vassals was organized.

War was a vital part of everyday life in the Middle Ages and the chivalric ideals were diffused by the Crusades as a way of social behavior. The conquerors of former Byzantine lands had a sense of military supremacy, which seems to have affected the way the native population perceived their presence. The knightly status of the ruling class of the principality of Achaia underlines a set of twelve high-quality spurs, which were probably imported from Western Europe and were unearthed from the burial levels of the Glarentza cathedral.

In the Frankish states of Greece, Western knights and their followers were well aware of European developments in military equipment. Italian records reflect the economic and political ties with neighboring Italy –the Kingdom of Naples, Genoa, Florence and especially Venice– which contributed to the relative stability of imports of arms, warhorses, pack animals and riding equipment in Greece, during the 13th and early 14th century.

The Franks of the Fourth Crusade wore chain mail, with variations in terms of length and slits, and a sleeveless surcoat bearing their coat of arms. They held triangular shields and wore helmets.
of various types over a chain mail hood (coif). The chain armor was flexible but vulnerable to blows from spears and arrowheads. As a result, the warriors gradually added new elements to their chain mail for extra protection. From 1250 until 1410, a sort of hybrid armor was used in which the chain mail was covered with leather or metal plates and mainly protected the vital parts of the body.

Swords and spears were the main weapons of knights. Daggers and maces completed the war gear, while bows and war axes were used by knights and even more so, by the lower military units. During the 13th and 14th centuries, the typology of the knightly sword in Europe and the eastern Mediterranean shared common characteristics, despite the numerous variations and sub-types. It consists of a heavy, tapering blade, a generally straight cross, circular in section and widening at the ends, and a circular or spherical pommel. The swords with the ‘wheel’ pommel gradually prevailed in Europe from 1100 to 1500/1550. During the 14th and 15th centuries, the dagger became an important item of the warrior’s gear. It was used both by soldiers and citizens and was fabricated in a variety of types (from simple knives to miniature swords). During the Crusades, the lance was mainly used to perform sudden attacks on equestrian units using the high-impact strength of the couched-lance technique (lance couchée). From the 13th century onwards, in the eastern Mediterranean, the spears of the lances became smaller, elongated and more acute-pointed. The bow and crossbow gradually became more important for the outcome of a battle. Written sources show how the military attitude of the Latins evolved, gradually adopting the practices of the Eastern armies, and preferring sudden attacks by equestrian archers positioned in passages, which had a low cost and could strike an effective blow against enemy forces. Equestrian or pedestrian groups of skilled archers are mentioned more often than not in the Chronicle of Morea, while the increasing use of the crossbow was mainly connected with the guarding of castles.

Knightly war games were important elements of the medieval military and social life. Joust and tournament, and the exercises which prepared for them, were the most serious occupation of knightly people when they were not engaged in hunting and hawking. They were suitable occasions for social interaction, education of young knights and equipment demonstrations.

War preparations presupposed financial prosperity. The economy of the Latin states of Greece was organized in conjunction with the commercial interests of Italian maritime cities. Written sources, mainly Italian archives and archaeological finds (ceramic imports and numismatic data) suggest that the Frankish urban centers were actively involved in eastern Mediterranean trading activities as suppliers of services to trade and shipping operations. Both foreign and local merchants increasingly viewed Latin Romania as a source of foodstuffs, especially grain, pastoral products, wine, and salt, as well as industrial raw materials such as silk and colorants for the industries of the West. In addition, the region was also a market for Western goods. The agricultural and livestock production was in the hands of the indigenous population. The internal distribution of production, as well as the gathering of a large amount of products for export, was organized through annual fairs, although in territories under Venetian rule, goods brought for sale to the city had to be weighed or measured at the Commune’s official station located in the marketplace.

Large urban centers (such as Coron, Modon, Negroponte, Candia, Glarentza) provided facilities for the conduct of commercial activities: markets, storehouses, shipyards, arsenals, hostels and hospitals. Repeated improvements in harbors also took place. Storage and transshipment, supply of provisions, ship maintenance and repairs, as well as money changing and banking, provided substantial infusions
of cash. All these activities generated profits which were reinvested in Latin Romania’s own economy, whether in the rural, trade or transportation sector. In the medieval centers there was professional specialization, with streets inhabited entirely by artisans engaged in a particular craft (blacksmiths, carpenters, tailors, glassmakers), as was the case in Corinth and Candia.

Economic growth created a taste for luxury fabrics which evolved into symbols of social superiority as well as into forms of financial investment. The emergence of the upper classes and bourgeois provides an excellent opportunity to study the coexistence of two different cultures.

During the 13th and early 14th century, two different trends are distinguished in terms of dress. The indigenous population continued to wear the traditional ample and long-sleeved Byzantine tunic while the Franks followed the sartorial habits of their places of origin which included clothes made from fine fabrics that folded into pleats and fastened at the waist with belts.

In Western Europe, the simple and ample lines that were predominant in the 13th century gave way to a trend for more close-fitting and elegant clothes in the next century. From the mid-14th century onwards, the dress appearance of various ethnic groups adopted common features. The typical female outer garment, the so-called cotta, worn with or without a belt, came in the form of a tunic which was tighter in the torso area and wider in the hips, with narrow sleeves and a variety of necklines. The end of the century saw the appearance of a corset-style female garment, with a low V-shaped neckline, which reflected the influence of French fashion. The corset-style dress is depicted in a donor representation from Hagios Fanourios of Rhodes as well as in the archaeological remains of a young noblewoman’s clothing from Mistra. Copper-alloy lace chapes are indirect evidence that the women of the ruling class in Glarentza also wore external garments with a low V-shaped neckline fastened with cords. Linen headscarves, usually light-colored, covered the woman’s head and neck both in the Byzantium and in the West. The scarves that encircled the neck and the head (barbette) and the little round hats (crespines) show a Western influence.

The male attire in the Greek regions under Latin rule probably underwent influence from the West to a greater extent. The adaptation of Western male garments by the indigenous population has recently been interpreted as an indicator of the social and economic standing of those men who often came into contact with the ruling Latin class. Traditional robes from the 14th century gradually shortened, reaching the middle of the calf and closing just at mid-length with buttons. The ample male tunics that fastened with a series of small buttons on the shoulder were considered to be a Western influence and were depicted in donor representations in Crete and Cyprus. During the 14th century, the belt, on which the scarf, the pouch and the dagger were fastened, was loosely tied just below the waist and was typical of the appearance of noblemen both in the Byzantium and in the West. In a mural painting from Lippomano’s chapel in the church of Hagia Paraskevi at Chalcis, dating c.1398, the basic features of the Latin ruling class’s attire can be discerned. All men wear trousers as underpants and boots. Their upper garments have tight sleeves, reach just above the knee and are fastened around the waist with a girdle, which in one case holds a purse. Comparing the painting with representations of male members of the Greek elite in the mural paintings of Mistra, we come across a sharp contradiction. Despite the well-documented presence of people of Western descent in the court of Mistra, and their close economic and political ties with Italy and the Frankish principality of Morea, the attire of the Greek donors follows the codes of the current Byzantine court robe, whose entire length is fastened with buttons. Only in a much later date, c.1445, Manuel Laskaris Chatzikes, in his funerary portrait, is dressed in a robe and mantle that echo Western, possibly Italian fashions.
In the late Middle Ages, and especially from the beginning of the 14th century, the range of household equipment grew as a result of the prosperity brought about by the development of trade. In urban centers, members of the ruling class, merchants and craftsmen were investing their surplus in furniture, textiles and tableware. In the trade centers, from the first half of the 13th century, local families, whether Greek or Frankish, were able to obtain a few pieces of pottery from Italy. Inside the houses, the furniture was solid and consisted of massive planks. The essential pieces of furniture were the bed, a folding table and a long chest. The chest held clothing and textiles, herbs, spices, tools, as well as important family documents, icons and money in a leather purse. Money and jewels were often kept in a casket bound with iron and carefully locked. Lamps, usually made of clay or metal for the affluent classes, candles, which facilitated the diffusion of light, candlesticks and lanterns, covered the needs of households and public buildings. Throughout the medieval period, wax was costly and candlesticks were used only in churches and on formal occasions. Fireplaces were used for lighting and heating purposes.

The excavations carried out by the American School of Archaeology in Corinth suggest that a change in the shape of cooking pots took place in the 1260s and 1270s as a result of the new demands in cooking. The globular shape of Byzantine cooking pots with a low, heavy rim, used in the 12th and the first half of the 13th century, was probably designed for the simmering of beans and legumes. The shape had a quick evolution under the Franks into a globular-bodied pot with tall neck and vertical rim. This change in shape was probably caused by a new taste in cooking preferences that demanded a change in preparation, possibly so that one could deal better with meat stews and with boiling rather than with simmering. By the end of the 13th century, the consumption of rice and pasta was spread throughout the Greek territories, most likely under the influence of Italian cuisine. Although general deductions about dietary habits may be obtainable, detailed conclusions are harder to come by, for it must be remembered that any specific group may have had its special dietary or may have been limited by different economic constraints. Given the difficulty of transportation, it is clear that every area consumed mostly local produce. Therefore, the Latin inhabitants would have been willing to adapt to the raw materials available locally.

The banquet depictions in the art of the late Middle Ages suggest the use of fingers for taking portions of food from a common dish, the sharing of knives and the absence of forks. Moreover, a distinct trend towards individualization is discerned, most probably in the search for luxury. It can be seen in the use of individual glass beakers. Bowls were sizeable and deep enough to hold food for several people. They could also be wide and shallow, perhaps to hold pieces of food or fruit. The increasing amount of deep bowls of smaller dimensions (found for instance in the excavations of Corinth and Glarentza) suggests the sharing of food by a smaller group of guests or the consumption of liquid dishes probably under the influence of the Frankish dietary habits.

The circle of life is ultimately marked by the fact of death. Excavations carried out in a significant number of graves and cemeteries of the late Middle Ages, showed similar burial practices between the Byzantines and the Latins. Burial within a religious institution was an honorable and costly action and a constant desire of the members of the upper classes. It presupposed a payment for the grave and a sort of bequest to the church to ensure that the name of the deceased donor would be mentioned in defined rites. In addition, the burial of people of both sexes in the same church, and even in the same tomb, was common, despite the legal obstacles.
The typology of the graves (built quadrilateral graves and burial pits), the construction materials and the burial practices, are nearly identical to the late Byzantine and Latin cemeteries. In the Latin states of the eastern Mediterranean, the floors of the churches were largely covered by funerary slabs, the placement and morphology of which was a matter of cost and a personal choice. The use of wooden coffins was an expensive option and became somewhat widespread among the upper classes of the Latin and Byzantine territories during the late Middle Ages. Iron nails found in burial levels in Glarentza, Rhodos, Crete and Thessaloniki are generally the only evidence to suggest the use of wooden coffins.

The primary burials were extended on their backs, generally facing east. The arms were either extended at the sides of the body or folded over the chest or the abdomen. The head was frequently propped up by stones on either side. Sometimes a roof tile piece was placed under the head as a sign of respect. Placements of reburied bones, especially skulls and long bones, within primary graves are usually, but not always, found over the lower legs and feet. The number of reburied individuals in a single grave can vary from one to as many as five, and is quite common throughout the Greek territory.

The study of the costume worn by the deceased is of great interest from an anthropological and sociological perspective. In most cases, because of the decomposition of the fabrics, it can be observed through the metal dress accessories and the jewelry. The members of the upper classes were most probably buried in formal attire indicative of their social rank. Plain copper jewels are generally thought to be representative of the lower classes. The excavations at the Glarentza cathedral demonstrate the widespread custom of offering copper coins during the burial. Finally, the senior members of the Western aristocracy were often buried along with their military equipment, which is a sign of a costly burial and emphasizes the military nature of the Frankish states of the Greek area.

In conclusion, the coexistence of Franks and indigenous population gradually led to financial development of the urban centers, where a mixed society was created characterized by economic and social contacts, flexibility to changes and cultural interactions. The new political situation didn't seem to affect the living conditions of the lower social strata of peasants and it didn't have a deeper impact to the religious and ethnic identity of people.
Politics and painting in Venetian Crete

Abstract: In my paper I will discuss religious paintings made by Cretan workshops in the first half of the fifteenth century, in which the studied amalgamation of Palaiologan and Italian late Gothic elements shapes a new pictorial language that serves specific theological and devotional needs. In these works of pronounced hybrid character, multifarious iconographic subjects in the same composition are conveyed with surprising stylistic diversity, often backed up by some equally distinctive technical solutions. Thus the various components retain intact their dual origin, yet the painting as a whole acquires a unified character thanks to the uniform treatment of the background and landscape, and above all the faces of the holy figures that are always in keeping with the Byzantine tradition. I will explore the motives behind the patrons’ choice of such hybrid ensembles. The careful stitching together of elements from different artistic and religious traditions becomes meaningful only when examined against the complex historical background of Venetian Crete. And this is all the more true at a time of intense debate over the burning issue of the union of the churches. Aspects of that debate, which sharply divided the Orthodox population, can be discerned in religious paintings from other parts of the Byzantine world. In the Venetian colony of Crete, however, this phenomenon takes on a distinctive local flavor, determined by the long term coexistence, struggles and interaction between Latins and Greeks on the island.
κυρίως αποκαλύπτει τις προθέσεις και τα ενδιαφέροντα του παραγγελιοδότη. Δύο πολυπρόσωπες σκηνές του συνόλου εκπροσωπούν τις τελευταίες εξελίξεις στην παλαιολόγεια ζωγραφική, ενώ η τρίτη είναι μία γνήσια ιταλική δημιουργία στην παράδοση του Duccio. Εξίσου μικτού ύφους είναι και τα πορτραίτα των αγίων στα υπόλοιπα διάχωρα του συνόλου.

Η σχεδίαση των φύλλων του πολυπτύχου, με τη δίξωνα οργάνωση, παρατηρείται στα συνήθη παλαιολόγεια πολύπτυχα, όπως αυτά που φυλάσσονται στην ιταλική ζωγραφική, ενώ η τρίτη είναι μία γνήσια ιταλική δημιουργία στην παράδοση του Duccio. Εξίσου μικτού ύφους είναι και τα πορτραίτα των αγίων στα υπόλοιπα διάχωρα του συνόλου.

Αν ωστόσο η αρχική σύνθετη μορφή του έργου μπορεί με σχετική βεβαιότητα να ταυτιστεί με γνωστά σύνολα του 14ου αιώνα από το Βυζάντιο και την Δύση, οι λόγοι που οδήγησαν τον παραγγελιοδότη να επιλέξει τα ποικίλης προέλευσης πρότυπα που χρησιμοποίησε στις επιμέρους σκηνές και τη συνύπαρξή τους σε ένα σύνολο είναι καθιερωμένα εικονογραφικά σχήματα, πρότυπα δανεισμένα από δυτικά και βυζαντινά λατρευτικά έργα. Φαίνεται λοιπόν, ότι ήδη στις αρχές του 15ου αιώνα οι σεβάσμιες εικόνες του νησιού, προερχόμενες από καθολικούς και από βυζαντινούς ναούς, είχαν ήδη διαμορφώσει μία ενιαία παρακαταθήκη λατρευτικών προτύπων από την οποία παραγγελιοδότες και καλλιτέχνες αντλούσαν και τα συνδυάζανταν κατά περίπτωση.
για την εκκλησιαστική αρχιτεκτονική της Κρήτης κατά τον Ύστερο μεσαίωνα. Ο Μανόλης Μπορμπουδάκης, μελετώντας τις επιγραφές του μνημείου, ξεκαθάρισε τη διαδοχική χρονολόγηση των κλιτών. Το 1407, στο μονόχωρο ναό της Παναγίας, προστέθηκε στα νότια, ένα μικρότερο κλίτος που αφιερώθηκε στον Πρόδρομο. Τα δύο κλίτη διατηρούσαν ελεύθερη και ανεξάρτητη λειτουργία, καθότι οι θείες λειτουργίες είχαν ανεξάρτητες λειτουργίες. 

Λίγο αργότερα, το 1426, επί ηγουμενίας του Ιωνά Παλαμά, προστέθηκε ένας ενιαίος νάρθηκας, το νότιο τμήμα του οποίου διαμορφώθηκε σε παρεκκλήσι του Άγιου Φανουρίου, και το 1431 ένας δεύτερος νάρθηκας. Οι κλίτες του μοναστηρίου είναι τοιχογραφημένες σε διαδοχικές φάσεις. Το μόνο που θα μας απασχολήσει εδώ είναι ο νάρθηκας του 1426, που ο Ιωνάς Παλαμάς ανέγειρε και αφιέρωσε στον νεόκοπο άγιο Φανουρίο. 

Για την τοιχογράφηση του νέου λατρευτικού κέντρου, ο Παλαμάς συνεργάστηκε το 1430 με έναν καλό ζωγράφο του Χάνδακα, τον Κωνσταντίνο Ειρηνικό, τον οποίο δεν γνωρίζουμε από άλλο έργο.
επιλογές παραγγελιοδότη και καλλιτέχνη. Η ίδια προσεγμένη συνύπαρξη στοιχείων χαρακτηρίζει και άλλες σύγχρονες εικόνες του αγίου Φανουρίου, όπως η υπογεγραμμένη από τον Άγγελο εικόνα στην Πάτμο, που επαναλαμβάνει το λατρευτικό πρότυπο του Βαλσαμόνερου, και οι δύο ανυπόγραφες εικόνες της Μονής Οδηγήτριας που έχουν αποδοθεί στο ίδιο ζωγράφο. Ειδικά η δίζωνη εικόνα της Μονής Οδηγήτριας, με το Μη Μου Άγγελο και το θαύμα του Αγίου Φανουρίου, προσφέρεται κυριολεκτικά πάνω στην διαμόρφωση ενός νέου εικαστικού ιδιώματος από τους πρωτοπόρους ιταλικών και παλαιολόγων στοιχείων, εκφράζεται εδώ με μία ἀψογα διατυπωμένη θεολογική και εικαστική ισορροπία. Στην προσέγγιση των εικόνων αυτών ώστε να αξιοποιηθούν στοιχεία από τις τεχνικές ανάλυσεις που πραγματοποιεί η εργαστήριο Συντήρησης του Μουσείου Μπενάκη, προκειμένου να διερευνηθούν τα τεχνικά μέσα που επιστρατεύει ο ζωγράφος ώστε να υπηρετήσει καλύτερα τη σύνθεση και απαιτητική παραγγελία του Ιωνά Παλαμά.

Η τοιχογράφηση του νέου προσκυνήματος και οι εικόνες που συνόδευαν την εισαγωγή της λατρείας του Αγίου Φανουρίου προσφέρουν ερεθίσματα και βρίσκουν συνδυασμένων αναφορών τόσο στην ορθόδοξη παράδοση και τους βυζαντινούς εικαστικούς τρόπους, όσο και στην λατινική της Μεσαιωνικής περιόδου. Πίσω από το μελετημένο υφιστάμενο υβριδικό χαρακτήρα της ζωγραφικής, διαπιστώνεται η πρόθεση του εμπνευστή προς διαμορφώσεις ένα θρησκευτικό πλαίσιο ως μέσο για τους καθολικούς, οίκο και για τους στρατιωτικούς της Κρήτης. Η μεικτή καλλιτεχνική γλώσσα που υιοθετείται δεν συνιστά μία μοναδική δυναμική και μεταφραστική παραγγελία, αλλά υιοθείται μέσα σε μια ενορχηστρωμένη προσπάθεια προώθησης και συνύπαρξης των δύο θρησκευτικών κοινοτήτων του νησιού. Αναφερόμενες αυτές τις παραγγελίες αυτές συνάπτονται με μία ανάλυση της συνολικής συμπεριφοράς του Παλαμά ως τμήμα της στρατηγικής του για την επικύρωση της λατρείας του Αγίου Φανουρίου. Αναφερόμενες αυτές τις παραγγελίες αυτές συνάπτονται με μία ανάλυση της συνολικής συμπεριφοράς του Παλαμά ως τμήμα της στρατηγικής του για την επικύρωση της λατρείας του Αγίου Φανουρίου.
Monumental Painting in Latin Religious Foundations of the Southern Greek Mainland and the Islands (13th-15th Centuries)

Abstract: My paper will concentrate on monumental paintings in ecclesiastical buildings commissioned by Latins settled in former Byzantine territories. Focusing mostly on the architectural history of Venetian Crete and the Frankish Morea, scholars studying this period located recently a significant number of monuments attributed to Latin commissioners and addressing also to a catholic congregation. Several such monuments retain their interior decoration that has been only haphazardly studied. The primary aim of my research is to record all surviving pictorial evidence documenting the Latin presence in the Byzantine world, particularly within the boundaries of modern Greece. Apart from documenting and analysing their specific iconographic and stylistic features, my intension is to explore these works of art as historical testimonies and expressions of religious identity, political agendas and social status of the Latin patrons settled in these lands. Last, but not least, I wish to study the individual characteristics of these monuments against those commissioned by Greek patrons in the same areas, but also in the wider context of contemporary Latin monuments in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Ο χαρακτήρας της καλλιτεχνικής έκφρασης που διαμορφώνεται στις λατινοκρατούμενες περιοχές της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου παραμένει μέχρι σήμερα ένα πεδίο γόνιμων επιστημονικών αντιπαραθέσεων. Αυτό αποκαλύπτει με ενάρεγια οι όροι που κατά καιρούς έχουν χρησιμοποιηθεί σε διάφορες περιπτώσεις για να ορίσουν τις διαφορετικές εκφάνσεις ενός υβριδικού στυλ, το οποίο συνδυάζει στοιχεία της βυζαντινής παράδοσης και της ρομανικής και αργότερα γοτθικής δύσης και συχνά εντοπίζεται σε αυτές τις περιοχές: σταυροφορική τέχνη, maniera cypria και lingua franca, «φραγκοβυζαντινό» για την εκκλησιαστική αρχιτεκτονική. Ορισμοί και προσεγγίσεις βασίστηκαν αρχικά στην έννοια της επίδρασης από τη μια εθνοτική και θρησκευτική ομάδα στην άλλη και στη συνέχεια, μέσα από μια «πολιτικά ορθή» οπτική, σε αυτή του συγκριτικού και της αλληλο-ανταλλαγής, για να καταλήξουμε πρόσφατα σε όρους όπως οσμωση ή ακόμη και ανάμειξη (entanglement) πολιτισμών και θρησκειών που λαμβάνει χώρα σε αυτές τις περιοχές.

Και με την μια ή την άλλη οπτική, τα αναλυτικά μας εργαλεία περιλαμβάνουν δύο διακριτές κατηγορίες: «δυτικο-ευρωπαίος και λατίνος» και «έλληνας και ορθόδοξος» χωρίς άλλες αποχρώσεις. Επομένως, οι ιστορικοί της τέχνης έχουμε συνήθως να τοποθετούμε από την ίδια πλευρά τον φράγκο πρίγκηπα και τις βενετικές αρχές, τον λομβαρδό ή βουργούνδιο ιππότη της Πελοπονήσου και τον βενετό φεουδάρχη της Κρήτης. Το μυθικό ενδέχεται και τα δυτικά μοναστικά τάγματα και από την άλλη πλευρά τους έλληνες ορθόδοξους, είτε κατοίκους των χωριών και τους παπάδες τους, μοναχούς ή μικρούς γαιοκτήτες της υπαίθρου και κατοίκους των αστικών κέντρων. Καταγράφοντας με αυτό τον τρόπο τα ιστορικά υποκείμενα από τα οποία προέρχονται και στα οποία απευθύνονται αυτά τα έργα γίνεται φανερό πόσο ανομοιογενής είναι κάθε μια από τις αναλυτικές μας κατηγορίες. Προσεγγίζοντας, δηλαδή, την τέχνη αυτών των περιοχών μόνον μέσα από το πρίσμα μια εθνοτικής και θρησκευτικής αντίθετης, ερωτήματα όπως η κοινωνική και οικονομική θέση, οι πολιτικές προθέσεις, η παιδεία και τις ιστορικές αντιλήψεις, ή ακόμη και η διάθεση για νεωτερισμούς και ο θαυμασμός για το διαφορετικό, παραγγελιοδοτούν και κοινού των έργων τέχνης αυτών των περιοχών βρίσκονται εκτός του πεδίου των αναζητήσεών μας.
Στη συγκεκριμένη παρουσίαση θα επικεντρωθώ σε τεκμήρια μνημειακής ζωγραφικής σε εκκλησιαστικά κτήρια που ανεγέρθηκαν από Λατίνους σε περιοχές του νότιου ελλαδικού χώρου. Πρωταρχικός στόχος της ερεύνας μου είναι να συγκεντρωθούν και να καταγραφούν όλα τα σωζόμενα εικονογραφικά σύνολα που με σχετική βεβαιότητα αποδίδονται σε χορηγία ή συνδέονται στενά με Δυτικούς στις παραπάνω περιοχές. Εκτός από την τεκμηρίωση και την ανάλυση εικονογραφικών και τεχνοτροπικών χαρακτηριστικών τους, η πρόθεσή μου είναι να αναζητήσω σε αυτά τα έργα τέχνης τρόπους έκφρασης της θρησκευτικής ταυτότητας και εθνικής καταγωγής, διατύπωσης της πολιτικής ατζέντας, κοινωνικής θέσης αλλά και του γούστου των Δυτικών που εγκαταστάθηκαν σε αυτά τα εδάφη.

Είναι γεγονός πως το σχετικό γνωστό υλικό είναι πολύ λίγο και ιδιαίτερα αποσπασματικό. Ωστόσο, τα τελευταία χρόνια έχει αρχίσει να αυξάνεται. Αυτό οφείλεται κυρίως στα νέα ενδιαφέροντα των ιστορικών της τέχνης που ασχολήθηκαν με την αρχιτεκτονική του λατινοκρατούμενου ελλαδικού χώρου. Έστωντας κυρίως στην εκκλησιαστική αρχιτεκτονική ιστορία της βενετικής Κρήτης και του φραγκικού Μοριά, νέωτεροι ερευνητές παρουσίασαν διεξειδικεύματα ένα σημαντικό αριθμό μνημείων που θα μπορούσαν να αποδοθούν σε ενέργειες δυτικών, απευθυνόμενες σε έναν λατινικό ή ακόμη και μεικτού δόγματος εκκλησίασμα. Κάποια από αυτά τα μνημεία διατηρούν την εσωτερική διακόσμησή τους, η οποία έχει σποραδικά μελετηθεί.

Στην περιοχή της Πελοποννήσου στις πολύ γνωστές στην έρευνα τοιχογραφίες στη Πύλη της Ακρωτηρίας θα πρέπει να προστεθούν τα σπαράγματα τοιχογραφιών που πρόσφατα βρέθηκαν ανασκαφικά στο ναό του Άγιου Φραγκίσκου στην Αργολίδα, όπως επίσης το σύνολο που διατηρεί την εσωτερική διακόσμηση τους, η οποία έχει ταυτιστεί με τον μοναστηριακό ναό των Δομινικανών στο βενετικό Νεγροπόντε. Οι τοιχογραφίες στο λεγόμενο παρεκκλήσι Lippomano στο ναό της Αγίας Μαρίνας στη Χίο, το οποίο σύμφωνα με την κτητορική επιγραφή ανακαινίσθηκε από τον φλαμανδό ιππότη Antoine de Flamenc, και η μνημειακή παράσταση της γνωστής ως Παναγίας των Καταλανών από την Αθήνα (μέσα 15ου αι.) θα πρέπει επίσης να συμπεριληφθούν σε αυτή την έρευνα. Οι τοιχογραφίες στα ναούς που αναγράφονται στην έρευνα θα πρέπει επίσης να συμπεριληφθούν σε αυτή την έρευνα.

Στην περιοχή της Βοιωτίας, πολύ γνωστό εντοπίστηκε τοιχογραφία στον Ναό του Αγίου Γεωργίου στο Κολλάκι, στον ομώνυμο ναό στη Φιλέρμο και στους ναούς του Προφήτη Αββακούμ και της Υπαπαντής στο Παράδεισο.
The Art of Epeiros and the West in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries

Abstract: The aim of the present paper is to shed some light on Western influences on the artistic production in the Byzantine State of Epeiros, one of the Greek successor states that emerged from the wreckage of 1204. In order to determine the extent of these influences, my examination will be based on a diverse set of visual evidence from coins and objects of the minor arts to church architecture, sculpture, and fresco decoration. Since during the thirteenth century Epeiros was fully under Greek dominion and the Latins never succeeded in establishing themselves or their monasteries in this territory, my aim is to investigate the circumstances under which artistic interrelations between the Epeirotes and the Latins occurred.

The partition treaty of the Byzantine Empire (Partitio Romaniae) from 1204 declared that Western Greece, including Epeiros and the Ionian Islands, should be governed by the Venetians. The Venetians were certainly not as interested in the hinterland, as they were in major ports, like Durrës, and the Ionian Islands, especially Corfu. As a result, the State of Epeiros was established in the territory between Durrës (Albania) and Arta, including Western Greece as far south as Nafpaktos. The Epeirotes attempted to maintain their Byzantine identity with an ultimate goal to re-conquer the imperial capital, Constantinople, and restore the former Byzantine Empire. However, Michael I Doukas as the first Epeirote ruler, although a pious defender of Orthodoxy, did not immediately engage in warfare against Crusaders, but rather forged alliances with them. When John X Kamateros, Patriarch of Constantinople, refused to recognise Michael as a legitimate successor of the Byzantine throne, he turned to the Pope Innocent III for recognition. In addition, he submitted to the Latin Empire by giving his daughter as wife to Henry of Flanders's brother Eustace in 1209 and offering one-third of his territory as a dowry. Michael I Doukas was also a “vassal” of the Venetians, with obligation to fight against their enemies and pay a certain amount of money as an annual fee.

Two other Epeirote rulers, Michael II Komenos Doukas (1230-1266/68) and Nikephoros (1267-1296), also forged alliances with Western leaders in order to protect Epeiros’ independence against threats that came from both the West and Nicaea. Part of this web of alliances included three dynastic marriages: Michael gave his daughter Helena as wife to Manfred of Hohenstaufen, king of Sicily, and the other daughter, Anna (later known as Agne), to the prince of Achaia, William II Villehardouin. In 1294, Nikephoros gave his daughter Thamar to the son of Charles II of Anjou. Despite the continued existence of close links with the West and alliances with Latin leaders, the presence of Western elements in the art of Epeiros was never very strong. The Latins never succeeded in establishing monasteries in Epeiros. The situation was quite different in Attica, Peloponnese, and a number of Greek islands, where the Latins managed to establish themselves on a permanent basis, organising the administration on Western models, where they also built important monuments of Gothic architecture. In those regions many Byzantine churches were under Western influence as well.

Nevertheless, the above mentioned political and territorial connections, which included frequent movement of merchants, pilgrims and goods between Epeiros and the West, led to some
artistic interactions as well. The best example from the second or third decades of the thirteenth century, worthy of closer consideration, are the coins of Theodore Doukas (1215-1230) with the motif of triple Western-style castles from German and Italian coinage, especially known on Frederic II’s royal seal. Similar castles are found on contemporaneous Frankish coins minted in Morea.

In the Epeirote architecture in the first half of thirteenth century it is possible to discern certain Frankish elements. It has been proposed that a new architectural type of cross-vaulted churches, which made its appearance in the thirteenth century, primarily in mainland Greece, is of Western origin and can be related to Norman churches of Sicily. The three-aisled variant of this type is encountered mainly in Epeiros. Among the oldest examples are the churches of Panagia tou Vryoni (1238) and Kato Panagia near Arta. Their architectural plan may have been influenced by the basic design of Gothic or Romanesque cathedrals in Italy, as, for instance, Trani Cathedral in Apulia, the church of St. Nicholas in Bari, and the cathedrals in Cefalù and Monreale, which are essentially three-aisled basilicas with a narrow transept in front of the sanctuary. The presence of transept in Western architecture can be traced from the time of Constantine the Great onwards, but it seems that the specific way in which this architectural element was integrated in large Norman buildings of Southern Italy and Sicily was also applied in Epeiros.

Another important foundation of Michael II, dated to the mid-thirteenth century, is the church dedicated to the Saviour near Galaxeidi. According to the Greek chronicle, known as Χρονικόν του Γαλαξειδίου, the church was built by the chief architect Nicolo Carouli, an Italian master craftsman.

Western influences, although fairly subtle, can clearly be discerned in the wall decoration of Epeiros’ churches. Depictions of equestrian military saints may serve as a good illustration. For example, a military saint on horseback is depicted in the church of the Old Metropolis in Beroia on the south face of the fourth pillar on the northern side of the nave. Another characteristic example is found in the church of St. Basil in Arta with St. Demetrios and St. Georgios represented as equestrian saints on the west wall and the St. Eustace (Placidus) on the north wall. Military equestrian saints, who were occasionally depicted in Orthodox Churches in border regions and in areas under Crusader control such as Cyprus and the Holy Land, began to appear in Greece from the thirteenth century onwards. Sharon Gerstel has pointed out that in Orthodox churches along the borders of Frankish Morea, the shift from standing to equestrian military saints took place during the period of Latin rule. This demonstrates “Frankish chivalric customs and reveals a certain degree of cultural emulation and symbiosis.” (S. Gerstel, “Art and Identity in the Medieval Morea”, in A. Laiou and R. P. Mottahedeh, eds, The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World, Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2001, 269-280, at 271).

Several other representations in monumental painting, undoubtedly inspired by Crusaders, deserve to be mentioned as well. One example is an unusual depiction of the struggle of a knight on horseback with a centaur-archer from the church of St. Theodore in Arta. Similar figures of centaurs are found in sculpture and on ceramic wares in Peloponnesos and dated to the thirteenth century. Another noteworthy representation is the Mocking of Christ in the church of St. John in Eupalio Doridos (Aitolia), in which Jews are dressed according to Western Medieval fashion. Their attire, which includes wide long dresses and large hats on their heads, is completely unknown to the Byzantine tradition. The Influence of Crusaders can also be seen in representations of military costumes and equipment, as, for instance, in the depiction of Roman soldiers in the scene of the Marys at the Tomb in the Church of St. George at Dhivrë, Sarandë, and in the Mocking of Christ from the Blacherna monastery in Arta.
In the last three decades of the thirteenth century, during the reign of the Despot Nikephoros (1267-1296), the number of Frankish elements in the artistic production of Epiros increased. The Komnenos-Doukas dynastic church, the catholicon of the Paregoretissa in Arta, abounds with western architectural elements, reminiscent of late medieval Italian palaces. As we have already seen in the case of the Epeirote cross barrel-vaulted churches, it is obvious that the builders attempted to maintain their Byzantine building tradition using as their models churches from north Greece, Thessaloniki and Constantinople. At the same time, we can also observe the presence of different Western elements. As a result, the builders were able to produce an idiosyncratic architectural style.

Furthermore, the technique and iconographic themes of the Paregoretissa's decorative sculpture does not follow Byzantine sculptural traditions. Rather, it is of Western origin with obvious links to Western France and Southern Italy. For example, on the apex of the west arch a cross-nimbed Lamb holding a Latin cross is depicted. Representing Christ as a Lamb was expressly forbidden in Byzantium by Canon 82 of the Quinisext Council (692), but this iconography was preserved in the Latin West. Its presence in a dynastic church of an Orthodox medieval state is notable, especially so in the period after the Second Council of Lyon (1274), whose main opponent was the Principality of Epeiros.

It is very likely that the Despot Nikephoros wanted to express his allegiance to his Latin allies in visual terms, through works of art. In the Paregoretissa, the dedicatory inscription with the names of the Despot Nikephoros, his spouse Anna and their son Thomas is situated in the crown of the arch of the sculpted lintel. Around their names, the arch is decorated with double-headed eagles, a symbol of the Byzantines, while the lower band of the arch is decorated with lilies, an emblem of the house of Anjou. Apart from the double-headed eagles, the arch is decorated with heraldic lions as well. This decoration was also widespread in the West as well as in the Byzantine territories conquered by the Latins, as, for example, in Mystra. In a similar way, the wedding gift of Thamar, Nikephoros's daughter, to her husband Philip, was a lily-shaped gilded enamelled casket, with double-headed eagles depicted on it. This wedding gift most likely symbolised the union of the two cultures in the same way that we can see in the architecture and decoration of the church of the Paregoretissa.

Nikephoros's edifice is not the only monument in Epiros with Frankish elements (Western elements). A comparable example is provided by the Pantanassa monastery in Philippias, erected by Michael II and renovated by Nikephoros. The church had an architectural plan of a large domed cross-in-square with two chapels and an ambulatory apparently added during the last building phase. Two entrances, the one to the south and the other to the north, that lead from this ambulatory to the main church had pairs of colonnettes which clearly formed Gothic-style porches.

It is also worth mentioning an outer pi-shaped stoa added to the church of Saint Theodora in Arta, covered with Gothic-style pointed ribbed groin vaults. The exact date of this construction is unknown, but it is certainly from the second half of the thirteenth-century.

Despite the strict orientation of the Epeirotes towards Orthodox Christianity and their attempts to maintain their Byzantine identity, we can conclude that many of the artistic works of Epiros were produced under evident Western influences. These influences occurred primarily due to both the geographical proximity and close political relations between the Epeirote ruling elite and the Latins, and not because of Crusader activity, as in the case of the rest of the Greek mainland and the islands. The richness and complexity of the impacts of Frankish elements on the Epeirote art of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries still remain to be fully explored. An analysis of the Epeirote artistic production in a broader context of its interaction with Western art will certainly open new horizons for its better understanding.
Imported Plans, Local Skills:  
The Development of Stone Carving and Sculpture in Crete  
During the First Centuries of Venetian Domination

Abstract: The establishment of Venetian rule in Crete was a matter of considerable importance. The location and size of the island and the fact that Venetian suzerainty lasted so long (1211-1669), meant that local and imported cultural traditions, existing side by side in the unequal circumstances of foreign rule, resulted in a great variety of interaction in art and craftsmanship. In my contribution I discuss the evidence of sculpture. A large part of the new architecture developed on Crete after the Venetian conquest is marked by the interdependent relationship between imported plans and local craftsmanship. This interaction, combined with the new requirements, brought about important changes in construction technology and contributed to the development of a new type of sculptural decoration. Next to it, material evidence shows also the persistence of local traditions as well as the ability of both sides to adapt new forms and habits.

Την εγκατάσταση των Βενετών στην Κρήτη στις αρχές του 13ου αιώνα ακολούθησε οικοδομικός οργασμός αρχικά στο Χάνδακα, έπειτα και στο υπόλοιπο νησί. Η επισκευή υποδομών και η δημιουργία υποδομών για τον ελλιμενισμό και την τροφοδοσία των πλοίων, οι ανάγκες για κτήρια αποθηκών, για τη στέγαση των υπηρεσιών και των εποίκων είχαν ως αποτέλεσμα τη συνεχή οικοδόμηση στις πόλεις. Η ταυτόχρονη εγκατάσταση των θεσμών της λατινικής Εκκλησίας απαιτούσε την ανέγερση εκκλησιαστικών κτιρίων που ήταν απαραίτητο να διαφέρουν από τα υπάρχοντα της βυζαντινής αρχιτεκτονικής, ώστε να είναι οικεία στους εποίκους και επιπλέον να προβάλλουν τη διαφορά του δόγματος των νεοφερμένων από εκείνο των αυτοχθόνων.

Τα έργα αυτά έγιναν προφανώς με τοπικά οικοδομικά υλικά, την άφθονη ντόπια πέτρα, και την τεχνογνώσιμη τη λιθοδομή των κρητικών συνεργείων. Όμως για μερικά από τα κτίρια της πρώτης ήδη εποχής έπρεπε να εφαρμοστούν αρχιτεκτονικά σχέδια πρωτόγνωρα στους τοπικούς τεχνίτες. Αυτό ήταν ασφαλώς τεχνολογική πρόκληση που καλλιέργησε την προσαρμοστικότητα τόσο των ξένων υλικών και των τοπικών οικοδόμων. Δυστυχώς τα κτίρια της πρώτης εποχής δεν σώθηκαν.

Χάρη στην εκτεταμένη ανοικοδόμηση τα τοπικά συνεργεία εξοικειώθηκαν με την κατασκευή οξυκόρυφων θόλων και οξυκόρυφων τόξων, που είχαν εν τω μεταξύ εξαπλωθεί σε όλη την Ευρώπη. Οι λιθοδότες βρέθηκαν στην ανάγκη να λαξεύουν ποικίλα αρχιτεκτονικά μέλη σύμφωνα με εισηγμένα σχέδια: κίονες και κιονίσκους, επίκρανα και κιονόκρανα, διακοσμημένα λαξευτά πλαίσια θυρών και παραθύρων. Κάποια από αυτά σώζονται in situ, αλλά μεγάλο μέρος του υλικού αυτού περιουλέχτηκε σε σπαράγματα κατά τη διάρκεια του 20ού αιώνα στο Ηράκλειο, το Ρέθυμνο και τα Χανιά. Μελετήθηκε από το Πρόγραμμα Καταγραφής της Γλυπτικής της Βενετικής Περιόδου που έγινε σε συνεργασία του Ινστιτούτου Μεσογειακών Σπουδών και των Εφορειών Αρχαιοτήτων της Κρήτης. Ο Κατάλογος τους ετοιμάζεται για έκδοση. Η παρούσα έκδοση στηρίζεται στο σύνολο των ευρημάτων.

Χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα για την αποσπασματικότητα των σωζόμενων καταλοίπων αλλά και για την ποιότητα της αρχιτεκτονικής γλυπτικής της παλαιότερης περιόδου είναι ένα μαρμάρινο κιονόκρανο από το Ηράκλειο. Τον έχει αφαιρεθεί –προφανώς για άλλη χρήση– μια ζώνη
στο ανώτερο τμήμα, όπου θα αναπτύσσοταν η περιέλιξη των λογχοφόρων φύλλων, των οποίων οι πλατύφυλλες άκρες κατεβάινοντας απλώνονταν στο σώμα του κιονοκράνου. Από το μέγεθος (ύψος 50 εκ.), το σπάνιο υλικό και την καλή ποιότητα του αναγλύφου εικάζεται ότι θα έστεφε κίονα μεγάλου και λαμπρού οικοδομήματος. Αυτός ο τύπος του κιονοκράνου, άγνωστος προηγουμένως στην Κρήτη, ήταν συνήθης στη Βενετία τον 13ου και 14ου αιώνα. Ιταλικό σχέδιο εφαρμόζεται και σε βάση κίονα που εντοπίστηκε, επίσης εκτός συμφραζομένων, στο Ηράκλειο. Έχει κοιλόκρυτη διατομή και συμφή πλίνθου. Στις γωνίες απλώνονταν πάνω στην πλίνθο φυτικό κόσμημα. Πληθυσμός και μεγάλο υλικό και καλή ποιότητα του αναγλύφου εικάζεται ότι θα έστεφε κίονα μεγάλου και λαμπρού οικοδομήματος. Αυτός ο τύπος του κιονοκράνου, άγνωστος προηγουμένως στην Κρήτη, ήταν συνήθης στη Βενετία τον 13ου και 14ου αιώνα. Παλικάρια σχέδιο εφαρμόζεται και σε βάση κιονοκράνου που εντοπίστηκε στην πόλη για να εργαστούν στον κατασκευαστικό τομέα, μια τάφρα πια σημαντική οικονομική δραστηριότητα.

Η εκπαίδευση των τεχνιτών ήταν πρακτική και γινόταν στο συνεργείο. Μαζί με την κατεργασία της πέτρας οι νεαροί τεχνίτες μάθαιναν και τα σχέδια. Στο τέλος της μαθητείας αποκτούσαν τα εργαλεία και τα αντίστοιχα υποδείγματα (χνάρια). Τα εργοταξία των πόλεων, όπου κυρίως εφαρμόζονταν τα νέα σχέδια, έγιναν επομένως τόποι μαθητείας της νέας αρχιτεκτονικής και κυρίως του γλυπτού διακόσμου της. Θραύσματα μελών που διασώθηκαν, κατασκευασμένα από τον τοπικό ασβεστόλιθο, άλλα καλύτερης κατασκευής και άλλα όχι, αποδεικνύουν τη διάχυση των σχεδίων και του δυτικοτροπού διακόσμου σε κτίρια που δεν άφησαν άλλα ίχνη. Από το σύνολο τέτοιων αρχαιολογικών τεκμηρίων διαπιστώνουμε ότι η αυξημένη οικοδομική δραστηριότητα συνετέλεσε στο να αναβαθμιστεί ποιοτικά η κατεργασία του λίθου. Σε πολλές περιπτώσεις οι απλές κοιλόκυρτες ζώνες συνοδεύονται από περίτεχνες λαξεύσεις, με διαφόρων ειδών οδοντώσεις, σχοινιά και κόμβους. Η διάχυση αυτή ήταν δυνατή γιατί ήδη η μεγάλη οικοδομική δραστηριότητα και η εφαρμογή των νέων σχεδίων συνετέλεσε στη δημιουργία του επαγγέλματος του λιθοκόκκου. Μια εύγλωττη ένδειξη για τη συμμετοχή ικανών λιθοκόκκων στα οικοδομικά συνεργεία δίνει ένα τυχαίο εύρημα: ένας δομικός λίθος στη μια πλευρά του οποίου έχει λαξευτέ γυναικεία μορφή με φωτοστέφανο. Από τη στάση και το ένδυμα αυξανωρίζεται Παναγία από παράσταση...
Εναγγελισμού δυτικού τύπου. Ο άγγελος θα είχε λαξευτεί σε διπλανό λίθο. Ο λίθος αυτός, ύψους 27 εκ., θα πρέπει να ήταν χτισμένος σε εξωτερικό τοίχο οικοδομήματος· η παράσταση απευθυνόταν στην ευσέβεια των διαβατών. Παράσταση γενειοφόρου προφήτη ακόμη in situ σε γωνία σπιτιού στο Ηράκλειο είχε φωτογραφηθεί ο Ζερόλα. Τα κρητικά μορφές αγίων σε σταυροδρόμια είναι γνωστές και από αλλού στη Βενετική επικράτεια. Εκεί όμως συνήθως πρόκειται για ανάγλυφες πλάκες που έχουν εντοιχιστεί και όχι για ανάγλυφα πάνω στους ιδίους τους δομικούς λίθους. Τα κρητικά παραδείγματα υποδεικνύουν ότι τα οικοδομικά συνεργεία είχαν τη δυνατότητα να εκτελούν παρόμοιες εργασίες γλυπτικής.

Η τέχνη του λιθοκοτή ήταν περιζήτητη και για την κατασκευή ενός είδους αναγλύφων που σχετιζόταν μόνον έμμεσα με την αρχιτεκτονική. Διακριτικό γνώρισμα της νεοφερμένης αριστοκρατίας ήταν οι θυρεοί. Σκαλισμένοι στην πέτρα, ενσωματώνονταν σε κάθε είδους κατασκευές επιδεικνύοντας ταυτότητες και κυριότητες. Η χρήση τους ήταν πολλαπλή.

Ανάμεσά στα πολλά εμβλήματα τα λιοντάρια του Αγίου Μάρκου ως σύμβολα της κρατικής έξουσίας είχαν πρωτεύουσα θέση: σηματοδοτούσαν δημόσια έργα και δημόσια κτήρια, αλλά και δήλωναν τη νομιμοφροσύνη των κρατικών υπαλλήλων. Αν και ίσως αρχικά το κρατικό έμβλημα ερχόταν λαξευμένο από τη Βενετία, σύντομα η συχνή του χρήση οδήγησε σε τοπική παραγωγή. Η ζήτηση επομένως για ανάγλυφα εμβλήματα σε πέτρα ήταν συνεχής και έδινε διαρκώς δουλειά στα εργαστήρια γλυπτικής. Η σχηματικότητα του είδους διευκόλυνε τους λιγότερο έμπειρους τεχνίτες να ανταποκριθούν στην κατασκευή τους, αλλά σύντομα η ποσότητα και ο ανταγωνισμός οδήγησε σε άνοδο της ποιότητας. Παρά τις διάσπαρτα σε όλη την Κρήτη ευρήματα, αρκετά από τα οποία βρίσκονται ακόμη κατά χώραν, διαπιστώνουμε ποιοτική ποικιλία που αποδεικνύει ότι πολλά εργαστήρια σε όλο το νησί καταπιάστηκαν με την κατασκευή τους.
Δύο κεφαλές μεταπικών ανδρικών γενειοφόρων μορφών από το Ηράκλειο, μία σε μάρμαρο και μία σε τοπικό ευθρύπτο ασβεστόλιθο είναι ολόγλυφες, αλλά η πίσω πλευρά τους δεν είναι λαξευμένη στις λεπτομέρειες. Επομένως προορίζονταν να τοποθετηθούν σε κόγχη ή σε επαφή με τοίχο. Αν ανήκαν σε ολόσωμα αγάλματα, θα είχαν περίπου φυσικό μέγεθος. Εικονίζουν προφανώς ιερά πρόσωπα, Χριστό ή Προφήτη το πώρινο, προφήτη ή Απόστολο το μαρμάρινο. Το πώρινο κεφάλι φέρει συγκρατημένα γοτθικά χαρακτηριστικά, μακρινό απόηχο από λαμπρά δυτικά έργα του 13ου αιώνα.

Μια σειρά από ανάγλυφα που εντοπίστηκαν σε Ηράκλειο, Χανιά και Ρέθυμνο δείχνουν ποικιλία στην ποιότητα επομένως και προέλευση από διαφορετικά εργαστήρια. Ολόγλυφα απουσιάζουν, τουλάχιστον στο υλικό που χρονολογείται μέχρι και τον 15ο αιώνα. Τα θέματα είναι θρησκευτικά. Τα περισσότερα παραπέμπουν σε δυτική εικονογραφία ή λατινική χρήση.

Ένας δομικός λίθος από τα Χανιά φέρει ανάγλυφη παράσταση στην κύρια όψη. Το ανάγλυφο παριστά τμήμα ανδρικής μορφής σε πλάγια όψη. Φορεί χιτώνα με φαρδιά μανίκια και κρατεί αναπεπταμένο ειλητό. Το χρονολογείται στον 14ο αιώνα. Μπορούμε άραγε να υποθέσουμε ότι το έργο είναι εισηγμένο στην Κρήτη ή ότι ο γλύπτης του δούλεψε στο νησί με εισηγμένο ή και ανακυκλωμένο υλικό; Δεν διαθέτουμε άλλες ενδείξεις που να μπορούν να υποστηρίζουν το ένα ή το άλλο ενδεχόμενο.

Ένα ανάγλυφο απουσιάζει, τουλάχιστον στο υλικό που χρονολογείται μέχρι και τον 15ο αιώνα. Μια μαρτυρία για εικονιστικό διάκοσμο στο υπέρθυρο του Αγίου Φραγκίσκου στο Ηράκλειο διέσωσε ο Τζερόλα: αυτόπτες μιλούσαν για παράσταση του Σωτήρα που περιτριγυριζόταν από Αποστόλους και πλούσιο φυτικό διάκοσμο. Κανένα ίχνος του συμπλέγματος αυτού δεν σώθηκε. Παρά την επιφύλαξη για την αξιοπιστία της μαρτυρίας, ένα ανάγλυφο άγνωστης προέλευσης με παράσταση Παλαιού των Ημερών από το Ηράκλειο δίνει μια ιδέα για το τι θα μπορούσε να είναι αυτός ο διάκοσμος. Είναι μετωπικό και έχει ορθάνοιχτα τα αδέξια διαμορφωμένα
μάτια. Όμως τα ενδύματα, παρά τη σχηματική πραγμάτευσή, δίνουν την αίσθησή του μαλακού υφάσματος. Σε σύγκριση με άγαλμα του ίδιου αγίου, με συγγενική εικονογραφία, που κοσμεί κάτω από τοξωτό πλαίσιο εξωτερική γωνία αρχοντικής οικίας του 1394 στο Σπλιτ η Δαλματίας το κρητικό γλυπτό υστερεί σε πλαστικές αξίες και εν γένει σε ποιότητα. Αναγωρίζεται ωστόσο ο ίδιος τύπος, ανάλογη μετωπικότητα και ύφος, και χρονολογικά θα πρέπει να βρίσκονται επίσης κοντά.

Και ένα άλλο ανάγλυφο από τα Χανιά δίνει την εντύπωση ολογλύφων, χωρίς να είναι. Εικονίζει ανδρική μορφή με χιτώνα και ιμάτιο και σώζεται από τη μέση και κάτω. Τα γυμνά πόδια πατούν σε πλίνθο. Την αμυδρή κίνηση και τον χιασμό της στάσης παρακολουθεί ο κυματισμός του ιματίου, και τα πόδια δηλώνονται με αίσθηση της προοπτικής, χαρακτηριστικά που επιτρέπουν τη χρονολόγηση στον 15ο αιώνα. Το ιδιαίτερο στοιχείο εδώ είναι ότι η ανάγλυφη μορφή έχει προσεκτικά ξακρίσει, και μόνο η πλίνθος, στην οποία προβάλλονται τα πόδια, μαρτυρεί ότι πρόκειται για ανάγλυφη πλάκα. Το γλυπτό προφανώς προοριζόταν να πακτωθεί σε άλλη κατασκευή. Ο γλύπτης ήταν επιδείξιος, αλλά δεν ήταν στις προθέσεις του μια τρισδιάστατη μορφή.

Μερικά ακόμη εικονιστικά ανάγλυφα, όλα σε κακή κατάσταση και αδιάγνωστο θρησκευτικό θέμα, που μπορούν να χρονολογηθούν στον 14ο και 15ο αιώνα, δείχνουν την ποικιλία στην ποιότητα από χέρι σε χέρι και τεκμηριώνουν την ύπαρξη εργαστηρίων γλυπτική τόσο στο Ηράκλειο, όσο και στα Χανιά και το Ρέθυμνο. Όλα είναι αναμφισβήτητα εργαστηριακά ανάγλυφα, χωρίς να αντέχουν στην επίσημη μορφή και τη σύγχρονη στάση του έργου. Οι μάλιστα περιορισμοί και τον δισταγμό προς την τρίτη διάσταση, ωστόσο, μεγάλος ο αριθμός των έργων που καταστράφηκαν, η σπάνις ολογλύφων και το ύφος των σωζόμενων, έστω και σε θραύσματα, εικονιστικών αναγλύφων φανερώνουν τους περιορισμούς του καλλιτεχνικού μέσου. Τα περιορισμοί αυτοί δεν μπορεί να είναι άσχετοι με τις παραδόσεις του τόπου: την απουσία παλαιότερης τοπικής γλυπτικής και τη βαθιά ριζωμένη συνήθεια ότι το θρησκευτικό εικαστικό έργο είναι ζωγραφικό. Αντίθετα η παραστατική γλυπτική ήταν φορτισμένη με συνδηλώσεις σχετικές με το λατινικό δόγμα. Από την άλλη μεριά το δημοφιλές και πολύ χαρακτηριστικό τοπικό είδος γλυπτικής που βασίζοταν στη διπλή παράδοση, χωρίς βυζαντινές αναμνήσεις. Είχε ανικανή να μεταδώσει στην τρίτη διάσταση.
Byzantine Responses to the Challenges of the Latin Church after 1204: The Evidence of Iconography

Abstract: The present contribution aims to examine iconographic choices in late Byzantine churches that can be interpreted as reactions or responses to the Latin doctrine. More specifically, it focuses on iconographic themes related to the apostles, who are regarded as founders of the Church since the very early Christian times. Scenes of the apostles preaching the gospel and baptizing (Hagia Sophia in Trebizond), the scene of the Mission and isolated representations of the apostles depicted in churches found in regions under or neighboring Latin- and Venetian-held lands will be examined and interpreted within their historical, geographical and religious context. Certain of these scenes can be regarded as a response of the Byzantines to the missionary activities of the Latin religious orders in lands formerly belonging to Byzantium. The Byzantines respond to the challenges of the Latin Church by going back to the roots of their tradition and by displaying the beginnings of the foundation of the apostolic church and the local churches all over the oikoumene, thanks to the preaching of the apostles. Moreover, the special emphasis given to the scene of the Pentecost, preferably depicted in the sanctuary, has been related to the Orthodox liturgical rite and regarded as a reaction to the rite of the Latin Church. Characteristic in this period is, additionally, the emergence of local cults in honor of certain apostles (e.g. St. Philemon, one of the Seventy Apostles, in Rhodes).

Το κεντρικό ερώτημα που θα μας απασχολήσει στην παρούσα ανακοίνωση είναι κατά πόσο μπορούμε να ανιχνεύσουμε στην εικονογραφία των βυζαντινών ναών, μετά την Τέταρτη Σταυροφορία, τυχόν αντιδράσεις ή «απαντήσεις» των Βυζαντινών στο δόγμα και το λειτουργικό τυπικό της λατινικής εκκλησίας. Ασφαλώς οι αντιπαραθέσεις μεταξύ των δύο εκκλησιών δεν είναι κάτι πρωτόγνωρο και ο αντίκτυπός τους στην τέχνη διαπιστώνεται ήδη από την παλαιοχριστιανική περίοδο. Εικονογραφικά θέματα εμπνευσμένα από τη διαχρονική αυτή αντιπαράθεση έχουν παρουσιαστεί συνοπτικά σε άρθρο του Ν. Γκιολέ. Το λειτουργικό θέμα του Μελισσού, η κατ’ εξοχήν εικαστική αποτύπωση της θείας ευχαριστίας, που εμφανίζεται το 12ο αιώνα στην αψίδα των ναών στον άγιο Πέτρο, φανερώνεται ως αντίδραση ή προβληματισμός των Βυζαντινών σε σχέση με τη λατινική λειτουργία και την λατινική εκκλησία. Εάν άλλο θέμα που αποκαλύπτει τους προβληματισμούς των Βυζαντινών κατά την υστεροβυζαντινή περίοδο, είναι η αναγνώριση της εκκλησίας της Ρώμης και των παπικών πρωτείων. Οι δίγλωσσες επιγραφές φαίνεται επίσης να απηχούν το εγχείρημα της ένωσης των εκκλησιών.
Ο προβληματισμός γύρω από το ρόλο των αποστόλων στη διάδοση της χριστιανικής διδασκαλίας και στην ίδρυση των τοπικών επισκοπών απασχόλησε από πολύ νωρίς τους Βυζαντινούς. Ο ρόλος τους μάλιστα τονίστηκε σε εποχές έντονης ερασιτεχνικής δραστηριότητας, για παράδειγμα στο δεύτερο μισό του 9ου και στο 10ο αιώνα (εκχριστιανισμός Σλάβων, Βουλγάρων, Ρώσων). Στην εικονογραφία εκφράστηκε με τις παραστάσεις των ιδίων των αποστόλων, με τις απεικονίσεις σκηνών με τη διδασκαλία τους και τη βάπτιση των αλλοθρήσκων, με τη σκηνή του Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε και βεβαίως με την παράσταση της Πεντηκοστής. Χαρακτηριστικό είναι το χειρόγραφο με τις Ομιλίες του Γρηγορίου Ναζιζηνού αρ. 510 της Εθνικής Βιβλιοθήκης του Παρισίου, παραγγελία του πατριάρχη Φωτίου για τον Βασίλειο Α’, περί 880. Η παράσταση της Πεντηκοστής (φ. 301α) και η ολοσέλιδη μικρογραφία του φ. 426β, όπου απεικονίζεται πάνω το Πορευθέντες και από κάτω 12 μικρές σκηνές με τους αποστόλους βαπτίζοντες, έχουν συνδεθεί από την Leslie Brubaker με την ευρύτατη επιχείρηση εκχριστιανισμού των Σλάβων και Βουλγάρων επί Βασιλείου Α’. Αντίστοιχες ερμηνείες έχουν δεχτεί οι παραστάσεις του Πορευθέντες σε ναούς του 10ου αιώνα στα Καππαδοκία.

Από το 13ο αιώνα η έμφαση στο διδασκαλικό ρόλο των αποστόλων γίνεται εντονότερη και νομίζω ότι θα μπορούσε να συνδέεται με τις στενές επαφές του Βυζαντίου με τη Δύση αποτελώντας ένα είδος απάντησης στην ιεραποστολική δράση των επαιτικών ταγμάτων στη Ανατολή μετά το 1204.

Στην Αγία Σοφία Τραπεζούντας, καθίδρυμα του Μανουήλ Α΄ Μεγάλου Κομνηνού (1238-1263), ο ρόλος των αποστόλων εξαρτάται από πολλούς τρόπους, όπως παρατηρεί ο Anthony Eastmond. Ο κύκλος των σκηνών μετά την Άνασταση, όπου σημαντικό ρόλο παίζουν οι απόστολοι συνεχίζεται στο βόρειο προστώο. Στο δυτικό τοίχο παριστάνεται ο Χριστός με ανοικτό ευαγγέλιο, οι τέσσερις ευαγγελιστές να διδάσκουν και οκτώ απόστολοι να βαπτίζουν. Οι σκηνές αυτές φαίνεται να απηχούν, όπως επισημαίνει ο Anthony Eastmond, τον ιεραποστολικό ζήλο του Μανουήλ και τη διάθεση του να εμφανιστεί η αυτοκρατορία της Τραπεζούντας ως υπερασπιστής της Ορθοδοξίας κατά αρετικών και απίστων και ως διάδοχος των αποστόλων. Δεν είναι τυχαίος και ο συνδυασμός με την παράσταση της Αγίας Τριάδας, με την παραδοσιακή μορφή της Φιλοξενίας του Αβραάμ, που απεικονίζεται απέναντι στο νότιο τοίχο του προστώου.

Στον ελλαδικό χώρο και συγκεκριμένα στην Πελοπόννησο, όπου οι αγώνες για την κυριαρχία μεταξύ Βυζαντινών και Λατίνων είναι συνεχείς, τα μνημεία κλείδια βρίσκονται στο Μυστρά, όπου απεικονίζεται άμεσα η επίσημη εκκλησιαστική πολιτική της Κωνσταντινούπολης. Στη Μητρόπολη, στη φάση που έχει χρονολογηθεί περί το 1290 με υπεύθυνο τον μητροπολίτη Αλεξανδρινό Νικηφόρο Μοσχόπουλο, παριστάνονται στο νότιο τοίχο οι 12 απόστολοι και στην πρόθεση ορισμένοι από τους Εβδομήκοντα. Τόσο οι δράσεις και διασυνδέσεις του Νικηφόρου όσο και η προοδευτική για την εποχή τεχνοτροπία δείχνουν σχέση με την επίσημη πολιτική.
Ιδιαίτερα ενδιαφέρουσα είναι η εικονογραφία στο ναό της Παναγίας Οδηγήτριας της μονής Βροντοχίου (περ. 1310-1322). Όπως αναλυτικά έχει επισημάνει η Ροδονίκη Ετζέογλου, στα υπερώα παριστάνονται οι Εβδομήκοντα απόστολοι φορώντας ωμοφόριο πάνω από το χιτώνα και ιμάτιο. Απεικονίζονται δηλαδή ως απόστολοι αλλά και ως επίσκοποι και συνοδεύονται από επιγραφές με το όνομά τους και με την ονομασία της επισκοπής που ιδρύουν. Οι περισσότεροι κρατούν ευαγγέλιο και σηκώνουν το δεξιό χέρι σε χειρονομία ομιλίας / διδασκαλίας. Επιπλέον σε ένα ξεχωριστό κλειστό χώρο στο ΝΔ τμήμα του υπερώου απεικονίζονται οι 12 απόστολοι. Πάνω από την είσοδο στο χώρο αυτό παριστάνεται η σκηνή της Πεντηκοστής. Τα επιλεγμένα εικονογραφικά θέματα της Οδηγήτριας (αλλά και η αρχιτεκτονική μορφή του ναού καθώς και η καλλιτεχνική ποιότητα και η τεχνοτροπία του ζωγραφικού διακόσμου) δείχνουν τις στενές διασυνδέσεις του Παχωμίου με την Κωνσταντινούπολη και ειδικά με τον Ανδρόνικο Β’ και τις πολιτικο-θρησκευτικές του επιλογές. Οι ερευνητές του μνημείου έχουν τονίσει τις άμεσες σχέσεις της εικονογραφίας του ναρθηκα με το ναό της Ζωοδόχου Πηγής στην Κωνσταντινούπολη (Ετζέογλου) και του νότιου παρεκκλησίου με τους ναούς των Βλαχερνών και των Χαλκοπρατείων (Παπαμαστοράκης). Νομίζω ότι αυτή η έμφαση στους αποστόλους που κρατούν ευαγγέλιο και φορούν ωμοφόριο τονίζουν το ρόλο τους στη διδασκαλία και στη διάδοση του ευαγγελίου και στην ίδρυση των τοπικών εκκλησιών σε όλη την οικουμένη και ότι αυτό, μέσα στο κλίμα της εποχής, μπορεί να θεωρηθεί ως ένα είδος απάντησης στην ιεραποστολική δράση των θρησκευτικών ταγμάτων στη Ανατολή, κυρίως των Φραγκισκανών και των Δυτικών Μοναχών, που ανέπτυξαν μεγάλη δραστηριότητα στην Κωνσταντινούπολη όσο και στον ελλαδικό χώρο (Tsougarakis). Είναι χαρακτηριστικό ότι στις σωζόμενες παραστάσεις Φραγκισκανών και Δυτικών Μοναχών στην Ανατολή, οι δυτικοί μοναχοί απεικονίζονται κρατώντας ευαγγέλιο στο χέρι, όπως ο άγιος Φραγκίσκος στο παρεκκλήσι των Φραγκισκανών στο ναό της Παναγίας Κυριώτισσας στην Κωνσταντινούπολη (Kalenderhane Camii, περ. μέσα 13ου αι.) καθώς και οι δυτικοί μοναχοί στην Όμορφη Εκκλησία στο Γαλάτσι (περ. 1300).

Στην Παντάνασσα του Μυστρά, καθίδρυμα του πρωτοστράτορα Ιωάννη Φραγκόπουλου (1428-1443), παριστάνονται οι Εβδομήκοντα απόστολοι στα υπερώα. Η Πεντηκοστή απεικονίζεται στην ιεραποστολική καμάρα στο ναό βήμα, κάτω από την Ανάληψη. Μάλιστα το κάθε ημιχόριο χωρίζεται στα δύο από το βόρειο και νότιο το ξεχωριστό χώρο των υπερώων, όπου απεικονίζονται οι Εβδομήκοντα. Η εικονογραφία αυτή φαίνεται ως «απάντηση» στο εικονογραφικό πρόγραμμα του ναρθηκα, όπου απεικονίζονται δυτικοί μοναχοί κρατώντας ευαγγέλιο. Στην ιεραποστολική δράση των
εκπροσώπων των δυτικών θρησκευτικών ταγμάτων η Ορθόδοξη πλευρά φαίνεται να απαντά με την επιστροφή στις ρίζες του χριστιανισμού, υπογραμμίζοντας την πρωταρχική ιεραποστολικό ρόλο των αποστόλων καθ’ υπόδειξη του ιδίου του Χριστού. Πρόκειται για αντιπαράθεση ή διάλογο και προσπάθεια προσέγγισης των δύο δογμάτων μέσα στον ιδίο ναό; Το προβληματικό μνημείο κρύβει ακόμα τα μυστικά των δωρητών του και των προθέσεών τους.

Προς τα τέλη του 13ου αιώνα εμφανίζεται στη Ρόδο τοπική λατρεία του αγίου Φιλήμονος, ενός από τους Εβδομήκοντα Αποστόλων, όπως εύστοχα έχει αναδείξει η Κωνσταντία Κέφαλα. Μαθητής του Παύλου, υπήρξε πρώτος επίσκοπος Γάζας. Κέντρο της λατρείας του στη Ρόδο ήταν ένα μικρό μοναστήρι στην Αρνίθα στα νότια του νησιού, όπου σήμερα σώζεται ένας μικρός μεταβυζαντινός ναός. Οι θρησκευτικοί ευελπίζουν ότι το προβληματικό μνημείο κρύβει ακόμα τα μυστικά των δωρητών του και των προθέσεών τους.

Πολλοί τοπικοί πιστεύουν ότι το μοναστήρι ένας πρώτος επίσκοπος Αγίας Παρασκευής στη Χαλκίδα περί τα τέλη του 14ου αιώνα και μελετήθηκε από τον Νικό Κοντογιάννη. Η τρίκλιτη βασιλική έχει ταυτιστεί με τον μοναστηριακό ναό που έκτισαν οι Δομηνικανοί και αφιέρωσαν στη Θεοτόκο και τον Άγιο Δομήνικο.
στα μέσα του 13ου αιώνα στο Negroponte. Στο γραπτό του διάκοσμου, που έχει χρονολογηθεί περί το 1400, περιλαμβάνονται σκηνές της διδασκαλίας των αποστόλων με λατινικές επιγραφές. Οι σκηνές αυτές θα μπορούσαν να συνδέθουν με τον Pietro Lippomano (+1397), του οποίου ο τάφος περιλαμβάνεται στο παρεκκλήσι, ενός πλούσιου Εβραίου που ασπάστηκε τον καθολικισμό, εξυπηρέτησε τα συμφέροντα των Βενετών και απέκτησε αξιώματα στη Βενετία. Να απηχούν οι σκηνές των αποστόλων που περιλαμβάνονται στο πρόγραμμα του νεκρικού παρεκκλήσιον τον προσωπικό προσηλυτισμό του Lippomano στην καθολική εκκλησία; Είναι πιθανόν. Αλλά εκείνο που έχει σημασία για την επιχειρηματολογία αυτής της μελέτης είναι το γεγονός ότι τα θέματα που σχετίζονται με τη διδασκαλία του Ευαγγελίου από τους αποστόλους απασχολούν τόσο την ανατολική όσο και τη δυτική εκκλησία που φαίνεται να βρίσκονται σε ένα συνεχή διάλογο δίνοντας η κάθε πλευρά στις ιδιες παραστάσεις τη δική της ερμηνεία.

Συνοψίζοντας:
Στο διάκοσμο των υστεροβυζαντινών ναών διαπιστώνονται εικονογραφικά θέματα που μπορούν να θεωρηθούν ως «απαντήσεις» των Βυζαντινών στους προβληματισμούς που προέκυψαν από τη στενή και καταναγκαστική επαφή των Ορθοδόξων με τους Λατίνους μετά το 1204. Η ανακοίνωση επικεντρώθηκε στην επιλογή εικονογραφικών θεμάτων που σχετίζονται με τους αποστόλους ως θεμελιωτές της εκκλησίας: σκηνές διδασκαλίας του Ευαγγελίου και βάπτισης, παραστάσεις των Εβδομήκοντα και του Πορευθέντος, αποστολική δράση των αποστόλων. Οι Βυζαντινοί αντιμετωπίζοντας την καινοφανή ιεραποστολική δράση των Αναγεννησιακών θρησκευτικών ταχειών, ανάπτυξη τοπικής λατρείας αποστόλων. Οι Βυζαντινοί αντιμετωπίζοντας την καινοφανή ιεραποστολική δράση των νεότερων θρησκευτικών αναφορών, φαίνεται να «απαντούν» με την επιστροφή στην καινοφανή ιεραποστολική δράση των αποστόλων από τη στενή και καταναγκαστική επαφή των Ορθοδόξων με τους Λατίνους μετά το 1204. Η ανακοίνωση επικεντρώθηκε στην επιλογή εικονογραφικών θεμάτων που σχετίζονται με τους αποστόλους ως θεμελιωτές της εκκλησίας: σκηνές διδασκαλίας του Ευαγγελίου και βάπτισης, παραστάσεις των Εβδομήκοντα και του Πορευθέντος, ανάπτυξη τοπικής λατρείας αποστόλων. Οι Βυζαντινοί αντιμετωπίζοντας την καινοφανή ιεραποστολική δράση των νεότερων θρησκευτικών αναφορών, φαίνεται να «απαντούν» με την επιστροφή στην καινοφανή ιεραποστολική δράση των αποστόλων από τη στενή και καταναγκαστική επαφή των Ορθοδόξων με τους Λατίνους μετά το 1204. Η ανακοίνωση επικεντρώθηκε στην επιλογή εικονογραφικών θεμάτων που σχετίζονται με τους αποστόλους ως θεμελιωτές της εκκλησίας: σκηνές διδασκαλίας του Ευαγγελίου και βάπτισης, παραστάσεις των Εβδομήκοντα και του Πορευθέντος, ανάπτυξη τοπικής λατρείας αποστόλων. Οι Βυζαντινοί αντιμετωπίζοντας την καινοφανή ιεραποστολική δράση των νεότερων θρησκευτικών αναφορών, φαίνεται να «απαντούν» με την επιστροφή στην καινοφανή ιεραποστολική δράση των αποστόλων από τη στενή και καταναγκαστική επαφή των Ορθοδόξων με τους Λατίνους μετά το 1204.
Cultural Interactions between East and West:
The Testimony of Three Orthodox Monasteries
in the Thirteenth-Century Frankish Messenia

Abstract: The present paper re-examines the scholarship on the frescoes in three Orthodox monastic foundations of Frankish Messenia and raises new questions of concern for current and future research. Central to the discussion are the paintings of Andromonastiro, one of the most important Orthodox monasteries in the Frankish Morea. The frescoes of the katholikon have recently undergone meticulous conservation and can now be dated to the second quarter of the 13th century on stylistic grounds. Some details in the design of decorative ornaments betray western influence, while the discovery of a painted fleur de lys in the scene of the Pentecost provides evidence for the involvement of the ruling Villehardouin family in the commission of the decoration.

The discussion continues with the church of Zoodochos Pege (Samarina), close to the village Ellenoekklesia (Samari). Recent conservation in the narthex has revealed paintings of ca. 1260 that are clearly Italianate in style. As for the involvement of the Villehardouins in this case, a thirteenth-century dedication in a sumptuous manuscript of the tenth century may illuminate this relationship. According to this, Anna, princess of Achaia, the wife of William II of Villehardouin, presented this manuscript in 1277 to the church of Hagia Marina, which she had restored. The church of Zoodochos Pege still preserves the name Samarina, which seems to derive from the homophone in French Sainte-Marine. Based on the new dating of the narthex frescoes, it seems that this is the very church with which Anna was involved.

Western elements can also be detected in the decoration of the third most important monastic church of Messenia, the katholikon of the Ellenika monastery nearby Ancient Thouria, where the trapezoidal capitals are painted on each face with a scene from the Life of Christ, in imitation of carved capitals in Western churches of the period.

A fresh examination of painting in Messenia demonstrates that contrasting terms like “Western” and “Eastern” may not be adequate in the description of art created in a region where the integration of two different cultures was gradually taking place. What is more, the presence and patronage of the Latin rulers encouraged changes in painting style and iconography even in monastic foundations of the Orthodox rite. The newly discovered murals indicate that cultural interactions between “East” and “West” were much deeper and stronger than previously thought and that artists, working for both Orthodox and Latin patrons, could adapt subject-matter and style to fit specific commissions.

Η Μεσσηνία υπήρξε αναπόσπαστο τμήμα του πριγκιπάτου της Αχαίας από τις αρχές της ιδρυσής του, έως και την οριστική διάλυσή του από τους Βυζαντινούς στα μέσα της δευτέρης δεκαετίας του 15ου αιώνα. Φράγκοι ιππότες, Βενετοί έμποροι, Ισπανοί στρατιώτες, Λατίνοι ιεραπόστολοι έρχονται σε επαφή με τον ελληνικό πληθυσμό, που παραμένει προσηλωμένος στο ορθόδοξο δόγμα, ενώ παράλληλα τα μέλη της τοπικής βυζαντινής αριστοκρατίας φαίνεται ότι βαθμιαία ενσωματώνονται στις νέες διοικητικές δομές. Πολύτιμη μαρτυρία για το πολυπολιτισμικό περιβάλλον που σταδιακά διαμορφώνεται στην περιοχή παρέχουν τα εκατοντάδες μνημεία.
της συγκεκριμένης περιόδου. Παρόλο που ήδη από τη δεκαετία του 1960 κορυφαίοι ερευνητές είχαν επισημάνει και σχολιάσει τη σταδιακή διείσδυση δυτικών επιρροών στην εκκλησιαστική αρχιτεκτονική της Μεσσηνίας, ανάλογες σχέσεις παρέμειναν άγνωστες στη μνημειακή ζωγραφική.

Οι εκτεταμένες αναστηλωτικές εργασίες που πραγματοποιήθηκαν τα τελευταία χρόνια από την Εφορεία Αρχαιοτήτων Μεσσηνίας αποκάλυψαν άγνωστα σύνολα μνημειακής ζωγραφικής και οδήγησαν στην αναχρονολόγηση ορισμένων κομβικών μνημείων. Στην παρούσα ανακοίνωση θα παρουσιαστούν οι τοιχογραφίες των τριών σημαντικότερων μοναστηριακών συγκροτημάτων της μεσσηνιακής υπαίθρου, του καθολικού του Ανδρομονάστηρου, του νάρθηκα της Σαμαρίνας και του καθολικού της μονής Ελληνικών κοντά στην Αρχαία Θουρία. Αν και τα τρία αυτά σύνολα είχαν χρονολογηθεί παλιότερα στα τέλη του 12ου αιώνα, τα νεότερα στοιχεία υποδεικνύουν τη μετάθεση της χρονολόγησής τους εντός της δέκατης τρίτης εκατονταετίας.

Το Ανδρομονάστηρο, από τα εντυπωσιακότερα μοναστήρια της Πελοποννήσου, είναι κτισμένο σε μία εύφορη ρεματιά πολύ κοντά στην Αρχαία Μεσσήνη. Στα νοτιοανατολικά του συγκροτήματος δεσπόζει το καθολικό της μονής, αφιερωμένο στη Μεταμόρφωση του Σωτήρος. Πρόκειται για τρουλαίο σταυροειδή εγγεγραμμένο ναό, της παραλλαγής του ημισύνθετου τετρακιόνιου, με νάρθηκα στα δυτικά, ευρέως μετασκευασμένο κατά τη μεταβυζαντινή περίοδο. Οι τοιχογραφίες του είχαν καλυφθεί, σχεδόν στο σύνολό τους, από επάλληλα στρώματα ασβεστώματος. Μετά την ολοκλήρωση των εργασιών αποκατάστασης αποκαλύφθηκαν τρία κύρια στρώματα ζωγραφικής. Η πρώτη φάση ιστορήσεως διατηρείται αποσπασματικά στον τρούλο, στις καμάρες των σταυρικών σκελών και στα φουρνικά και τις καμάρες των γωνιακών διαμερισμάτων. Στο ημισφαίριο του τρούλου αποκαλύφθηκε σε μετάλλιο η στηθαία μορφή του Χριστού, πλαισιωμένη από ζώνη αγγελικών δυνάμεων. Χαμηλότερα στα σφαιρικά τρίγωνα, παριστάνεται οι ευαγγελιστές, από τους οποίους καλύτερα διατηρείται ο Μάρκος. Οι καμάρες των σταυρικών σκελών κοσμούνται με μνημειακές παραστάσεις από τον κύκλο του Δωδεκαόρτου, που αναπτύσσεται με δεξιόστροφη φορά. Το διακοσμικό επείχε θέση παρεκκλησίου αφιερωμένου στον επίσκοπο Μύρων Νικόλαο, όπως μαρτυρεί ο ζωγραφικός του διάκοσμος. Στην καμάρα της πρόθεσης απεικονίζονται σκηνές Οικουμενικών Συνόδων. Παρά τις κομνήνειες αναμνήσεις οι αρχικές τοιχογραφίες του Ανδρομονάστηρου μπορούν να χρονολογηθούν, βάσει εικονογραφικών και τεχνοτροπικών κριτηρίων, στο δεύτερο τέταρτο του 13ου αιώνα.
μονών. Τίθεται λοιπόν επιτακτικά το ερώτημα: που βρίσκονταν αυτά τα μοναστήρια; Ορισμένες εικονογραφικές λεπτομέρειες στις τοιχογραφίες του Ανδρομονάστηρου φαίνεται να βοηθούν στην απάντηση του συγκεκριμένου ερωτήματος.

Στο τριγωνικό τετράγωνο του κτηρίου που ορίζεται το δεξιό άκρο της σκηνής της Πεντηκοστής δεσπόζει ένα εντυπωσιακό χρυσό κρινάνθεμο οριοθετημένο με έντονο μαύρο περίγραμμα. Το συγκεκριμένο σύμβολο αποτελεί το κυριότερο διακοσμητικό θέμα στα οικόσημα του γαλλικού βασιλικού οίκου, ενώ φαίνεται ότι αξιοποιήθηκε, λόγω του συμβολισμού του, και από την ιδιαίτερα πολύτιμη ιστορική και καθεστωτική αξία των Βιλλεαρδουίνων, που διατηρούσαν μεγάλη επιρροή στη διοίκηση του Πριγκιπάτου καθ’ όλη τη διάρκεια του 13ου αιώνα. Η προβολή του Κρινάνθεμου σε σημαντική θέση στις τοιχογραφίες του Ανδρομονάστηρου, αλλά και ο τρόπος απεικόνισής του με χρυσό χρώμα, σύμφωνα δηλαδή με τους κωδικοποιημένους κανόνες της εραλδικής, παραμένει χωρίς παράλληλο στη βυζαντινή μνημειακή ζωγραφική. Θα μπορούσε η συγκεκριμένη εικονογραφική λεπτομέρεια να συνιστά έναν έμμεσο υπαινιγμό για τη συμμετοχή του φημισμένου Φράγκου ηγεμόνα στη διακόσμηση του Ανδρομονάστηρου; Παρά την έλλειψη πρόσθετων στοιχείων μια θετική απάντηση στο ερώτημα αυτό δεν θα μπορούσε να αποκλειστεί.

Το Ανδρομονάστηρο συνιστά το σημαντικότερο ορθοδοξο μοναστήρι της Μεσσηνίας κατά την περίοδο της Λατινικής επικυριαρχίας, ενώ βρίσκεται εντός της περιοχής που κατασκευάστηκαν τα Βιλλεαρδουίνοι. Σύμφωνα μάλιστα με την αραγωνική εκδοχή του Χρονικού του Μορέως, με πρωτοβουλία του Γουλιέλμου αναδιοργανώνεται διοικητικά η κεντρική Μεσσηνία, ενώ για τον αποτελεσματικότερο έλεγχο της, ιδρύεται περί τα μέσα του 13ου αιώνα, σε απόσταση μόνο χιλιομέτρων από το Ανδρομονάστηρο, μια νέα πόλη-κάστρο, από τις σημαντικότερες του Μοριά, η Ανδρούσα, που έμελε να παίξει σημαντικό ρόλο στη διοίκηση του Πριγκιπάτου. Η εκκλησία της Σαμαρίνας, αφιερωμένη σήμερα στη Ζώοδοχο Πηγή, βρίσκεται στο μέσο περίπου της απόστασης του Ανδρομονάστηρου και Ανδρούσας. Η εκκλησία της Σαμαρίνας, αφιερωμένη σήμερα στη Ζώοδοχο Πηγή, βρίσκεται στο μέσο περίπου της απόστασης του Ανδρομονάστηρου και Ανδρούσας.
Το ενδεχόμενο να έχει επηρεαστεί τεχνοτροπικά ο ζωγράφος που εργάστηκε στον νάρθηκα της Ζωδόχου Πηγής από δυτικά έργα προοδεύει στο μεσσηνιακό σύνολο πρόσθετο ενδιαφέρον. Αξίζει να σημειωθεί ότι κατά τον 13ο αιώνα οι δυτικές επιρροές στον κόσμο της Ζωοδόχου από δυτικά εργά αποτελούν πρόσθετο ενδιαφέρον. Αξίζει να σημειωθεί ότι κατά τον 13ο αιώνα οι δυτικές επιρροές σε τοιχογραφίες πελοποννησιακών μνημείων περιορίζονται συνήθως σε δευτερεύουσης σημασίας εικονογραφικές λεπτομέρειες, όπως λ.χ. στις εξαρτώσεις των στρατιωτών ή στη διακόσμηση των φωτοστεφάνων. Με το παράδειγμα του εντοίχου ζωγραφικού διακόσμου στην πύλη της Ακρωτηρίου, όπου εικονίζονται τα υιόσημα των Φράγκων πριγκιπών και οι συνυποδεικτικές επιγραφές είναι γραμμένες στη λατινική γλώσσα, το έργο ακολουθεί τεχνοτροπικά τις επαρχιακές τάσεις της βυζαντινής ζωγραφικής κατά τον όψιμο 1300 αιώνα. Είναι πολύ σπάνιες οι περιπτώσεις όπου η διείσδυση της δυτικής τέχνης ανιχνεύεται και στο πεδίο της τεχνοτροπίας, με αντιπροσωπευτικότερο ίσως παράδειγμα τις αδημοσίευτες τοιχογραφίες του Τακτάρχη η Ικαρίσσα Λακωνίας.

Αναφορικά δε με την ενδεχόμενη συμμετοχή των Βιλλεαρδουίνων στην ολοκλήρωση της διακόσμησης της ωραίοτερης εκκλησίας εντός των οικογενειακών τους φέουδων, μια αφιέρωση σε ένα πολυτελές χειρόγραφο του 10ου αιώνα, που σήμερα φυλάσσεται στη Μόσχα, προσφέρει μια ιδιαιτέρως πολύτιμη πληροφορία. Σύμφωνα με αυτήν, η σύζυγος του Γουλιέλμου Άννα, κόρη του ηγεμόνα της Ηπείρου Μιχαήλ 2ος, αφιερώθηκε το συγκεκριμένο χειρόγραφο στη μονή της Αγίας Μαρίνας που η ίδια ανακαίνισε. Στην αναφορά δεν σημειώνεται η ακριβής θέση του μνημείου. Η εκκλησία της Ζωδόχου Πηγής, ωστόσο, είναι έως σήμερα γνωστή στην περιοχή με την επωνυμία Σαμαρίνα, ονομασία που φαίνεται να προέρχεται από το ομόηχο στα Γαλλικά Sainte Marine. Η αναλογία των τοιχογραφιών του νάρθηκα της Ζωδόχου Πηγής υποστηρίζει την πιθανή ανακαίνιση του μνημείου με την εκκλησία που ανακαίνισε η Μιχαήλ Β΄ Άννα.

Το τελευταίο παράδειγμα μιας ασυνήθιστης αφομοίωσης δυτικών επιρροών που θα μας απασχολήσει, βρίσκεται στις βόρειες παρυφές της μεσσηνιακής πεδιάδας, πολύ κοντά στην Καλαμάτα, εντός του ερειπιώνα της Αρχαίας Θουρίας. Πρόκειται για το καθολικό της μονής Παλαιοκάστρου ή Ελληνικών, αφιερωμένο στη θεομητορική εορτή της Κοιμήσεως της Θεοτόκου. Οι λιγοστές σωζόμενες τοιχογραφίες του, έργο του τελευταίου τέταρτου του 13ου αιώνα, συνιστούν ένα από τα καλύτερα δείγματα της πρώιμης παλαιολόγειας ζωγραφικής στην Πελοπόννησο.
σκριπτόρια της Κωνσταντινούπολης στα χρόνια της βασιλείας του Μιχαήλ Η' Παλαιολόγου και προορίζονταν πιθανώς να αποσταλούν ως δώρα σε ηγεμόνες της Δυτικής Ευρώπης.

Αξιοσημείωτη στις τοιχογραφίες του μεσσηνιακού μνημείου είναι η χρήση lapis lazuli για την απόδοση του φωτεινού γαλάζιου χρώματος στα ενδύματα του Χριστού και της αγίας Άννας. Η διακόσμηση των πεσσόκρανων με πολυπρόσωπες ευαγγελικές σκηνές, αντί για τα συνήθη ένζωδα ή φυτικά θέματα, συνιστά υπερήφανη τεχνητή τέχνη. Η συγκεκριμένη αισθητική επιλογή οφείλεται προφανώς σε έμμεση επίδραση της τέχνης της Χύτης, όπου πολύ συχνά, ήδη από τον 11ο αιώνα, προσφέροντας στην καλύτερη κατανόηση του συνόλου, προσφέροντας επιπλέον περισσότερα στο πεδίο της τεχνοτροπίας και της εικονογραφίας. Ως εκ τούτου, η μονοδιάστατη χρήση των όρων «Δυτικός» και «Ανατολικός» δεν ανταποκρίνεται πάντα με την ίδια ακρίβεια στις προσπάθειες ερμηνείας και ομαδοποίησης έργων μνημειακής ζωγραφικής, ειδικά όταν αυτά έχουν φιλοτεχνηθεί σε περιοχές και ευρείες επικοινωνίες με άλλες πολιτισμικές κοινότητες. Οι καλλιτέχνες μεταξύ άλλων δεν φαίνεται ότι με αξιοσημείωτη ευελιξία προσαρμόζουν την τεχνοτροπία και το εικονογραφικό τους θεματολογίο ανάλογα με την περίσταση.
Papal Policy and the Latin Religious Orders in Frankish Greece

Abstract: The present contribution aims to summarise some of the recent advances made in the field of papal relations with, and policy towards, the Greeks in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade and to outline the implications of these advances for our view of Latin monasticism in Frankish Greece. Papal policy towards the Greeks within Latin dominions is shown to be more tolerant and flexible in the 13th century than was once assumed, yet this is also the period which sees the first crusading calls against Greek enemies outside of the Latin Empire. Given the conciliatory attitude of 13th-century popes towards the Greeks within the Latin dominions, it is argued that the Latin religious orders in Greece should not be seen as papal missionaries. It is recognised, however, that the orders’ activity cannot be reduced to a single model and that certain members of the religious orders seem to have pursued a confrontational agenda towards the Greek rite.

The field of study of Greco-Latin relations in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade has undergone extensive revision in recent years, to the point that the older historiographical view of two ethno-religious groups set in almost permanent confrontation has been rejected almost wholesale by most historians of Frankish Greece. This revision has ranged from the microcosm of the home and everyday social interactions (McKee) to the macrocosm of diplomacy, government and Church relations. The present contribution aims to outline some of the advances made in the field of papal policy towards the Greek rite in the aftermath of 1204 and examine the implications that these revisions raise for Latin monasticism in Frankish Greece.

Older historiography, especially Byzantine historiography, saw papal attitudes towards the Greek Church in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade as uncompromisingly hostile, its primary aim being to subjugate the Greek Church under the Roman one. According to this interpretation the Greeks were identified in the eyes of the papacy predominantly by their religious difference and papal policy, from the time of Innocent III onwards, aimed at ending the schism by subjecting the Greek Church to the Roman one, both administratively and doctrinally and ritualistically. This policy was supposedly made manifest in the Latin states of Greece through the almost complete substitution of the Greek episcopacy by a Latin one, the spoliation of Church lands by the Latins (secular and religious) and the installation of monastic and mendicant orders, which –by this model– were seen either as Roman missionaries to the Greeks or at least as enforcers of papal primacy over the Church in Romania. To put it simply, the Greek Church became the victim of papal universalist ambitions and laboured under Roman oppression for the following several centuries, which in turn created an insurmountable obstacle in the relations of the two rites. Certain elements of this picture cannot be doubted. It is true for instance that the schism becomes much more prominent in papal rhetoric from the 13th century onwards –much more so than it had been at any time before 1204– and is now routinely invoked to promote papal policy in the East. It is also of course true that the Greek Church was subjected jurisdictionally to the Latin one, though, as Bernard Hamilton pointed out long ago in relation to similar developments in the Holy Land, this should be seen as evidence of the papacy’s belief in the essential unity of the two rites, rather than the opposite.
Other elements of this picture, however, have been significantly revised in more recent years. Filip Van Tricht, for instance has argued that a significant number of Greek bishops and archbishops – perhaps even the majority – remained in place in the heartland of the Latin Empire in the years immediately following the conquest. This would suggest that, for whatever reason (practical self-interest? Conviction? Dedication to their flock?) many more Greek prelates than was once assumed were prepared to take the oath of obedience to the papacy and retain their position. This was entirely consistent with Innocent III’s intentions, whose registers make it perfectly clear that he had hoped that the Greek bishops would submit to Roman authority and remain in place especially in the territories with an overwhelmingly Greek population. Evidence of this religious accommodation can be seen elsewhere too. Brendan McGuire, for instance has recently re-examined two liturgical texts issuing from early 13th-century Constantinople, which reproduce parts of the Roman mass, but written in a Greek alphabet with interlinear Greek translation. The original editors of the texts (Papadopoulos-Kerameus and Heisenberg) had interpreted these texts as evidence of the Latin Church’s attempt to impose the Latin rite on the Greeks in the aftermath of the conquest. McGuire’s careful textual analysis, however, proves that the texts must be seen as spontaneous attempts by the Greek clergy to adapt the Latin rite, so that it might be performed (in Latin) by Greek priests with no knowledge of Latin. The picture that emerges from this kind of evidence is one that acknowledges the tensions that resulted from the conquest but doesn’t see religious difference as the prime (or only) factor in relations between Greeks and Latins.

As far as the papacy’s policies towards the Greek Church are concerned, the most systematic revision of the old view in recent years has been undertaken by Chris Schabel, through the careful examination of the papal registers of early 13th-century popes. Schabel’s view, expressed in a multitude of publications, can be summarised thus: the early 13th-century papacy (taking its cue from Innocent III and Lateran IV) adopted a consistent, pragmatic and reasonably tolerant policy towards the Greek rite in areas under Latin control. The oath of obedience was required from Greek bishops, if they were to maintain their position, but this was predominantly a jurisdictional matter, not one that aimed to impose the Latin rite and doctrine over the Greek Church. In fact, in purely religious matters the early 13th-century popes were willing to accept tacitly all Greek practices as valid, except where the Greeks expressly opposed the Latin rite (e.g. by washing their altars after they had been used by Latins or by calling the Latins heretics). The popes therefore actively avoided placing undue emphasis on the Greeks’ religious otherness, since they themselves remained steadfast in the opinion that the union had been achieved de facto with the conquest. This fact is amply reflected (according to Schabel) in the registers of Honorius III who carefully distinguishes between obedient Greeks who are part of the Roman Church, i.e. those within the Latin dominions, and schismatic Greeks, i.e. the rulers of Epirus and Nicaea along with their subjects. The implication of this is that, for the Roman Church, the schism was not just simply a matter of jurisdiction (rather than doctrine) but moreover one that was intimately connected with political allegiance. In a recent article for Traditio Schabel applies these views also to the installation of the Cistercians in Greece and seeks to disprove Brenda Bolton’s assertion that the Cistercian involvement in the Latin Empire was essentially a Latin mission to the Greeks.

Though Schabel is undoubtedly correct both on his assessment of the papacy’s precise use of the rhetoric of schism and on the nature of Cistercian involvement in Romania, the practicalities of Greco-Latin religious interaction on the ground of the Latin states remain hard to detect, as
does the effect of the papal rhetoric of schism. It may well be the case that the popes only applied the term ‘schismatics’ to the representatives of the Byzantine successor states, but (as N. Chrissis has discussed) this coincides with the first crusades (under Honorius) that explicitly targeted Greeks, who were also described as enemies of God and the Church. By the reign of Gregory IX the crusading calls against the Greeks or Greek-rite enemies of the Latin Empire employed not only the rhetoric of schism but also the justification of removing the protectors of heresy, in the same way that this justification had been used during the Albigensian Crusade. Moreover the papacy’s tendency to oscillate between crusading calls and unionist negotiations in this period can be seen as emphasising the religious difference of the Greeks, even if, technically, the crusades were called not against all Greeks but only against certain enemies of the Latin Empire who happened to be Greek. It is no surprise then to detect in the 13th century a ‘hardening of attitudes between Latins and Greeks on account of the crusade’ (Chrissis), despite papal efforts at appeasement of the Greeks under Latin rule.

Whether this hardening of attitudes is reflected in the religious interactions of the two groups and in the activities of the religious orders in the Latin states of the Peloponnese, mainland Greece and the islands is hard to answer with conviction. But it is surely important to note that in those areas Innocent’s policy of appeasement was unsuccessful for there is no doubt that most of the high-ranking Greek clergy abandoned their positions there. In explaining this, we have to remember that papal policy was reactive and not pro-active. In most of these territories, the pope found himself confronted with a fait accompli, whereby much of the Greek clergy was expelled from its sees, monasteries and lands to make room for the new Latin lay and ecclesiastical lords. Under these conditions the papacy’s high-minded ideals about the relations between the two rites were surely less important than the popular attitudes towards the Greeks and their Church among the crusading armies and their clergy. And we know that they were inclined to see the Greeks as schismatics in need of coercion and replacement, because that is precisely the justification that they put forward for the conquest of Constantinople, even before the papacy started using the schism in its crusading rhetoric.

So is it possible to comment on the role of the religious orders in Greece within this general framework of papal policy? The task is made harder because we lack clear statements by the orders themselves on their ambitions in the Latin Empire. Nevertheless, Schabel is certainly right in stating that the Cistercians had no missionary role in Greece. My own research has found no evidence of interaction between the Greeks and the Cistercians, whose main function was ministering to the spiritual needs of the Latins, just as they would have done in Western Europe. The situation becomes more complicated with the advent of the mendicants, who had an avowed interest in preaching and missionizing. Indeed, both the Franciscans and the Dominicans played an active role in the papacy’s unionist activity in Greece. Yet again, however, their unionist efforts seem to have been directed towards the Greeks outside of the Latin dominions, in accordance with the papacy’s distinction between obedient and disobedient Greeks. The talks at Nicaea/Nymphaeum in 1234 and again in 1249-54, the negotiations with Michael VIII Palaeologus leading to the union of Lyon, and later the close relations of the Dominicans with segments of the Constantinopolitan intelligentsia and the union of Florence-Ferrara, were all ‘missionary’ efforts directed at the Greeks outside of the Latin domains.

Within the Latin states, it is harder to see how the mendicants interacted with the Greek population. It would appear that their establishment followed the pattern of the Cistercian installation, in that their houses were founded at the invitation of the local Latin nobility (St
Peter the Martyr of Candia for example having been founded following a donation by the Cretan government) – though it is certainly possible that these orders saw Greece as a land of mission, as is suggested by the existence of the Dominican missionary organisation of the Society of Pilgrim Brothers for Christ in the Genoese dominions of Greece from the end of the 13th century onwards. Still, on balance the evidence suggests that the mendicants’ involvement in the Latin domains was geared mostly towards ministry to the Latins rather than missionizing to the Greeks. One notable exception was the Dominican friary of Constantinople, which already in the early 13th century was actively involved in the above-mentioned unionist efforts. It was at this house that the influential tract *Contra errores Graecorum* was composed in 1252, which was later used by Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas for their own polemical tracts against the Greeks and it is probable that one of the Dominican friars of Constantinople participated in the Nicaea/Nymphaeum delegation of 1234.

There exist of course other exceptions which suggest meaningful, if ambiguous interactions between the mendicants and the Greeks, especially in the 15th century. The depiction of St Francis in the Greek church of Kritsa (14th c.) and the ill-fated attempt by friar Marcus Scavo to allow the Greeks to celebrate the mass in Greek in St Francis’s friary of Candia on the saint’s feast are oft-cited examples; but it is hard to know how common such instances of ‘spontaneous’ rapprochement really were. 15th-century Crete also saw of course the Dominican efforts to promote the *Filioque* with the writings of Maximus Chrysoborges and the publication of papal decrees on the matter by Simon of Candia. Yet even in this period, the foundation of new mendicant houses in Crete was not accompanied by any statement regarding missionary or unionist activity towards the Greeks, as is shown by two letters of Martin V in 1424, authorising the foundation of new Franciscan friaries. By the end of the 15th century one can also find evidence of tension between the mendicants and the Greeks of Crete. The German Dominican pilgrim Felix Fabri, for instance reports that the Greeks vandalised the Augustinian friary of the Holy Saviour, though it is possible that this report reflects Felix’s intense dislike for the Greeks more than the actual relations between the Greeks and the friars on the island.

The most bizarre instance of tension between the mendicants and the Greeks (and one of the strangest instances of Greco-Latin interaction) comes from the beginning of the 14th century and is reported by George Pachymeres: according to the historian, in 1308, the friars of Negroponte had the Greek patriarch of Alexandria, Athanasius (who was passing through the island) arrested and questioned on the matters dividing the two rites. Because the patriarch refused to answer the friars threatened him with burning at the stake and actually came close to executing him, before apparently deciding that it would be a bad idea. The incident bears some similarity to the burning of the Cypriot monks of Kantarain 1231 for denouncing the Latin rite as heretical. A friar had been the driving force of those prosecutions as well, though on that occasion the course of action had been approved by Gregory IX.

It is evidently impossible to reduce the interactions between Greeks and the Latin religious orders to a single formula. Though the early 13th-century papacy chose to see the Greeks under Latin rule as obedient, its toleration had limits and though the religious orders seem to have been mostly interested in ministering to the Latins, cases such as the above show that some of their members pursued a confrontational agenda. For the historian, the problem lies in the absence of local sources from many areas which forces us to rely almost exclusively on the fragmentary information in the papal registers, which are themselves incomplete and mostly unpublished
from the 14th century onwards. I think the point is well illustrated by the example of Our Lady of Camina in the Peloponnese, which I recently researched with Chris Schabel. Here we have a princely foundation of the Villehardouins, which seems to have changed hands thrice (first from the Greeks to the Benedictines, then to the Poor Clares and finally to the Cistercians of Daphni), whose monks appear to have been involved in a major controversy resulting in the burning of some of them, and which may have also been one of the longest lasting Cistercian houses in Greece and the last Cistercian abbey to be founded in the East. Yet we cannot be sure of its location, and we can say nothing about what its monks did, nor are there any traces left of its interactions with its mother-house of Daphni, much less with the Greek population. All we have to go on are three rather cryptic papal letters from between 1291 and 1306 followed by a few lines in a register of tithes from the 14thC and then a papal letter of appointment addressed to Camina’s abbot in 1363. Thus this apparently important foundation remains shrouded in obscurity.

The written evidence for the activity of the Latin monks on the ground, therefore, tends to be anecdotal and with a strong bias towards the instances when something went wrong or something out of the ordinary happened. Moreover the chronological and geographical disparity of the surviving evidence does not help paint a coherent picture of Latin monasticism in Greece and may in fact encourage historians to generalise from isolated examples which confirm their own views on Greco-Latin relations. These limitations of our sources make the contributions of archaeologists and art historians all the more significant, for it is largely through their efforts over the last couple of decades that our view of two implacably hostile communities set against each other has been overturned, in favour of a much more nuanced model of a Franco-Byzantine hybrid society sharing many characteristics across the Eastern Mediterranean world, where religious difference is only one of several factors that might influence the interactions between the two ethnic groups.
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Introduction

Byzantine hymnographic traditions offer a significant but understudied body of literature. Keying their works to lectionaries and liturgical calendars, Christian and Jewish liturgical poets offered biblical exegesis in metrical form and enhanced religious rites with affective performances and theological reflection. This roundtable discussion assesses the literary efforts of liturgical poets in shaping Syrian and Greek Orthodoxy and Byzantine Judaism. Papers consider late antique madrashe, kontakia, and piyyutim, including works by Ephrem and Romanos the Melodist; and the rise of the kanon hymn in Palestine and Constantinople. Attention will be given not only to questions of literary invention and tradition, but also to performance practices and contexts. We offer close readings of single texts; methodological reflections on the relationship among texts, performance, and audiences—both original and subsequent; and explore the reception and preservation of liturgical literature in manuscripts.
Romanos in Manuscript: Some Observations on the Patmos Kontakarion

A two-volume kontakarion at the Monastery of St. John the Theologian on Patmos is the most important witness to the works of Romanos the Melodist, the great sixth-century hymnographer. The kontakarion, executed by a single Middle Byzantine scribe, consists of two codices, Patmos 212 (P) and 213 (Q), which contained a repertoire of kontakia for the entire liturgical year. The first volume (288 folios) assigns hymns to the cycle of fixed feasts; the second (153 folios), hymns for the moveable cycle, covering the same period as the Middle Byzantine Triodion and Pentekostarion. Because of missing leaves, P lacks the period from 1 September to 6 October and from 6 to 31 August; and Q begins with Apokreos Sunday and ends on the Tuesday of Pentecost.

The last philologist to have worked extensively on the manuscript seems to have been José Grosdidier de Matons in the 1960’s. He dated P and Q to the eleventh century and proposed that they were either written in Constantinople or in the monastic settlements on Mt. Latros in Bythinia in Asia Minor. The latter assumption accords with the fact that Christodoulos Latrinos (d. 1093), who founded the Patmos monastery in 1088, had been abbot of the Laura tou Stylou on Mt. Latros before he came to the island, and that P includes a commemoration of St. Paul of Latros, who died in 955 (Grosdidier de Matons 1977: 70). In another manuscript, Paris. gr. 598 of the mid-tenth century, there is a note by a later hand that the abbot of the Laura tou Stylou on Mt. Latros, Christodoulos, fled to Patmos carrying with him as many books as he could. More importantly, Christodoulos himself says that he built the Patmos library from books he sent via Constantinople (see Papaioannou 2015: 266–70). Based on a comparison with other manuscripts ascribed to Bythinia, the paleographer Nadezhda Kavrus-Hoffmann has proposed to us that the manuscript was executed in the second half of the tenth century, not in Constantinople, but in a provincial monastery, perhaps in Bythinia. Thus Mt. Latros, being closely connected to Constantinople, is not an unlikely place of origin. We shall proceed following Kavrus-Hoffmann’s judgment.

The manuscript is one of a small number of manuscripts (8 by our count) dating from the tenth to twelfth century attesting a similar arrangement of hymns over the liturgical calendar (Mass and Trypanis, Cantica, xxvi-xxvii; Grosdidier de Matons, Hymnes 1:24-32). This would suggest that the Kontakarion was a service book necessary for the performance of some form of Middle Byzantine service, to which P and Q are the richest witness. The importance of the Patmos kontakarion for our knowledge of Romanos is stark. Among surviving kontakaria, it is not only one of the earliest; it is also the most comprehensive one. In total, P and Q contain some 379 compositions, mostly complete, although some are fragmentary. The manuscript also includes 4 preludes without
additional stanzas (Grosdidier de Matons 1977: 70). When it comes to Romanos, these two codices include the most complete collection of hymns attributed to the Melodist, both those regarded by scholars as genuine and those whose authorship has been doubted. More than half (56%) of the kontakia in Q are attributed to Romanos; his name dominates the moveable cycle. Of the 59 kontakia regard by P. Mass and C. A. Trypanis as genuine, 56 are extant in P and Q. Of these, 23 are found only in this manuscript. This means that the critical editions of nearly 40% of Romanos's undisputed compositions are entirely based on what we can read in P and Q. Seven additional full kontakia from P and Q are found only in truncated versions in other manuscripts, making the Patmos manuscript the only witness to these hymns in their complete form. Were it not for P and Q, in other words, half of the corpus of Romanos would be completely unknown to us. Only three undisputed hymns are lacking in P and Q—On the Nativity of the Virgin (35), On the Beheading of John (38), and On All Martyrs (59) (according to the numbering and the judgment in the Oxford edition). Their absence can be explained by the fact that the first and last parts of the codices are missing. Furthermore, of the thirty or so poems regarded as dubia by Maas and Trypanis, the Patmos codices contain 24. Three of these are attested only here. For another 15, only Patmos contains most or all of the hymn.

The kontakion was originally a poem of one prelude (or prooimion, called koukoulion in the manuscript, e.g. Q f. 93v) and a set of usually between 15 and 25 stanzas (called oikoi, Q f. 32v). Many were later truncated, often to between three and eight stanzas. We do not know the details of this development, but the process of truncation had apparently already begun when a scribe wrote the Patmos kontakarion, as he included some kontakia in truncated versions. Other kontakaria, such as Sinai 925 of the tenth century, contain mostly truncated versions. In a separate development kontakia were truncated more severely, to their prelude and the first stanza, to be intercalated between the sixth and seventh odes of the kanon hymn during the Morning Prayer (orthros) in the later Byzantine rite. Overall, about 740 kontakia survive from the Byzantine period, if we count also those that have survived in a truncated form. This means that about half of all the kontakia we know of from the Byzantine world are included in these two Patmos volumes, many of them in their most extensive forms.

Given the significance of P and Q for Romanos studies and for the study of the kontakion as a genre, we traveled to Patmos in October of 2015 to examine the manuscript. We sought to understand what the manuscript could tell us about the transmission, presentation, and performance of Romanos's poems some 400 years after they had been composed. We wondered about their inclusion and arrangement in a service book. Was the kontakarion intended to provide liturgical pieces for a Middle Byzantine ritual office? To what extent can the kontakarion be taken as a witness to such an office? Our observations here are preliminary. We hope to publish a more complete study in the future.

The Presentation of the Hymns in the Manuscript

A number of features of the visual presentation of the hymns in the manuscript merit remark. The treatment of Romanos's hymn On the Nativity I (1; P f. 121r and ff.) is typical. A heading gives the date, 25 December. Indeed running heads throughout the manuscript indicate the date or feast for the hymn beginning on any particular page. This makes it easy for a reader to navigate in the book and find the right page in the course of the liturgical year. On the Nativity I's beginning is articulated by a narrow horizontal geometric pattern with vegetable leaves, perhaps ivy, at its ends.
After an ornamental asterisk, the scribe gives the “title” of the hymn, or rather an indication of what the hymn is about or what feast it is for, in open majuscules filled in with red, using some conventional abbreviations: “Kontakion of the Holy and Most Sacred Nativity of the Lord Jesus Christ.” The following line, in regular uncials, supplies the acrostic (“bearing the acrostic...”), which contains the author’s name, followed by an indication of the musical mode (echos). In most cases, these are followed by an indication either that the hymn has its own melody (idiomelon, e.g. P f. 123v) or is to be sung to a preexisting tune, which is indicated by its opening words. The latter is most common. There is no other musical notation. In this the kontakarion resembles Triodion manuscripts of the same era such as Sinai gr. 734 and 735.

The prelude and subsequent stanzas are written in paragraphs, not colometrically by verse. This is normal in Byzantine liturgical manuscripts. The divisions between kola are indicated with a raised dot. The grouping of paired kola into verses of two or three kola each is an invention of modern editors and not evident in the manuscript. The refrain is usually indicated by the combination of signs similar to a modern colon and a dash, both before and after it. Thus the metrical units and the shape of the stanza would be clear to an experienced performer. The refrain does not begin on a new line of text, but appears in uncials, slightly more spaced apart in most instances. Any left over space after the refrain is not filled with text, but simply ornamented, in this case with three crosses, to fill out the line. (Elsewhere the scribe prefers clusters of four dots and or a horizontal tilde-like dash. [See P f. 287r.) The subsequent stanzas are indicated with large initial letters in open majuscule (usually filled in with color) that protrude into the left margin. In this manner, the acrostic comprising the initial letters of each stanza is clearly visible on the page. Further out in the margin, to the left of these letters, the stanzas are numbered. In contrast to the prelude and refrain, the text of the stanzas appears in a legible cursive. When the refrain returns, the scribe uses uncials once again. As the poem progresses, the refrains are often abbreviated. The scribe uses all the space left on the line, sometimes extending into the right margin, but never using a new line to continue the refrain text.

Yellow highlighting inconsistently decorates the capital letters of the prelude’s opening and the acrostic, and occasionally the stanza numbers. Some capitals are filled in in red (see P f.187r). In many cases the yellow highlighting extends to the title, musical indication, and refrain (loc. cit.). It is our impression that the use of color increases for some more important festivals, but this is in no way systematic. Easter, for example, receives no special treatment.

The system, consistent in P and Q, for distinguishing the prelude and the refrain in uncials while the rest of the hymn is written in cursive is obviously a Middle Byzantine innovation, a method of articulating the structure of the poetry with varied lettering styles dependent on the ninth-century invention of cursive script. That said, the Vienna papyrus fragment of the hymn On the Three Children (46.5), Pap. Gr. Vind. 29430 dated 600-650, transmits the poem with similar dots to indicate rhythmical units (kola), and employs a comma to set the refrain off from the rest of the stanza. It also abbreviates the refrain (Zuntz 1965). Another papyrus, containing the prelude and part of the first stanza of On the Nativity II, P. Amst. I 24 of the sixth or seventh century, also runs the metrical units together (Brunner 1993). The use of uncials and cursive in the Patmos manuscript articulates the structure of the poem, particularly in cuing the refrain. The uncials probably indicate that refrains were sung by the whole congregation. The use of uncials in the prelude, however, probably does not suggest congregational or choral performance of these parts of the text.
Romanos’s *On Mary at the Cross* (19; Q f. 95v-98r) is an important Holy Week kontakion, a dialogue between Christ and his Mother at the cross. In the Patmos manuscript the hymn receives a distinctive and unique treatment: Q bestows alone on this kontakion markings in the margins signaling who speaks, either the mother (Theotokos) or the son (Despotes). These character names appear in the same ink as the main text; they may have been written by the same scribe in a different moment. Although a great many kontakia composed by Romanos depend on dialogue between biblical or mythic characters, only this one contains such explicit visual indication of alternating voice. It is unclear what this might tell us about performance, whether in this one instance the kontakion was to be sung by alternating cantors, or whether a single cantor was to modulate the voice—a technique which would have been useful also in any number of other hymns.

One poem not by Romanos that receives special adornment is the lengthy acrostic hymn which today is normally named the *Akathistos for the Mother of God*. In the manuscript it is simply labeled “a kontakion for the Annunciation,” and it is assigned to 25 March. Romanos’s *On the Annunciation* comes after it, and is referred to as “another kontakion on the Annunciation.” The manuscript’s designation of the *Akathistos* as a kontakion presents challenges for wide-spread scholarly conception of the kontakion as a genre, since it is not in the same poetic form as most of the hymns of Romanos. The initial capitals on the first folio of the *Akathistos* receive non-figural illumination in red and blue, with yellow wash (P f. 209r). It is quite clear from the manuscript folia that the *Akathistos* has been used more than Romanos’s Annunciation hymn (P f. 212r-214v). It is darkened and has several stains and marks, while the margins of the hymn by Romanos are blank and clean. So while the manuscripts P and Q do not show evidence of heavy use, this is one obvious exception. The increased wear may reflect liturgical practices according to the later Byzantine rite, where this is the only kontakion read in its entirety during the normal liturgical year. Was this practice already emerging in the years after the manuscript was copied? It is possible that P and Q sat in Patmos’s library largely unused?

**Between Monastery and the Sung Office: Romanos and the Liturgy of the Kontakarion**

It is clear, however, that the kontakarion was compiled in order to be used. Rubrics indicate that the kontakia should be sung. Many include the words ἀδόμενον or ψαλλόμενον (e.g. Q ff. 15r, 26r, 68v, 80r, 98r). The kontakia are organized according to the liturgical calendar, with the feast or date indicated on the top of the page. The kontakia were collected and presented for liturgical performance. Some communities in the tenth century must have needed a complete cycle of kontakia for their services. It remains unclear, however, what kind of service the Kontakarion’s scribes (in its various manuscript witnesses) intended it for.

Lingas (1995) has demonstrated that the kontakion continued to be an integral part of the *asmatike akolouthia*, the “sung office,” of the urban cathedral rite in Constantinople through the twelfth century. Constantinople seems to have been bi-ritual in centuries before the twelfth century. The hagiopolitis rite, with its roots in Jerusalem, may have entered the churches of the capital as early as the sixth century. For years the two rites existed side by side until the synthesis known as the Byzantine rite gradually emerged. While the kontakion was written for the Constantinopolitan rite, the kanon hymn has traditionally been thought to belong to the hagiopolitis rite (Fröyshov 2013). Earlier scholarship has connected the hagiopolitis rite to monasteries and the efforts by the Stoudios Monastery to create more comprehensive hymn collections in the ninth century. The strict dichotomy, however, between a monastic rite with kanon hymns on one hand and a popular cathedral rite with kontakia on the other is
increasingly being questioned by scholars. Were these two rites really kept as separate as we have been used to thinking? In other words, were the kontakaria written down for use in the cathedral rite alone, or may they also have been used in the hagiopolitis rite at this time? How else could truncated kontakia have ended up, eventually, as a part of Orthros, or Morning Prayer, in the middle of the kanon?

The Kontakarion as a service book is an anthology of hymns by a great many authors. What struck us about the Patmos kontakarion was the vastness of the genre. Only about 20% of the compositions are attributed to Romanos, the majority of these in Q, dedicated to the moveable cycle. Scholars have generally assumed that the hymns on various saints reflect later efforts to fill out the liturgical calendar, including the so-called dubia of Romanos, which Maas and Trypanis (1970: 186ff) determined lacked poetic quality. In any event, many of the kontakia are most certainly later works. Kontakion composition continued at least into the ninth century, and the Patmos manuscripts attest to the thriving vivacity of the genre.

The later kontakia, largely dedicated to feasts of saints, are characterized by the use of acclamation rather than the dialogues most frequent in Romanos, suggesting a development of the genre as liturgical tastes changed (Grosdidier de Matons 1980: 263). To some extent this stylistic choice assimilates the direct address to the saint in a kontakion to similar trends in the development of the kanon hymn. An important aspect of kontakion composition in this period is that more authors have a monastic background, and we know that some of them were also composing kanons. It is puzzling that a full collection of kontakia, such as the Patmos kontakarion, seems to have been penned in one monastery and apparently used and kept in another. While the Stoudite reform—if such a thing ever existed—did not necessarily monastisize the Kontakarion's rite itself, monks were increasingly involved in the process of editing and composing hymnography. The presence of kontakia by the great monastic leader Theodore the Stoudite in the corpus of hymns in the Patmos (and other) manuscripts suggests that the formation of the kontakarion as a service book containing a complete liturgical sequence of hymns for the entire year may have taken place in Constantinople, under the supervision of the Stoudites (cf. Lingas 1995: 53). This was also, of course, the century when the monks of Stoudios were compiling the Triodion, with kanons and stichera for the period of Lent, and Joseph the Hymnographer, who also had a monastic background, was composing enormous numbers of kanon hymns to fill out the Menaia. The Patmos kontakarion seems to have been executed around the same time as Symeon Metaphrastes was generating his Menologion (Ševčenko 1998). The creation of the Kontakarion as a type of service book thus coordinates with other efforts to canonize a liturgical cycle of hymns and readings for the calendar of saints.

The kontakarion's ordering of Romanos's hymns on biblical themes reflects the placement of the relevant pericopes in the emerging middle Byzantine lectionary cycle in Constantinople, as reflected in the ninth-tenth century Typikon of the Great Church. We do not have firm evidence for lectionary assignments in Romanos's own era, thus while some of the hymns, especially those for major Christological and Marian feasts, are almost certainly assigned to the same days that Romanos intended, others may have been moved to accommodate the structure of the later lectionary. Some assignments seem odd, so that a hymn whose original liturgical occasion—if any—is unclear has been assigned somewhat arbitrarily. A case in point would be On Earthquakes and Fires (54), which appears in its entirely only in the Patmos kontakarion and is assigned to Wednesday of the third week of Lent. (Another manuscript, Sinai gr. 927, copied at Sinai in 1285, is peculiarly arranged and contains only one stanza of the hymn without assignment [Grosdidier de Matons 1977: 72]).
When we compare the Patmos tomes with other extant kontakaria (Grosdidier de Matons 1977: 74-93), we note that some of Romanos’s hymns are assigned uniformly in a number of witnesses, especially for the major feasts of Christ and Mary. But the kontakarion tradition as a whole includes a great deal of variation, particularly for minor, and in some cases more recent feasts, and for saints’ days (Grosdidier de Matons 1977: 93-4). In fact, the variety of hymns assigned is comparable to the variation among extant Middle Byzantine Triodion manuscripts, suggesting that while there were some efforts at standardization, Middle Byzantine hymnals in general, including the Kontakarion, were essentially open traditions, receptive to local variation, and occasionally providing multiple options for any given observance. For example, Q provides three possibilities for the lection of the Sinful Woman on Holy Wednesday, suggesting that those using the manuscript were invited to choose. In very rare cases in the Patmos volumes, a kontakion is given with two preludes. For Romanos’s On Peter’s Denial (18; Q f. 84v) and On the Passion (20; Q f. 93r) a second prelude is presented as an alternative with the words ἄλλο κουκούλιον, “another prelude,” again suggesting some discretion on the part of a performer.

If we see the Kontakarion as part of a ninth- and tenth-century drive to organize and systematize liturgical time, then these service books played an important part in liturgical life. The continued composition of kontakia and the performer’s freedom to choose between different texts for the same liturgical event point in the direction of a vital liturgical genre. It remains an open question, however, what liturgical context the kontakia were performed in during the tenth century and later. A few of the kontakia in the Patmos manuscript are truncated—and we know that they are not just short, because in some cases the scribe gives the whole of the original acrostic in the title, even though a number of stanzas are lacking (see e.g. On St. Basil, P f. 208r)—but most are not. The majority of the hymns are given in their full length.

Even if the hymns of Romanos first served for the urban lay night vigil (Lingas 1995; Grosdidier 1973:255; Koder 1997-99; Koder 2003), as has been now generally accepted, the Kontakarion itself does not appear to have been designed for this service alone—the Typikon of the Great Church shows no trace of such a developed use of the kontakion (see, however, Mateos 1963: 301). The service book governing the office had come under monastic editorial control. Thus the nature of the service at which a Kontakarion would function still remains unclear, but may have been common to lay and monastic congregations alike. Why did the monastic compilers, perhaps at the Stoudios Monastery, create the archetype? It was not integrated with other service books (such as a Triodion or Pentekostarion), used largely at Morning Prayer. Thus it appears that this collection was intended for a distinct office, most likely a vigil, now greatly expanded in use from Romanos’s original festal cycle. Despite Lingas’s work, the Patmos manuscript itself is not direct evidence for the Middle Byzantine lay cathedral vigil.

Moreover, it remains unclear how and when kontakia as a genre made their transition from being part of a lay Night Vigil, as attested in the sixth and seventh centuries, into a service book reflecting concerns about semi-daily celebrations by the end of the ninth century. Did this happen simultaneously with the truncation of the kontakion to a prelude and (usually) a single stanza to be intercalated in the midst of the kanon hymn at Orthros? Or were these developments independent of each other, as monastic communities assimilated—or participated in—the singing of a kontakion in its entirety during a vigil service? Did the merging into the Byzantine rite synthesis involve assimilating important materials in their entirety from the cathedral office into a hagiopolitis
service? This revisiting of the tenth-century kontakarion does suggest that the relation between the two rites in Constantinople were more flexible and open in this period. The production of a Kontakarion manuscript in one Middle Byzantine monastic library, probably Mt. Latros, and its preservation in another, namely Patmos, suggests that a service book containing a complete cycle of kontakia was deemed necessary for the liturgical functioning of a monastic community—at least one founded from Constantinople with imperial patronage.

The authors thank the Monastery of St. John the Theologian on Patmos and especially its librarian, Ioannes Melianos. We are grateful to Nadezhda Kavrus-Hoffman for her invaluable insights about the manuscript's paleography and ornamentation.
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Studies:
Congregation as Crowd in Romanos’s Lenten Kontakia

In late antiquity, Christians and Jews alike gravitated to new forms of liturgical poetry in which congregations retold sacred stories from the perspectives of individual biblical and parabiblical characters. These sung sermons were known by various names and forms: *piyyutim* were performed in Aramaic-speaking synagogues; *kontakia* were sung in Greek churches around Constantinople, and Syriac Christians learned from biblical exemplars who came to life in dialogue poems (*sogyatha*) [Munz-Manor, McGuckin, Brock (2008)]. Biblical figures who were marginal or underspoken spoke their piece; and new interlocutors shed light on the doubts, desires, and distress of key biblical figures, through the device of invented speech [Amato, Kennedy].

These monologues and dialogues invited Christian audiences to witness the leper’s abjection, the apostle Thomas’s puzzlement, Mary’s lament, and even Satan’s distress. Moreover, these genres allowed pointed exchanges between Sarah and Abraham, Elijah and the widow of Sarepta, Satan and Death, and Adam and Eve, to name a few [Harvey; Brock (2012)]. Yet, one hymnographer, Romanos the Melodist, also took interest in the collective speech of groups. Much like the chorus in Greek tragedy [Segal], Romanos’s groups engaged biblical protagonists in dialogue. Herod debated his own army on whether to murder defenseless newborns; Noah contemplated the cries of the drowned; and the disciples supplicated Jesus. These groups served as both exemplars and counter-exemplars for Romanos’s congregations. As Derek Krueger [10-11, 43-51] has demonstrated, Romanos generated a remarkable gallery of individual portraits by which to shape an emerging interiority and penitential subjectivity in Byzantine Christianity. In addition, Romanos could also look beyond individuals for moral exemplars and object lessons. In his portrayal of both named and anonymous groups, Romanos provided his congregations with models of collective emotions and appropriate responses to biblical events.

How this collective self emerged over the course of the liturgical year merits closer examination. This liturgical framework reveals how Romanos’s portrayal of these groups served two important roles: within the biblical drama they offered a foil to various protagonists. On a performative level, such collectives modeled for congregations whom to imitate and, no less, whom to repudiate. I assume that lay Christians joined in the refrain to these stanzas [Hunger, cf. Moriarty, Page 31, 95, 100, 156]. That participation through repetition gave them access to a collective subjectivity presented in these hymns [cf. Harvey, Krueger, Reklis]. Romanos both loved and feared groups. Some groups he portrayed as bold and wise, whereas others he cast as savage mobs. Yet, with notable exceptions, he endowed his groups with powerful speech. In bringing forth the voices of these crowds, the Melodist positioned the congregation in relation to them: some groups elicited solidarity, others identification, and yet others, outright rebuke and mockery. These relational dynamics may reveal what Romanos’s crowds meant for the formation of early Byzantine lay experience.
Romanos’s *Kontakia*

Romanos the Melodist was active in Constantinople in the middle of the sixth century. He composed hymns comprising a prologue and roughly 18-24 stanzas, each with a refrain. These hymns, or *kontakia*, as they later came to be called, were composed for the night vigils on the eve of liturgical feast days in the Christian calendar. Of the 80 surviving that bear his name, at least 60 are confidently ascribed to Romanos. We have no firm indication of their original melodies, and those performance directions that do survive in later manuscripts may not be original [Rasted]. Still, some performative cues linger in the words themselves. For instance, refrains are often preceded by a verb of shouting (e.g., βοἀω; ἀναβοἀω, κρἀζω) or speaking.

Romanos’s retellings featured individual biblical figures alone or in dialogue. Yet, he also portrayed groups of more than two figures who sing in unison. Their words would be sung by a soloist, but completed with the congregation at the refrain. Groups consisted of a fixed number of named individuals: Joseph’s brothers sang in unison, as did the three youths from the Book of Daniel, and Jesus’ disciples. Other groups comprised anonymous crowds of an unspecified number: the drowned from the great deluge, the Ninevites from the Book of Jonah, the Chaldeans who tormented the three youths from the Book of Daniel, Herod’s soldiers, and the ten virgins of the parables (Matt 25:1-13). Whether named or unnamed, these groups appeared throughout the liturgical year with their collective song: from the week before Christmas, when the faithful sang with the three youths in the fiery furnace (Dan 3:19 - 31), to Pentecost, when they supplicated God. Such crowds were also connected across the year through common rhythms and possibly common tunes. As editor José Grosdidier de Maton has observed, the rhythm sung for Noah during Lent was reused in other *kontakia*, such as the Massacre of the Infants, for the feast of the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia, and at the Ascension (all of which feature groups). [SC 99:99, 283:133]. That is to say, a familiar rhythm reappeared not just annually, but at various intervals within the year.

Even if the melodies no longer survive, the words of some *kontakia* provide a glimpse of the heightened emotions congregations experienced singing together at the evening vigil. The “Man Possessed by Demons,” a *kontakion* composed on Wednesday during the fifth week after Easter, devotes no less than three stanzas to describing the congregation before it turns to the gospel story of the occasion:

The people of Christ, loyal in their love, have gathered
to keep a night-long vigil with psalms and songs.
The congregation can never sing too many hymns to God.
So now that the Psalms of David have been sung
and we are blessed by the clear reading of Scripture,
let raise an anthem to Christ and an anathema to Satan.

It is wonderful to sing psalms and hymns to God,
and to scourge the demons with reproaches [22.1-2]

These opening stanzas provide modern interpreters with one of the clearest pictures of the night vigil’s order, its abundance of song, including hymns, psalms and anthems, and its emotional range. One might sing and rejoice in one verse, while take special glee in cursing Satan or reproaching demons in another. It is easy to imagine that emotions ran high and in all directions at such vigils.

---
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Each refrain would harness the congregation's acclamation. Whereas Romanos quotes the demon's response (“My name is Legion”) [22.21], it is the disciples who speak in unison. “Moved to pity,” they appealed to Christ on the demoniac’s behalf [22.11-12]. Thus, the kontakion closes with another rare glimpse of the congregation’s role in the ritualized retelling of this exorcism:

Devotees of Christ, all of us always love
to assemble and sing his glory.
We have just led the devil on a march of shame [22.25]

These closing lines remind the congregation that as a group they have the power to glorify Christ and publically humiliate Satan. Such mixed emotions of glory and contempt are kept in tension by congregational singing and the return to the refrain. The words, by and large, remain the same, yet the affective tone shifts. For instance, the refrain “the Master of the Universe” could be uttered to assert God’s control, however much Satan struggled to touch humans, or humans nearly fell victim to the enemies’ plots, or the “band of demons” who failed to recognize Christ’s divinity [22.2-4]. Whatever horror the stanza evoked, the refrain assured release from its grip. And whatever joy true knowledge ensured, was sealed by the refrain.

By what means did Romanos connect his audiences to these biblical individuals and groups? In addition to the refrain, often marked by a cue to shout or cry out, Romanos situated his audiences temporally in biblical time through a variety of liturgical expressions. His use of the present tense and the word “today [σήμερον]” in a prelude or opening stanza invited audiences to experience biblical events as if there were here and now [Krueger 75, 78]. In the opening stanza of several kontakia, Romanos also situated the congregation by the word deute (now, or come). “Come (δεῦτε) let us rush to the hospital of repentance” [SC 99.nin.1]. By this focalizing command, Romanos summons together as well as leads the congregation to the earthly and celestial places of the sacred drama.

Collective Song in Lent: The Ninevites and Noah

Romanos’s kontakion on the Ninevites offers one of his most unusual depictions of crowds, as they are central to the story, but never speak. Jonah makes a fleeting appearance in this hymn, as Romanos focuses on the Ninevites’ acts of repentance. Although “they are the topic (hypothèsis) of this hymn,” they do not speak in unison, except when “each cried out unceasingly to the Lord” [nin.4, 12]. Instead of portraying their words of repentance, the Melodist focuses on the power of their acts of contrition: their “streams of tears cleansed the filth from the city; their prayers adorned the metropolis” [nin.5]. The entire city--even the herds in the pastures--fasted, and the people abstained from sex, and young and old performed prayers, processions, fasts and good works [nin. 7, 11; cf. SC 99:421, n. 2]. Yet, throughout the congregation sings what the Ninevites do not, when they utter the refrain, an appeal to God to “cherish (with me) their/ our repentance.” Thus, the closing stanza calls upon God to “deliver from judgment those who sing your praise” [nin. 17]. Although the congregation presumably sang the refrain, they have reason to fear. In the final refrain, the singer admits in the final verses, “I know how to sing; I don’t know to act” [ibid.] This confession provides a reverse image of the Ninevites, who know how to act, but do not join in song. No surprise then that the final refrain breaks from the litany of collective repentance (“our/their”) to a more solitary plea: “Deliver me, you who cherish my repentance [ibid.].”
In the Noah kontakion, Romanos recasts the story of the flood and its aftermath according to a series of crowds: the congregation who hears the tale, the recalcitrant people (laos), the animals, incorporeal celestial beings, and Noah's family. In the course of the telling each group constitutes a chorus in the telling of the tale. The structure of this kontakion is very tightly organized. With the exception of the first and final stanzas the intervening 19 stanzas close with the refrain, (Ῥῦσαι πάντας “redeem [us] all”). The soloist exhorts the congregation to enter the drama yet avoid the fate of the drowned when the time of final judgment comes [2.1]. Yet, the sinful remain silent in their unrepentance. Noah implores them to weep bitterly and cry out to God, rusai pantas! But his words fall on deaf ears and prompt no response. God, however, hears Noah's prayer and assembles a crowd of beasts, wild, but capable of fearing the wrath of God [2.5-7]. Thus, this menagerie both mimics and at the same time shames the people's unresponsiveness. Although speechless, the animals project a vision of the final days, as wolves and sheep stand side by side, and serpents mix with birds. Yet, even this silent chorus does not move those endowed with speech to utter their repentance, or cry, “redeem us all.” Giving up on the unrepentant, Noah and his family board the boat along with all the animals. Upon God's sealing of the vessel, Noah's voice alone utters the refrain, “redeem us all,” having given up on those who refuse [2.11]. This refrain persists as it punctuates the description of the deluge, how the waves overtook the unrepentant, who did not cry out “redeem us all.”

Much as the animals serve as a counter crowd, the incorporeal celestial beings also serve as a counter crowd, to cry out, “Now, let the righteous take hold of the ends of the earth” [2.16; cf. Ps 36 (37):29]. And as they await the return of the crow Noah sent out, his family assumes the singing of the refrain. Their collective voice underscores the silence of the drowned, who did not cry out the refrain when they could and now it is too late to cry out. As if to reinforce God's favor upon those who speak, Romanos mentions God's delight in seeing those in his image again, the elect rescued from the ravages of the storm, and capable of crying out the refrain, “redeem us all.” Just ark is a type of the church, the voices of the faithful enact the voices of the saved.

From a performative standpoint, the congregation provides the words that the unrepentant refuse to utter, “redeem us all.” The congregation fills the void left by the silent (and eventually silenced) crowd. They join with Noah's lone voice and ironically, sing counterfactually. By counterfactual, I mean simply that the damned could have spoken these words and saved themselves. That the chorus sustains the song should not come as a surprise. For the chorus stands for the “children of the kolumbêthra,” the word for baptismal font, or pool [cf. John 5:2-9]. And the kontakion bears several echoes of their baptismal experience: there's the term for pool to connote the font, the ark is described in language reminiscent of death and rebirth imagery associated with baptism: it is a womb (ἐκ μήτρας) and a tomb (ἐκ τάφου; τοῦ μνήματος), all of which call to mind the congregation's baptisms [2.10, 17]. Thus, Romanos constructs a kontakion which mobilizes the congregation to sing when the unrepentant fall silent, join their collective voice to the solitary exemplar, and speak with the saved. The congregation furnishes the voices of the lost. And the refrain here serves as the key to salvation, even if those who need it most are incapable of uttering it.

The refrain, then, serves in this kontakion as the force that holds things together. As all the world returns to its primordial state, formless and void, the refrain infuses order in the narrative world. Put differently, it “territorializes,” insofar as it gives a place to stand throughout the watery chaos of destruction. As philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari have noted of the refrain's stabilizing power, “sometimes chaos is an immense black hole, in which one endeavors to fix a fragile point
as a center” [Deleuze – Guattari, 311-12, 326-27, esp. 312]. The saved (here, the baptized) utter the refrain. Yet even when the unrepentant in the story cannot utter it –and even if they did, Noah refuses to listen for it--their silence does not hinder the refrain’s arrival at each stanza. How better to differentiate the saved from the damned in a kontakion on divine judgment past and future than to provide a “sonorous” home for the elect? The refrain instills order even as the voices of the damned gurgle down into the depths.

Thus, Lent began with wholesale destruction and mass repentance, as described by the silenced and the saved. Through these voices congregations saw the rifts that separated humanity from God and from each other. The refrain was instrumental for repairing that breach, as congregations sang from both sides of that chasm. They affirmed as others denied. They spoke where others fell silent.

**Emotional Contagion and Collective Song**

As Susan Harvey has noted of Syriac liturgies, congregations were hardly passive [23-24, 66]. They engaged the whole range of sensory experiences, from the sounds of the hymns, to the smell of the incense, the touch and taste of the eucharist, and the spectacle of the processions. As in the soghyatha (dialogue hymns), the kontakia involved the congregation in singing the refrain that punctuated each stanza.

What set Romanos apart from other dialogue hymns and invented speech, however, was the frequency with which he endowed groups with a collective voice. Romanos’s groups varied in size and definition. Some were named, but most were anonymous. Some were small as three, but mobs also spoke up. Some engaged fully in the refrain, whereas others were kept away from that collective acclamation. Through these groups audiences found not only individual exemplars, but also communal ones, groups that could model a collective voice and engagement in events of the biblical past. As these examples have suggested, singing in--and also as—a group shaped how congregations navigated a collective identity [cf. Hatfield]. They shared in emotional shifts, and learned, above all, to understand sudden, and even counterintuitive shifts in emotion, whether from sorrow to joy, or to speak when others in the story fell silent. Over the course of the liturgical year, that collective subjectivity was most salient in Lent, a time for introspection, but also a time, as these examples suggest, for collective discovery. As musicologist Christopher Page notes, early on Christian’s tapped into music’s ritualizing propensity, not only to define roles, but also to dissolve distinctions between the speaker and the interlocutor in speech [Page 39-40]. The sung refrains of Romanos’s kontakia illustrate this chameleon-like vocality he afforded congregations, whether they sang with the protagonist or sang over the tormentors. Romanos’s kontakia, when read for these affective, gestural, postural, sonic, and verbal cues, then guided lay Christians into the spaces and moments of the biblical past and confronted them with other singing groups whose voice they could either join or reject.
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Hymnography and Narratology

In this paper, I argue that narratology is a relevant and powerful tool in the analysis of the stories told in Byzantine hymns and homilies. Applying narratology to the study of these texts will entail important shifts in perspective and terminology. It will also make serious contributions to the history of Byzantine homiletics and hymnography, to the history of Byzantine literature, as well as to narratology as a discipline, providing it with a much needed diachronic perspective.

From ethopoeia and dialogue to diegesis

In recent years, much attention has been paid to the use of ethopoeia in Byzantine literature in general and in homilies and hymns in particular. This is highly understandable as dialogue and monologue spoken by biblical characters are striking features of Byzantine homilies and hymns. The interest in ethopoeia and dialogue has led to a focus on who speaks, how and why. In other words, a focus on characters as they are presented by the homilist or hymnographer. Yet these characters are also most often part of a larger narrative, a re-telling of a biblical episode, in which their speeches are but one way of narrating what happened. Often the Progymnasmata are referred to in order to analyse and explain the use of dialogue or description in the fashion “the author uses this technique as he was taught to do so in the rhetorical schools”. Yet, the use of exercises other than ethopoeia and ekphrasis is seldom analysed. One of the most important of these other exercises is the diegesis or narrative (I use diegesis, narrative and story synonymously). This exercise was crucial for the public speaker as the diegesis is the part of a speech in which facts and actions for discussion are presented (Lausberg 1960, 534-6). Likewise, as stated by Aelius Theon in his Progymnasmata, diegesis as an exercise was necessary for writers of any kind in composing a wide range of genres: historiography, epics, dramas, forensic speeches. Furthermore, ethopoeia and ekphrasis could be integrated as parts of the diegesis (Theon, preface; Kennedy 2003, 4).

But we should go beyond the rhetorical handbooks which were aimed at students at the beginner’s level if we want to study poetry by skilled and admired authors – especially if we want to compare similar or different ways of telling stories in hymns and homilies synchronically or diachronically. The discipline known today as narratology is especially devoted to the study of narratives and therefore quite apt when studying story telling in hymns and homilies.

Narratology - “jargon” and “fiction”?

There are nevertheless two sceptical questions often raised against the use of modern narratology: first, that the discipline is loaded with complex technical “jargon”; second, that it is a discipline developed in order to study modern and post modern fiction and thus is less appropriate for studying historical texts in their proper contexts.

Concerning the complex and technical “jargon”, the narratological terminology should actually not surprise classicists and students of rhetoric. Even though the term narratology wasn’t
coined before the late 1960’s, similar approaches to studying narrative have been around since Plato and Aristotle. In fact, as Irene de Jong and Ingela Nilsson have argued, one can speak of a “proto-narratology” found already in Plato, Aristotle, the Progymnasmata, the rhetorical treatises of Hermogenes and not least in the scholia on Homer’s epics and the ancient tragedies (de Jong 2014; Nilsson, forthcoming). Rene Nülist has convincingly shown how much of the modern narratological terminology is similar to concepts found already in these ancient sources and how authors and readers were well aware of a wide range of literary techniques to use when telling stories (Nülist 2009). So in a certain sense, narratology is nothing but a continuation of this tradition, however with influence from modern semiotics and linguistics and therefore with a more refined and elaborate terminology. The aim of narratology is universalistic in the sense that the methods and analytical tools can and should be used when analysing any type of narrative in any given historical or cultural context, including early Christian and Jewish hymnography. Of course, only to the extent that we can identify something as a story told in these texts is the application of narratology relevant.

Defining a story or a narrative pertains to the second sceptical question raised before. With Jim Phelan and Peter Rabinowitz, I define a narrative as: “somebody telling somebody else, on some occasion, and for some purposes, that something happened to someone or something” (Herman et al. 2012, 3). Furthermore, with David Herman, I define one of the main purposes of narrative as creating “storyworlds” through which experience is mediated (ibid., 14-15). The first definition is rhetorical and puts emphasis on narrative as a social act rather than as a genre, whereas the second definition is grounded in cognitive theory and examines how narrative is used as a basic human sense-making strategy. These two definitions are not confined to any genre or dependent on whether or not a narrative is fictitious. Rather, story telling is defined as a speech act with specific purposes and occasions, just as the act of describing, exhorting, praying, and so on. The act produces an utterance that may in fact be a combination of several other speech acts. In modern rhetorical genre theory one would call each of these speech acts “micro genres” (Larsen 2015, 17-18). The dominant genres, the purpose and the occasion would then define the overall genre of a certain utterance, for instance a hymn or a homily. Such a definition allows for a broader range of types of a certain genre as a combination of several genres, rather than trying to squeeze texts into categories and boxes, as is the case when defining a kontakion as a “metrical homily” or a “sung sermon” (see Barkhuizen 2012, 5 and 9-13). This of course also goes for narrative. In some types of utterances, for instance a novel, narrative would be the dominant genre, rather than explaining or praying.

So to sum up this far, I would define narrative in hymnography as follows: the hymnographer telling his audience during his song that something happened (most often an event in the Bible) with the overall purpose of creating a story world in which the experience of meeting God is mediated. There are several other purposes as well: for instance to instruct, to exhort, to explain, to entertain, etc. How these narratives are told and why can be analysed with clarity and precision by applying narrative method.

From rhetoric to narratology - new perspectives and terminology

Shifting the focus from the use of dialogue and ethopoeia to diegesis in hymns and homilies would entail at least the following five changes in perspective and terminology:

1) Studying the use of narrative in stead of dialogue and ethopoeia would indicate a move away from the theatrical and dramatic connotations found in earlier scholarship (see White 2015). Even though narratives might be highly dramatic in terms of the emotional impact of the
experiences and events they tell of, we avoid the confusion of using a term like drama which is notoriously ambiguous. Likewise with the theatrical connotation: by stressing that the dialogues appear in a narrative framed by the hymnographer-as-narrator’s overall reporting and evaluating voice, a real-life theatrical performance with more than one actor impersonating the characters seems less obvious.

2) In an article on Severian of Gabala’s homilies, Karl-Heinz Uthemann has stressed the need for a history of the development of the homily in late antiquity and early Byzantium, especially focused on what he sees as a gradual evolution in style from the use of the diatribe in early Christian preaching to the full fledged dramatic dialogues in the 6th century homilies and hymns (Uthemann 1998, 171-175, esp. n. 63). I suggest that such a history should also include the use of narrative in which dialogue is but one element. Such an examination would include a larger material of especially homilies that do not contain dialogue or ethopoeia but retell the biblical stories in longer or shorter passages.

3) Following Uthemann, Mary Cunningham has suggested distinguishing between intra- and extratextual dialogue. Intratextual dialogue is between characters in a story, whereas extratextual dialogue is between the preacher and his audience (Cunningham 2003, 102-103). I acknowledge that this distinction is illuminating, but I suggest to adapt the narratological distinction between intra- and extradiegetic levels in stead. This distinction is more precise as it denotes what belongs to the storyworld in the diegesis/narrative and what belongs to the world in which it is told. Strictly speaking, we cannot study the extratextual level, as we only deal with texts. But we can study all the rhetorical elements in the texts that mimic a dialogue or conversation with an extratextual audience: the diatribe, rhetorical questions, prokatalepsis, fictitious interlocutors, apostrophe, and in the case of the kontakia the refrain. The distinction between intra- and extradiegetic also allows us to describe the interplay or relation between the two levels. In the kontakia, there are at least three kinds of relations: a metaphoric, a metonymic and a metaleptic. The metaphoric relation establishes the characters and events in the story as examples to imitate by the audience, or is found in cases where the storyworld resembles or mimics the world in which it is told (or vice versa); the metonymic relationship establishes a causal link between the story and the world in which it is told and provides identification between past and present and future; and the metaleptic relationship is rather a collapse between the levels where the worlds conflate into one world. It is often described how for instance Romanos the Melodist tells his stories in such a way that the audience is invited to enter into the stories. The narratological concept of metalepsis – the conflation of the extra- and intradiegetic level – makes it possible to describe this entrance more precisely and to distinguish between different kinds of entrances for the narrator and his audience – as witnesses, as bystandes, as co-narrators or as participants – but also exits in the opposite direction when characters such as the Hades (SC 42) or the Mother of God (SC 18) step out of the narrative to speak directly to the narrator and his audience.

4) As a narrative is the act of telling somebody that something happened to somebody or something, the content matter of “what happened” has been the primary focus of analysis among narratologists ever since Aristotle. In a narrative there are four constituent elements: events, characters, time and space. How these actions and events are ordered forms the plot of a narrative. In her analysis of late antique and early Byzantine homilies, Judit Kecskeméti noted
that recognition plays an important role in these texts (Kecskeméti 1993, 60). Characters in
the stories go through a process of recognizing or failing to recognize Christ as fully man and
fully God. In the classical tradition from Aristotle, recognition, anagnorisis, is one of the two
most important elements of a plot. The other is the reversal, peripeteia, where an action has a
result opposite to what a character expects (Ar., Poet. 10). In my dissertation, I have pointed
out several instances of recognitions and reversals in the kontakia of Romanos (Eriksen 2013).
The recognition motif is also frequently found in the Bible, most prominently in the Gospel
of John (Larsen 2008). It is closely linked with acts of concealing and revealing, and one
might even argue that in Christian storytelling recognition, or revelation, is the fundamental
plot. Storytelling in the Christian context, especially in a liturgical setting, is thus a way of
mediating or even doing theology. A focus on recognition, reversal, plots, characters and their
experiences might prove to be a fruitful way to compare hymns and homilies from different
areas and periods to see how they mediate theology by re-telling well known biblical stories.
Such an analysis would also entail a move away from the classical Quellenforschung to a study
of how sources are received and transformed in each new re-telling of a well known biblical
story. The narratological field of transtextuality (Genette 1997) – how texts are received and
transformed into new texts – is very promising for studying literary history, and it is obvious
that such an approach must be applied to the Canons which are conscious adaptations of the
nine biblical odes and the texts pertaining to a certain feast during the liturgical year.

5) Finally, besides contributing with a method and tools to conduct close readings of hymns and
homilies and do comparative analysis across centuries in order to contribute to the yet unwritten
history of Byzantine liturgical storytelling, the application of narratology will also contribute to
the discipline itself. It is true that narratology has mostly been used in order to study modern
and post modern fiction, but early on, biblical scholars applied methods and theories from
narratology to study the narratives in the Old and the New Testament. Recently, narratology has
convincingly been applied to classical texts including all literary genres from epics to speeches
and letters (de Jong 2014). However, Byzantine texts have not yet been studied in great detail
with the use of narratology, although Ingela Nilsson has done some much needed pioneering
work on the Byzantine novels (Nilsson 2001). Right now, she and I and a group of scholars from
Uppsala and Paris are working together in the project “Text and Narrative in Byzantium” with
the intention of making contributions to this new field of Byzantine literary history, but also to
provide narratology with a much needed diachronic perspective.

**Conclusion**

Providing these, in my view, promising and important shifts in perspective, I should emphasize
that all is not said and done with narratological readings of homilies and hymns. My interest lies
in storytelling and especially storytelling in a liturgical context. All the parts of a homily or hymn
that are not, strictly speaking, narrative, should of course be studied with other approaches, be it
for example discourse analysis, gender theory, rhetoric, and with different kinds of interests. I will,
however, conclude with the bold claim that one of the lasting effects of especially the kontakia
which make them transcend the time and context in which they were written and performed, lie
precisely in the stories they tell and how they are told, in their storytelling. Narratology will help us
understand in more detail how these stories are constructed and how they were effective means of
persuasive Christian oratory in the late antique and early Byzantine periods.
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The Sinful Woman in Homilies and Hymns

The Byzantine liturgical services for Holy Week contain an abundance of riches, as each day centers upon a particular theme leading up to the celebration of Pascha. Wednesday of Holy Week, for instance, focuses on the woman who anoints Jesus in preparation for his burial. The Gospels present 4 different accounts of a woman who anoints Jesus. Matthew and Mark's accounts are quite similar, with the setting of Bethany, in the house of Simon the Leper (Matthew 26:6-13; Mark 14:3-9). An unnamed woman enters in and anoints Jesus' head. Some of the disciples are bothered by the waste, but Jesus says that she has done this for his burial. John's account sets up the scene differently and with a different cast of characters. In John it is six days before the Passover, in Bethany, but this time Lazarus, Martha, & Mary are with Jesus and it is Mary who anoints his feet (John 12:1-8). Luke's account is the only to define the woman as a sinner (ἁμαρτωλός). She enters into the house of Simon, but now it is Simon the Pharisee. In Luke's Gospel we are also given a parable about a creditor and two debtors. Luke makes no mention of this having a connection to Jesus' death and burial (Luke 7:36-50). These narrative accounts, however, take on a different shape as they are incorporated into the Byzantine liturgical cycle; while the account from St. Matthew is appointed for Wednesday of Holy Week, details from the other Gospels are present in the liturgical services for this day. In the services for Holy Wednesday, the woman is specifically the Sinful Woman, drawing on Luke's account; however, the context is clearly the time leading up to the Crucifixion, more in line with the other Gospel accounts.

Of particular interest here is how narrative elements outside the Gospel accounts—especially the story of how the Sinful Woman acquired the myrrh—find their way into the hymns for this day. Among the many hymns on the Sinful Woman that make up the liturgical services for Holy Wednesday, there is something curious; a figure absent in the Gospel accounts is present. In the morning service of Orthros, one of the stichera at the Lauds introduces a non-Biblical character. The sticheron following the singing of Glory (doxasticon), according to the printed Greek Triodion, refers to a narrative element not found in the Gospel: “the sinful woman ran to buy the myrrh, a myrrh of great price, to anoint with myrrh the Benefactor, and she cried our to the myrrh-seller: 'Give me the myrrh, that I may anoint the One who has blotted out all my sins'” (Ἡ ἁμαρτωλός ἔδραμε πρὸς τὸ μύρον πριάσασθαι, πολύτιμον μύρον, τοῦ μυρίσαι τὸν Ἐνεργέτην, καὶ τῷ μυρεψῷ ἔβοα· Δός μοι τὸ μύρον, ἵνα ἀλείψω κἀγώ τὸν ἐξαλείψαντά μου πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας. Triodion, 2004). Here the language draws upon Luke and John's account, where a form of the same verb is used for anointing (ἤλειψε Luke 7:36; ἠλειψε John 12:3), but there are other elements not found in any Gospel. First of all, the woman runs to the myrrh-seller, highlighting her eagerness and haste; but more noticeably, it is the person she runs to, the myrrh-seller, that is unexpected.

The obvious question then concerns this myrrh-seller: where does this narrative element come from? The Gospel accounts are silent concerning the woman's backstory and give no details about where she acquired the myrrh. This sticheron does not provide a narrative but instead depends upon a narrative as it reflects upon the details provided in the narrative. The stichera as a hymn-type
depend upon other texts, which can be seen in the structure of stichera as they are interlaced with Biblical verses (in the Lauds, they are interlaced with Psalms 148 & 149). In general, Scriptural readings provide the narrative, and these are supplemented by homilies; the work of hymns is to reflect and meditate upon details of the narrative. Therefore, it is necessary to uncover what narrative this sticheron draws upon and uncover who the myrrh-seller is. This paper argues that what is missing is a homily on the Sinful Woman, attributed to St. Ephrem the Syrian but surviving in Greek (part of the corpus of Ephrem Graecus), which was assigned as a reading for Holy Wednesday; over time this reading fell out of practice, and thus we are left with the mention of the myrrh-seller, but no narrative providing the details about the myrrh-seller. Furthermore, this highlights the need to examine liturgical texts in context, since an individual homily or hymn takes on new meaning when approached alongside the other readings and hymns associated with the liturgical setting.

Before investigating how homilies and hymns work together, it is important to note what readings and hymns were coming together during the crucial period of the 9th and 10th centuries (Cunningham 2011). This period is crucial because it is during this time that patristic homilies are collected into liturgical books and assigned a fixed place in the typika, while, at the same time, the Lenten Triodion is taking shape at the Studite Monastery in Constantinople. In this process, the homily of Ephrem is assigned for Holy Wednesday alongside a multitude of hymns—kontakia, stichera, kanons—that all focus on this story of the Sinful Woman. It should be noted, however, that “fixed” should be used loosely; while certain things are fixed early on, there is great variation in which hymns are used in the manuscript Triodia. So we are dealing with something more fluid that the fixed rubrics found in the printed Triodion.

What were the various pieces coming together at this time to make up the liturgical readings and hymns for Holy Wednesday? These various components represent different liturgical traditions coming from different areas, reflecting both the Cathedral rite and the Monastic rite, and so there may have been differences and variations; but among the possibilities we can say for certain that the following existed:

1) the Gospel reading from St. Matthew (26:3-16) of the woman who anoints Jesus. Evidence exists for this reading already in the early 5th century (Renoux, 1969). It is likewise appointed for Holy Wednesday in the 10th century Typicon of the Great Church (Mateos, 1963).

2) Romanos’ kontakion on the Sinful Woman (Maas and Trypanis #10; Grosdidier de Matons #21). While the manuscripts of Romanos indicate this kontakion was appointed for Holy Wednesday, it is not clear how long this practice continued, especially since the earliest manuscript of the Triodion (MS Sinai 734-735) contains a different, truncated kontakion and oikos.

3) Ephrem Graecus’ homily (Sermo in mulierem peccatrice CPG 3952) was appointed to be read at Orthros on Holy Wednesday, during the kathisma. This homily appears in a number of 10-11th century collections of liturgical homilies. Assemani’s edition (1732-1746) cites manuscript evidence assigning the homily for Holy Wednesday. Although the reading ceases to appear in the Greek typikon, the standard Slavonic typikon (which reflects a very conservative liturgical tradition) still contains a reading from St. Ephrem on the sinful woman for Holy Wednesday; in the pre-Nikonian typikon Oko Tserkovnoe the incipit is also given, firmly demonstrating that it is the same homily as the Greek version.
4) various stichera, including Kassia’s hymn. The earliest manuscript of the Triodion (MS Sinai Graecus 734-735, 10th century), where the hymns are arranged by genre with alternates provided, rather than fixing the verses to particular points in the service, shows a rather developed interweaving of texts on the Sinful Woman for this day (Krueger 2014).

5) the kanon, attributed to St. Kosmas in the Triodion. The earliest manuscript (MS Sinai Graecus 734-735) also contains a second kanon.

While there is not time here to investigate all of these texts, let us follow one thread and see how the narrative of the myrrh-seller develops across these various texts. It is not uncommon for homilies and hymns to give new life through imagined speeches to otherwise silent and peripheral characters in the Bible, and this is especially true in Syriac and Greek homilies and hymns of the 4th to 6th centuries. The story of the woman who anoints Jesus’ feet caught the attention of many homilists and hymnodists. Part of the motivation to develop a backstory for this woman might have been an attempt to reconcile the different Gospel accounts. Another motivation, though, might have been her silence. None of the Gospel accounts record any words from her, which leads one to wonder: what might she have said, or what might she have thought as she entered in uninvited and anointed Jesus with costly myrrh?

The earliest expansion upon the story of the Sinful Woman — and also one of the most influential — is the Syriac memre (narrative poem) attributed to Ephrem the Syrian. Most concur that the poem is late fourth century and from the “school of Ephrem,” and so it is called the “ephrmic” memre. In this text, new plot elements are developed which provide the template for later narrative expansions. In the Ephremic memre, the Sinful woman hears that Jesus is at the house of Simeon (following Luke’s account) and decides she will approach him with repentance (Brock 2012). After divesting herself of her prostitute’s clothes and make-up, she approaches the myrrh-seller with haste. The myrrh-seller, who is perplexed by her now humble attire, argues with her. He cannot comprehend why she is dressed in such a way and yet asking for such a precious oil. The tone is confrontational between the woman and the myrrh-seller. All told, the exchange is not overly long — about 70 lines — and this obstacle is but one of many she faces (after this she faces Satan in the guise of a former lover).

Following and expanding upon this narrative development is the Greek homily of Ephrem Graecus. This homily forms part of the massive but important corpus known as the works of Ephrem Graecus. Only a few at most of these Greek texts appear to be translations of Syriac texts, but for the Byzantine world these Greek texts were the Ephrem they knew, and many of the translations into other ancient languages came via the Greek versions. The homily on the Sinful Woman is found in volume 7 of Phrantzoles’ edition (1998). Phrantzoles’ edition is less than ideal because it mostly reprints texts from the older editions published by Thwaites (1709) and Assemani (1732-1746). The first thing to notice about his treatment of the myrrh-seller is how long and developed this encounter is. In Ephrem Graecus the woman runs with great eagerness to the myrrh-seller (δραμοῦσα ἀπίει ἐν πολλῇ θερμότητι πρός τινα τῶν μυρεψῶν 94) — a narrative element that reoccurs in the sticheron where she runs (ἔδραμε) and cries out to the myrrh-seller (καὶ τῷ μυρεψῷ ἔβοα). She begins the dialogue and urges the myrrh-seller to sell her the best he has. The myrrh-seller, while not as confrontational as in the Syriac memra, nonetheless wants to know more before he sells anything. He wants to know whom the myrrh is for. Since she has asked for myrrh fit for a king
(μύρον βασιλικὸν 95), the myrrh-seller then goes on to ask if her new lover is someone of royal stock and asks if her lover surpasses even King David? This gives the woman an occasion to display her Biblical knowledge. She gives a tour de force of Biblical citation, but it has the unintended consequence of causing the myrrh-seller to be even more curious. Then we encounter a distinctive moment: in this homily she suggests that the myrrh-seller may be converted as well and she becomes a preacher of repentance.

The homily of Ephrem Graecus takes the narrative expansion of the encounter with the myrrh-seller and runs with it. In similar fashion, the kontakion of Romanos—also appointed for Holy Wednesday—presents a narrative, though one that is less fully developed. In this narrative hymn, the myrrh-seller is likewise curious and wants to know more. In Romanos’ kontakion the sinful woman again begins the dialogue and insists that the myrrh-seller not argue with her. After a brief question from the myrrh-seller about the identity of her new love, the sinful woman displays a deep Biblical knowledge, though she proves it here with one example—comparing herself to Michal who once saw David—rather than the excessive display in Ephrem Graecus. And then the kontakion moves on; the scene with the myrrh-seller only takes 3 strophes. Here we see a difference in what different literary forms can accomplish; the kontakion, limited to a certain number of strophes, needs to be more economical, whereas the homily has the space to be expansive. The homily allows certain things, whereas the form of a hymn presents certain restraints by virtue of its poetic form.

While there is undoubtedly lots of overlap in how homilies and kontakia are constructed—leading some to call the kontakia a homily in verse—there are key differences. Even with these differences, though, themes in one can work together with similar themes in the other, creating a kind of liturgical composite. In the homily, the narrator imagines the sinful woman thinking to herself: “Many I submerged in the filth of sin, and on account of that multitude I had no knowledge of the God of salvation” (92). Ephrem Graecus uses the word βόρβορος, a word meaning ‘filth’ or ‘mire.’ Romanos also uses the word βόρβορος, but in a different context. In Romanos’ kontakion, the word forms part of the refrain: “the filth of my deeds” (τοῦ βορβόρου τῶν ἔργων μου). In usual fashion in the kontakia of Romanos, the words of the refrain are taken up by different speakers and introduced by different initial phrases. So at first the “I” of the kontakion implores Christ God to deliver me “from the filth of my deeds”; in oikos 1 & 2 it is likewise the “I”, the speaker/singer who remains in the “filth of my deeds.” From there the refrain is then used by the sinful woman as the narrator imagines what she said or thought. At the final oikos the refrain returns again to the speaker/singer. As many have observed, this is one of the marks of Romanos’ brilliance, since he so fluidly adapts the language so that the refrain is taken up by different speakers and employed in these various ways.

But the formation of this liturgical composite can also work by placing texts alongside one another; in so doing, themes not otherwise apparent in an individual text come to the forefront through the conjunction of these various elements. Take for example Judas. The Gospel of John is the only one to mention Judas in regard to the anointing scene—but this Gospel is read on the previous Sunday, not on Holy Wednesday itself. In the homily of Ephrem Graecus, there is no mention of Judas. Yet as these various texts come together for services of Holy Wednesday, hymns on Judas are placed alongside hymns on the Sinful Woman, or even within a sticheron, and this is especially true with the various stichera appointed for the day. Thus in the stichera sung at the Lauds in Orthros, the costly and precious myrrh of the Sinful Woman is contrasted with Judas’ concern
with money: “when the sinful woman offered myrrh, then the disciple made an agreement with the lawless. The one rejoiced as she emptied out something of great price, while the other hurried to sell the One beyond price” (3rd sticheron at Lauds; transl. Lash). Judas is depicted as hastening to sell Jesus (ἔσπευδε πωλῆσαι), in contrast to the sinful woman running to buy the myrrh, as described in the sticheron discussed earlier. Thus Judas becomes a counterpoint to the Sinful Woman, as these stichera highlight the one who out of love for Christ purchased the costly myrrh (πολύτιμον) compared to the one who sold him who is beyond price (ἀτίμητον).

In conclusion, we see how the sticheron’s mention of the myrrh-seller relies upon the narrative developments given either in Ephrem’s homily of the full narrative kontakion of Romanos; without the homily or the full kontakion, one is left wondering: what myrrh-seller? As the homilies and hymns come together in their liturgical context, a composite develops, where themes and motifs from one text hearken back to another text. This interweaving provides a more nuanced and complete picture than any one of these texts could provide. Therefore, it is not just the individual hymn or homily that shows how silent Biblical characters were brought to life, but rather it is the interweaving of homilies and hymns within the liturgical context that presents the Sinful Woman a model of repentance.
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The Parable of the Lame and the Blind in Epiphanius and Its Relation to Jewish Liturgical Poems

I. Introduction

In Panarion (64.70) Epiphanius discusses the shared responsibility of body and soul to human sins and brings a parable in support of his claim. According to the parable (that Epiphanius attributes to a certain Ezekiel): ‘A king had made soldiers of everyone in his kingdom and had no civilians but two, one lame and one blind… And the blind man said: “Let’s go into the garden and ruin the plants there.” But the lame man said, “And how can I, when I’m lame and can’t [even] crawl?” And the blind man said, “Can I do anything myself, when I can’t see where I’m going? But let’s figure something out.”… By so doing they got into the garden, and whether they did it any danger or not, their tracks were there to be seen in the garden afterwards. And the merry-makers who entered the garden on leaving the wedding were surprised to see the tracks in the garden… What did the righteous judge do? Seeing how the two had been put together he put the lame man on the blind man and examined them both under the lash, and they couldn’t deny the charge.’ [Trans. Frank Williams, pp. 208-9]. Epiphanius concludes the parable by stating that the body and soul are inseparable and that they are responsible for the good or evil that they have done.

A similar parable in rabbinic literature appears in the Mekhilta derabbi Shimon bar Yochai, a set of homilies on the book of Exodus, that dates to the third century of the Common Era. The Mekhilta’s version describes an encounter between a Roman “emperor”, Antoninus, and Judah the Prince. Antoninus asks Judah about the final judgment of body and soul and the Jewish patriarch uses the parable of the lame and the blind in order to illustrate that both are responsible, similar to Epiphanius’ claim. Marc Bregman who studied the relationship between the texts and concluded that despite Epiphanius’ attribution of the parable to Ezekiel its source can not be the so-called Apocryphon of Ezekiel. Rather, according to Bregman the parable in the Panarion echoes a rabbinic homiletical midrash that builds upon the parable as it appears in the Mekhilta. In his words: ‘It therefore seems most likely that the author of the passage quoted by Epiphanius was a Christian who borrowed and reworked homiletical traditions current in the cultural milieu of rabbinic Judaism.’ (p.137) Bregman based his conclusions primarily on rabbinical Midrash, namely homiletical and exegetical texts written in prose. However, in recent years new Hebrew liturgical poems were discovered in the Cairo Genizah and among them poems that contain the parable of the lame and the blind in the context of a dispute between body and soul concerning the responsibility for sins. These liturgical poems shed new light on the subject matter and enhance our understanding of the literary interactions between Judaism and Christianity in the late antique Near East.

II. Liturgical Poems Concerning the Dispute Between Body and Soul

Theological discussions concerning the relationship between body and soul abound in patristic and rabbinic writings from Late Antiquity. Most of these discussions have a distinct scholarly
nature and were intended for a limited audience, consisting primarily of learned men. In contrast, presentations of the relationship between body and soul in contemporary liturgical compositions, written mainly in verse, were aimed at a much more diverse audience and overall were less scholarly. In the context of liturgy the theological concern was presented many times by means of a dispute poem that portrays a debate between body and soul, each of whom tries to convict the other of responsibility for person's sins. Each side in the dispute addresses its opponent - and at times also God - and bring proofs and arguments that exemplify its own innocence and the other's guilt. The poems, Jewish and Christian alike, share the same verdict - both body and soul are responsible for sins and both should be punished. Scholars of eastern Christianity are well aware of Syriac dispute poems, including disputes between body and soul, but interestingly similar texts are also known from contemporary Jewish liturgical poetry, a fact that went almost completely unnoticed. Some of the Jewish poetic disputes between body and soul were known for years while new texts were reconstructed in recent years from manuscripts of the Cairo Genizah and these findings shed new light on the subject matter.

The parable of the lame and the blind appears in several Hebrew liturgical poems from Late Antiquity that juxtapose the debate between body and soul and the parable. The earliest Hebrew dispute dates to the fifth century C.E. and was recited on the Day of Atonement. Below are the opening and concluding couplets from the poem:

When You set forth judgment, You call to the heavens to render the soul,
Thus also the earth You call from below to raise up the flesh.
When they are examined, “Who sinned unto Me?” You say, and each other they reprove.

The soul is Yours and the body Your making, Have mercy on your creatures!

... He from on high at them mocks for the deception they harbor.
The one with the other, exchanging arguments to be saved from judgment.
Summoned one against another, they place hand on mouth for there is naught to answer.

The soul is Yours and the body Your making, Have mercy on your creatures!

They are likened to a pair, the lame and the blind, guardians of a king's orchard.
The fruits were stolen by the efforts of both, but they deceived in the admission.
The king hastened to expose their deception in the court, so he combined and convicted them.

The soul is Yours and the body Your making, Have mercy on your creatures!

[Yahalom, The World of Grief and Mourning, 2005]

The poet uses here more than one word to refer to body and soul: in the refrain he uses the words מְשַׁנִּים and פְּגָגִים and in the couplets שפנ and רשב (literally, flesh). This does not seem to bear any theological significance, rather it is used to contribute to the poem's richness and beauty. We can also discern here the use of נֵיד (in a verbal form in the last verse: סנד) and the mention of the king, here, primarily the earthly one from the parable although it quite clearly also relates to God.
Thematically we see that the poem opens with an interesting allusion to Psalms 50:4: "He calls to the heavens above and to the earth, that he may judge his people". The poet modifies the verse as if indicating that God summons the soul and the body from the heavens and from the earth respectively. Another remarkable feature of the poem is the use of the refrain, which involves the entire congregation in the performance of the poem. It is noteworthy that the refrain reaffirms the unity of body and soul and conclude with a plea for mercy.

In the overall context of this paper the concluding couplets is most interesting as it alludes to the parable of the lame and the blind even if in a concise version. The major elements in the parable are all here, as they are in the text from the Mekhilta and in Epiphanius, namely the figures of the lame and the blind, the judgment by the king and lastly the sin and punishment. It seems probable that the author of the poem was familiar with the version of the parable as it appears in the Mekhilta derabbi Shimon bar Yochai since both texts are of Palestinian provenance and the Mekhilta, was edited in the third century, namely some two hundred years before the composition of the poem. Both the poem and the Mekhilta (both written in Hebrew) use שומ and פוג for soul and body and in both we also find the use of the root נ"יד. Moreover, the parable in the Mekhilta ends with a quotation of Psalms 50:4 and it is the same verse that opens the poem.

As mentioned above the relation between the Mekhilta, other rabbinic sources and Epiphanius was throughly studied by Bregman that concluded that the author of the parable as quoted in the Panarion was a Christian who reworked texts current in Rabbinic culture. In what follows I discuss two Hebrew liturgical poems that were published recently and shed interesting light on the connections between Epiphanius and Jewish sources.

III. The New Poetic Versions of the Parable and Epiphanius’ Version

In his discussion of the relationship between Epiphanius’ version and rabbinic Midrash Bregman singled out one main conclusion. He argued that Epiphanius’ version of the parable is based on an early (and now lost) rabbinic version of the parable that was linked to the lectionary reading from Leviticus 4:1 (“If a soul shall sin”) and Ezekiel 18:4 (“The soul that sins, it shall die”). According to Bregman the liturgical reading from the book of Ezekiel probably mislead the author of the passage quoted by Epiphanius and therefore the attribution to the Apocryphon of Ezekiel is doubtful. Without having to decide whether Bregman is correct in his assertion concerning the attribution to Ezekiel it is curious to find the exact association between the lectionary readings and the parable in a Hebrew liturgical poem by Yannai, the sixth century Palestinian poet. Yannai composed a poetic cycle for the entire triennial lectionary according to the Palestinian rite. For the reading of Leviticus 4 that begins: “If a soul shall sin” he wrote a beautiful poem that combines the debate between body and soul and the parable of the lame and the blind. Curiously, at first Yannai stresses the responsibility of the soul alone:

So being from a place of justice and a place of judgment
and a place of Law, the soul is submitted to judgment
Hence when it sins it will give a reckoning
when You pass […] on the day of reckoning.
If the body sins it’s from a place of sin.
But how can the soul sin, as it’s from a place of no sin.
And so the soul gives reckoning alone
[…] like sin and iniquity.
Yannai’s presentation of the soul as responsible for sins relates undoubtedly to the liturgical context of the poem, namely the lectionary reading of Leviticus 4:1 and Ezekiel 18:4 that stress both the sole responsibility of the soul (interestingly, this is what Origen claims and the reason Epiphanius discusses the matter to begin with). Yannai also continues to use the common vocabulary of the theme of body and soul discussed above of יָשָׂר, יָשָׂב and יָדו. However, Yannai did not dismiss the body altogether and in the next section of the poem he introduces a dispute between the two and the conclusion is that both are guilty. In his presentation Yannai incorporates the parable of the lame and the blind as well:

The soul will say, “The flesh brought me to sin.”
And the flesh will retort, “The soul brought me to sin.”
The Judge of their deeds will laugh at them,
for He is their Maker and knows their make.
The two together are like a lame one and blind,
who had their abode in the king’s garden.
They ruined the fruit as one hoisted another.
The king will judge them hoisted on one another.

[Loeffler, 2002]

Unfortunately only fragments have survived from this poem hence it is difficult to assess Yannai’s treatment of the entire subject matter but at any rate his poem corroborates Bregman assertion that until now was based on a much later text that could not have been dated with precision. On the other hand, Yannai was still writing some two hundred years after Epiphanius wrote his Panarion and therefore we are still missing a Jewish text from before the days of Epiphanius to connect the lectionary readings and the parable as Bregman has it.

In the second Hebrew dispute poem from the sixth or seventh centuries the parable is presented in an expanded version and with additional interesting correspondences with Epiphanius’ version:

A fanciful parable about vineyard keepers – a lame one and a blind:
The lame one holds speech with the blind proposing a scheme.
The blind one retorts reprimanding his fellow, the lame one and his plot.

The soul is Yours / and the body Your creature. / Your works cry “Mercy!”
The lame one replied, “How does the lame gird on a sword?”
I am lame, come bear me and I’ll fill my garment’s bosom.
The two were joined and between them took all their heart’s desire.

The soul is Yours / and the body Your creature. / Your works cry “Mercy!”

A wayfarer stood, saw the burden and cried out to the king.
Their lord saw that the fruit was gone and said to them thus:
Branches and tree! Who wrecked them, and who took the fruit?

The soul is Yours / and the body Your creature. / Your works cry “Mercy!”

[Münz-Manor, 2014]
In the second couplet the lame describes himself as someone who can not carry a sword, namely that he is not a soldier. This notion, that does not appear in any of the other dispute poems (or any other prose version of the parable) is found in Epiphanius’ version (“A king had made soldiers of everyone in his kingdom and had no civilians but two, one lame and one blind”). Bregman suggested that the appearance of the soldier image in Epiphanius’ version relates to a different parable adjacent to the parable of the lame and the blind in a late midrashic compilation, however the evidence from the liturgical poem shows that the soldier motif was an inherent part of the lame and blind parable and therefore already known in a Jewish text from the sixth or seventh centuries.

A second interesting feature in the poem is the figure of the wayfarer that discovers the mischief of the lame and the blind, again a motif that appears only in Epiphanius (“And the merry-makers who entered the garden on leaving the wedding were surprised to see the tracks in the garden”). Again, this detail is only known from Epiphanius’ version and once again the complex nature of the relationship between his version and the Jewish versions is revealed. It is also worthwhile noting that this poem features another intriguing details, namely the blind person reacting angrily at first to the lame's suggestion. This details is neither attested in any other Jewish version of the parable in verse or prose nor in the Panarion and perhaps further investigations and finding hopefully will shed light on this detail as well. In the spirit of Bregman's study one could speculate that this poem reflects an early Jewish text that stood in front of the author of the text quoted by Epiphanius. However, one could argue conversely, namely that the author of the liturgical poem was aware of the version in Epiphanius in this form or the other. However this sort of genealogy should be taken with a grain of salt: the connections between the Hebrew, Jewish Aramaic and Syriac are based in part on the great linguistic affinity of these traditions. In contrast the connections between the Hebrew texts discussed here and Epiphanius’ Greek Panarion is less straightforward even if possible as Bregman demonstrated.

IV. Conclusions

The new poetic materials that feature the parable of the lame and the blind complicates the question concerning the relationship between the rabbinic versions of the parable and the version in the Panarion. On the one hand, the newly discovered liturgical poem of Yannai corroborates Bregman assertion that there existed an inner Jewish tradition that associated the lectionary reading of Leviticus 4:1, Ezekiel 18:4 and the parable of the lame and the blind. On the other hand, the anonymous Hebrew poem dated to the sixth or seventh centuries seems to be dependant on Epiphanius’ version or at the very least on some of its features. From a bird’s-eye view the following chronologic picture emerges: in the Jewish and Christian traditions the parable is first attested in a rabbinic prose work dated to the third century. Epiphanius’ version is dated to the fourth century and the first Hebrew liturgical poem to present it is from the fifth century. It then appears twice in additional liturgical poems in the sixth and seventh centuries as well as in other rabbinic sources in prose some of them from later rabbinic compilation. Given that textual complexity it is almost impossible to offer a feasible reconstruction of the actual interactions between the Jewish and Christian texts in verse or prose. Furthermore, the notion that the parable of the lame and the blind derives from the so-called Apocryphon of Ezekiel complicates things further as this would push the tradition back to the first century C.E. This textual complexity is not unusual in early Christian and Jewish literature and it might be more useful to examine such textual complexities in light of the theoretical concept of Narrative Dialogue developed by Galit Hasan-Rokem. According
to Hasan-Rokem “the narrative dialogue is an analytical tool devised to explore the transport of cultural goods in terms that stretch the linear and dichotomous models of thought lying behind the concept of influence.” [Hasan-Rokem, 2003]

Furthermore, the discussion in this paper singles out the great importance of the study of contemporary liturgical poetry in treatments of rabbinic and patristic writings. Histories of religion in Late Antiquity have often underplayed the role of liturgical texts. In the context of theology and exegesis, liturgy is usually regarded as a versified version of rabbinic or patristic discourse. However, liturgy, and liturgical poetry in particular, played a significant and independent role in the formation and transmission of theological concepts, especially for lay or unlettered audiences. Therefore, the incorporation of liturgical poetry to the study of religion in the late antique and early medieval periods offers a more comprehensive and nuanced consideration of Christian and Jewish theology.
“Now Womankind Rejoices…”

Thekla’s Kanon on the Theotokos and the Female Voice of Klement the Hymnographer


Given that Byzantine women’s writing has left only few, scattered traces in the surviving record, eighth and ninth-century liturgical poetry provides a comparatively rich corpus of texts authored by women, with the works of three female hymnographers known by name (Thekla, Kassia, Theodosia), and perhaps more remaining undetected among the many anonymous or pseudepigraphic hymns. Among these texts, Thekla’s kanon on the Theotokos (ETh 166-68) is remarkable for its content, compositional structure and complex dialogue with the work of other hymnographers.

The only source for Thekla’s identity is the kanon she composed. The third troparion of the ninth ode allows the conclusion that she was a nun and that the hymn was composed to be chanted in her convent. The lifetimes of Kosmas of Jerusalem (ca. 674/6–752/4) and John of Damascus (ca. 670–745), whose melodies she uses for her prosomoia, provide a terminus a quo. At the other end of the chronological spectrum, the œuvre of the hymnographer Klement (ca. 765–post 824/ante 843), who added theotokia to Thekla’s kanon, can serve as a terminus ad quem. Thekla must thus have flourished during the second half of the eighth century.

The kanon on the Theotokos has the usual nine-ode structure with the common omission of the second ode. The acrostic formed through the first letters of the first three troparia of each ode reads ΕΓΚΩΜΙΑΖΕΙΤΗΝΘΕΟΤΟΚΟΝΘΕΚΛΑ. The first letters of the theotokia create the acrostic ΚΛΗΜΕΝΤΟΣ, suggesting that they were composed and subsequently added by Klement.

Each ode has a thematic focus: in the introductory ode the congregation (ἐκκλησία) offers the hymn as a eulogy to the Theotokos and praises her for bringing forth the Redeemer. Ode 3 traces the successive development from Eve’s deceit vis-à-vis humankind to women’s redemption through the Theotokos. Ode 4 focuses on the prefiguration of the Theotokos and of the coming of the Logos (Jacob’s ladder, the descent of the angels). Ode 5 highlights the Theotokos’ superiority: she is more venerable than the Ark of the Covenant and surpasses the cherubim. Ode 6 is dedicated to the theme of joy (the Virgin as η τού κόσμου χαρά and τῆς χαρᾶς τῆς ἀλήκτου χωρίον). Ode 7 takes up again prefiguration with regard to the conception of Christ (Gideon’s fleece and basin); it is the only ode that has a refrain (εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς σῆς κοιλίας, ἄγνη: “blessed be the fruit of your
womb, oh pure one”). Ode 8 praises the Theotokos as a source of salvation and eternal life. Ode 9 concludes the hymn with personal and congregational prayers. Between the sixth and seventh odes a kathisma is inserted which comprises a penitential prayer of the poet to the Theotokos.

As can be seen from this brief outline, there is no clear narrative sequence in the succession of the odes. Although Ode 3 treats Mary’s conception and birth, it remains the most “historical” of the odes, and the following ones are rather loosely grouped around various aspects of the Theotokos’ role in salvation history. The increasing appearance of penitential prayers and concomitant shaping of the authorial “I” and the congregational “we” (on which see below) give the impression of a gradual climax, which reaches its summit in the renewed (see Ode 1), but more emphatic offering of the hymn to the Theotokos, thus creating a ring composition.

Besides this poetic macrostructure of the kanon, one can also observe a quite coherent pattern of compositional microstructures within each ode. Most commonly, the first troparion or stanza introduces the main theme of the ode and (literally and figuratively speaking) sets the tone for it. The second troparion then elaborates or expands the topic, while the third, building on this topic, deals with redemption and salvation. The theotokion usually addresses the Theotokos directly, offering praise and prayers.

To give two examples of this common structure, Ode 3 begins with humankind’s alienation from God through Eve’s deceit and its reconciliation with God through the Theotokos. The second troparion describes the Theotokos as “the world’s treasure of life”, brought forth by Joachim. Troparion 3 proceeds from her birth by Anna to the King’s birth by her, and highlights the joy of women at the Theotokos’ offspring, as they are now liberated from the curse (συγχαίρουσι τῷ τόκῳ σου αἱ γυναῖκες λυθεῖσαι διὰ σοῦ τῆς ἀρᾶς), which refers back to the mention of Eve in the first troparion. The theotokion presents the unburnt bush as a prefiguration of the conception of Christ, thus reinforcing the ode’s focus on the conception and birth of both Mary and Jesus, while also marking the transition to the following Ode 4, which has prefiguration as its main theme.

Ode 5 can serve as a second example: in the first troparion the congregation praises the Theotokos as more venerable than the Ark of the Covenant, as she carries not tablets but God. The second troparion exalts her as the “throne of God the Logos” on which God took seat as a mortal man, which rendered the Theotokos superior (ὑπερτέραν) to the cherubim. Troparion 3 is devoted to salvation through the Theotokos: she “liberated from bitter slavery all humankind” and honored womankind through her divine offspring. The theotokion picks up the theme of the last verses of the third troparion, highlighting women’s struggles against “the enemy” and the virtuous conduct of maidens.

On the micro- and macrostructural levels one can thus observe the successive (if not linear) development of themes, but also circular figures of composition, which provide the odes and the hymn as a whole with cohesive, overlapping frameworks. Thekla’s kanon is characterized by a multiplicity and simultaneity of voices which find expression in the abundant usage of verbs in the first person singular and plural. The poet’s authorial “I” remains elusive in the first five odes of the kanon. In Odes 5 and 6 she first appears as a passive observer: in 5.2 she beholds (ὦπταί μοι) God sitting on the throne Theotokos; and in 6.2 she sees (ὤφθη μοι) God residing wholly in the Theotokos (ἐν σοὶ ... ὀλικῶς ἐποχούμενος). In both instances, the dativus auctoris μοι (“by me”) stands in close proximity to the communal “we” (5.2: κηρύττομεν; 6.2: ἡμῶν). It is only with the penitential prayer of the kathisma, placed between Odes 6 and 7, that her presence becomes
more palpable: she beseeches the Theotokos to “cure me of the irksome indolence of my soul and the obtuseness of my heart” (ῥαθυμίαν ψυχῆς μου τὴν χαλεπήν καὶ καρδίας μου πάρωσιν, μήτερ Θεοῦ, ἐπινεύσασα ἰάσαι), addressing her as “my only hope and comfort” (ἡ μόνη ἐλπὶς μου καὶ παράκλησίς). The apogee of the poet’s presence, and of her authorial agency, is reached in the last ode in whose first troparion Thelkla offers her hymn as a gift to the Theotokos, likening herself to the widow of Lk 21:1-4 / Mk 12:42-44: “Bend your ear towards me, all-holy Virgin, while I am faithfully praising (ἀνυμνούῃ πιστῶς) your offspring with encomiastic words (δι’ ἐγκωμίων λόγων); and as you accept the hymns from my lips as the widow’s gifts (ὡς δόρα χρησικά τοὺς ἴμνους τῶν χελέων μου προσδεχομένη), ask for the remission of my sins”. By appropriating the poet’s voice in the act of chanting, every individual could identify with this “I” in the performance of the hymn.

This leads us to the communal character of Thelkla’s kanon, as expressed in the ubiquitous references to “we”, “us” and “our”. These first person plurals may refer to various groups, comprising overlapping layers. In its broadest sense, it may denote humanity or Christendom in its entirety—in Thelkla’s words, τὸ γένος ἄπαν (which the Theotokos liberates from slavery: 5.3); or πᾶσα ἡ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία (which is enchanted by the Theotokos’ offspring: 8.2). This communal “we” is most commonly expressed in the pronominal formula “we (all)” / “(all of) us” (1.3: Christ, the savior of “all of us”; 3.1: reconciliation of God with “us”; 4.2: the appearance of the Logos to “us”; 4.3: “we all” have found life through the Virgin; 6.2 and 7.2: “our” God; 7.2: “we all” have reconciled with God; 8.1: the Theotokos appeared to “us” as the new paradise and “we all” delight in immortal life). In a narrower sense (which is not always clearly distinguishable from the broader meaning), the first person refers to the congregants of the liturgy—the ἐκκλησία which in 1.1 is presented as offering the hymn as an “ever-blooming crown of praise” to the Theotokos (ἐγκωμίων σοι άειθαλές διάδημα νόν ἐξυφαίνει πνεύματι ... καὶ προσάγει μελῳδ ...) and singing the Hail Mary (τὸ χαίρε ἄδουσα). As is the case with Thelkla’s persona, such self-references of the congregation to the act of chanting and praising increase with the progression of the hymn, contributing to the above-mentioned heightening in tone (with the exception of Klement’s theotokia (1.4; 4.4) first appearance in the fifth ode: 5.1: ἀνυμνούμεν; 5.2: κηρύττομεν; 6.1: χαίρε σοι κραυγάζοντας; 6.3: τὸ χαίρε σοι κραυγάζομεν; 7.1: κραυγάζομεν; 7.2: συμψάλλομεν; 9.2: μεγαλύνομεν; 9.3: μετὰ φωνῆς αἰνέσεως δεόμεθα).

As the masculine grammatical gender was (and in many languages continues to be) the default means to denote a group of people comprising both sexes, it comes as no surprise that whenever the poet employs participles or pronouns in reference to both Christendom as a whole and the chanting congregants, these participles and pronouns are masculine (1.3: τὸν σωτῆρα πάντων ἡμῶν; 4.3: ζωὴν πάντες εὑράμεθα; 6.1: χαίρε σοι κραυγάζοντας; 6.3: τῆς χαρᾶς τῆς ἀλήκτου χωρίν σε ... ὑπωσκόντες; 7.2: ἐν σοὶ κατηλλάγησαν πάντες τῷ Θεῷ; 8.1: τῆς ἀθανάτου ζωῆς τρυφώμεν πάντες; 8.2: σώζονται πάντες ἀμαρτωλοί καὶ πτωχοί οἱ πόθῳ ἐν σοὶ καταφεύγοντες; 9.2: διὸ σε πάντες μεγαλύνομεν). However, just as the poet’s persona gradually takes a clearer shape in the course of the hymn, and assumes a female appearance in the process (9.1: κλινόν μοι τὸ ὀ δος σου ... ἀνυμνοῦση; ὡς δῶρα χρησικά τοὺς ἴμνους προσδεχομένη), so also the congregation appears in the last regular troparion of the last ode not only more narrowly as monastic, but also as female (9.3): it has evidently become a community of nuns who extol (ἐκθειάζουσαι) the Theotokos’ purity and chastity and entreat her to protect their own purity and chastity (ἐν παρθενίᾳ στήριξον καὶ ἐν ἄγνεια ἡμᾶς φύλαξον).

Although we have to wait for this gendering of the communal “we” until the hymn’s very last troparion, there is a noticeable presence of womanhood already in previous odes, with several
third-person references to “women” or “womankind”: in 3.3 Thekla has women (αἱ γυναῖκες) rejoice at Theotokos’ offspring (συγχαίρουσι τῷ τόκῳ σου), as they have been liberated through her from Eve’s curse (λυθεῖσαι διὰ σοῦ τῆς αρᾶς). In 5.3 the Theotokos is praised for having honored womankind (τὴν φύσιν τοῦ θήλεος ἐτίμησας) through her divine offspring. Finally, Ode 8 begins with the juxtaposition of the “tree of death” (θανάτου ξύλον) with the “plant of life” (ζωῆς φυτόν; i.e., Christ) which the “new paradise” (νέος παράδεισος; i.e., the Theotokos) brought forth without seed. This allusive evocation of Eve and Mary as symbols of woman is further elaborated in 8.3, where the poet claims that through the Theotokos the “first mother” (ἡ πρωτομάρτυς; i.e., Eve) is exculpated (ἐλευθεροῦται καταδίκης), and points (ἰδοῦ) to women nowadays struggling on behalf of Christ (νῦν γυναῖκες ὑπεραθλοῦσι Χριστοῦ); and therefore “womankind rejoices (χαίρει ἡ φύσις τοῦ θήλεος), as the first martyr and virgin Thekla demonstrates (ὡς ἡ πρωτομάρτυς βοᾷ παρθένος Θέκλα)”. In other words, thanks to the Theotokos, and because of the virtuous lives that contemporary women lead following St. Thekla’s example, womanhood has been released from the sinful state (or “curse”: ἀρά) that Eve has bequeathed to it: woman has developed from προμήτωρ to πρωτομάρτυς.

While this persistent call for the redemption not only of humanity in general, but of womankind in particular is perhaps the most remarkable feature of the kanon, Klement’s engagement with Thekla’s composition—and especially its gendered elements—is equally noteworthy. Like Thekla, Klement is a rather shadowy figure about whom we know next to nothing. A brief entry in the Synaxarium (713.3-5), a kanon in his honor (ed. Pétridès, “Office”) and his own œuvre of liturgical poetry suggest that he was an iconophile monk who was exiled for some time, probably during the second phase of Iconoclasm. Alexander Kazhdan, who devoted a comprehensive study to Klement’s works (“An Oxymoron”; see also his History, 261-69), credited him with some innovations in liturgical poetry. According to Kazhdan, Klement introduced the “double acrostic” into the kanon, and was the first composer to systematically use theotokia as the last troparia of each ode and to “sign” them with an acrostic forming his name. Moreover, he authenticated his hymns with a closing formula in the last verse of the last theotokion, which includes the verb πληρῶ (or a derivative or synonymous verb). Based on these “signatures”, Kazhdan attributed 26 kanones on saints and various religious topics and occasions to him. Moreover, Klement seems to have added theotokia to kanones of other poets. This is suggested by a few kanones (including Thekla’s) the acrostic of whose theotokia reads ΚΛΗΜΕΝΤΟΣ, while the regular troparia form an acrostic bearing the name of another poet (see, e.g., also AHG 10: no. 19).

Klement’s compositional technique in the added theotokia to Thekla’s kanon is highly interesting for notions of authorship in Byzantine literature. On the one hand, Klement impresses his own authorial thumbprint on the kanon by adding his “signature” not only in the acrostic, but also in the closing verse of the hymn with his πληρῶ-formula (9.4: τὴν σωτηρίαν πληροῦμενος). Moreover, he adds a theme, which is otherwise absent from Thekla’s kanon, but particularly dear to him, namely icon veneration (see Kazhdan, “An Oxymoron”, 25-31; id., History, 262-64). Thus in 8.4 Klement asserts that “no one is lost the hopes of whose faith rest on you in an orthodox manner (τὰς τῆς πίστεως ἐλπίδας κεκτημένος ἐπὶ σοι ὀρθοδόξους), Virgin Mother of God”, but only those (will be condemned) who “out of envy refuse to show reverence to the imprint of your form (προσκυνεῖν τῆς μορφῆς τὸν χαρακτῆρα).” On the other hand, Klement adapts his theotokia to the original hymn, not only by following the melodic and rhythmical patterns of the heirmoi of the odes, but by further
developing their themes, while using vocabulary (single words or whole phrases) from the regular troparia. Kazhdan acknowledged this particularity of Klement's style, stating that “unity is achieved … by the conscious repetition of key words that bind together the separate parts of the narrative” (History, 268). Klement proceeds in like manner in his theotokia to Thekla’s hymn, and particularly with regard to the topic of women’s redemption from Eve’s curse. Thus, in the theotokion of Ode 5 Klement turns his attention to women “daring openly the enemy” and maidens “following her [i.e., the Virgin]”. Although this can be regarded as an elaboration of the immediately preceding verses of 5.3 stressing the honor conferred upon womankind by the Theotokos, this theotokion also clearly corresponds in idea and wording with 8.3: while the first part of both troparia highlights women's struggles on behalf of their faith (5.4 (theotokion): εὐστολμούσι γυναίκες κατὰ τοῦ ἐχθροῦ; 8.3: γυναίκες ὑπεραθλοῦσι Χριστοῦ), the second part focusses on the virtue of female virginity following the example of the Theotokos and St. Thekla respectively (5.4: ταύτῃ ἀκολουθοῦσι νεάνιδες παρθενείαν ἀσκοῦσι; 8.3: χαίρει ἡ φύσις τοῦ θήλεος ὡς ἡ πρωτομάρτυς βοᾷ παρθένος Θέκλα). A similar compositional technique emerges from the theotokion of Ode 6, in which Klement draws on the contrast between grief and joy that dominates this ode (e.g., 6.1: ἡ τοῦ κόσμου χαρά, ἀειπαρθένε, χαίρε σε κραυγάζοντας … τῆς σῆς χαράς ἀξίωσον καὶ τὴν λύπην ἡμῶν διασκέδασον; 6.4 (theotokion): νῦν ἡ φύσις τοῦ θήλεος γέγηθε, νῦν ἡ λύπη πέπαυται, χαρά δὲ ἡγηθησέν ὅτι Μαρία ἔτεκε τὴν χαρὰν τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ Κύριον). At the same time, the opening formula νῦν ἡ φύσις τοῦ θήλεος γέγηθε is evidently borrowed from 8.3 (νῦν … χαίρει ἡ φύσις τοῦ θήλεος). With this adoption and application of basic ideas and of the style of the original hymn to his own theotokia, Klement assumes Thekla's authorial persona and appropriates her gendered voice.

These two seemingly paradoxical approaches of Klement to Thekla's composition add to the hymn's complex play with multiple, simultaneous voices, which are at once communal (and potentially transgender) and personal (and gender specific). This symphony of voices situates the kanon, and liturgical poetry in general, between individuality and communality: through the composition and performance of liturgical poetry, the authorial and performing agents seek—both individually and as a community (as humans, congregants, monks, nuns, women, etc.)—to establish communication with the heavenly sphere, and ultimately to be granted redemption. Viewed in this light, hymnography is paradigmatic of Byzantine literature, which oscillates between ritualized communality and humility on the one hand, and individuality and self-presentation on the other.
Assessing the Performative Context of Ephrem's Madrashe

“The drama is the domain of the author...the script is the domain of the teacher...the theater is the domain of the performers; the performance is the domain of the audience.”


As scholars, we tend to read Ephrem’s madrashe as texts, as words on a page. To derive meaning from these texts, we parse them like we would other sophisticated texts—like a Gospel, a play by Shakespeare, a Platonic dialogue, or a poem by Emily Dickinson. We read the madrashe aloud, trying to get a feel for their Syriac rhythms. We wrestle with Ephrem’s occasionally obscure lexicon, and with his often twisting, ambiguous syntax. We may look at other texts from the period, comparing Ephrem’s ideas with those of other fourth-century writers. Yet, however thoroughly we read the madrashe, most of us read them in a way that is fundamentally different from the way Ephrem wrote them to be read, for Ephrem did not write the madrashe to be read at all, but to be heard. We can see this in the madrashe themselves. All his madrashe carry a melody and a refrain, two simple features that suggest two important things: they were sung, with others. These are not philosophical dialogues, early American poems, or Shakespearean plays. They are late antique, Northern Mesopotamian, communal songs.

Using the language of Richard Schechner, in interpreting Ephrem we tend to deal with the “drama” and the “script,” but ignore, or only allude to, the theatre and the performance. There is, of course, good reason for this: we know very little about how Ephrem’s madrashe were sung, who sung them, or in what venue(s). Indeed, from a modern text-critical perspective, all we have are the drama and the script. The theatre and the audience have disappeared, leaving only traces behind. Yet, few would claim insignificance for these traces, and the lost world they partially reveal.

For the most part, the “theatre” and the “script” has only floated along the surface of our interpretation of Ephrem—a detail that establishes an ambience, but little more. The classic modern works on Ephrem spoke little about the performative context of the madrashe. Beck tended to their formal qualities; only in passing did he mention that they were sung. André de Halleux and Bernard Outtier, following Jerome’s fifth-century report, affirmed that at a certain point the madrashe were introduced into the liturgy. Sebastian Brock added to this that the madrashe were “sung by soloists, while a fixed response was provided by a choir after each stanza.” Robert Murray and Kathleen McVey both emphasized as well that the madrashe were sung, and by women’s choirs. Ute Possekel nuanced this picture slightly, suggesting that the madrashe were “mostly occasional pieces...written for a particular festival, to adorn the worship ceremony, or to fight a heretical belief.” Intriguingly, she also implied that not all the madrashe had liturgical functions. With each of these scholars, however, these performative clues sit at the margins of their interpretations; rarely do they actually touch what they say about Ephrem.
In the last twenty-five years, however, certain scholars have begun to place Ephrem’s performative context at the center of their interpretation of him. Not surprisingly, it was a scholar who once lauded the role of the imagination in historical research that first, and most evocatively, brought Ephrem’s performative context to the fore. In his 1989 ground-breaking study of Christian asceticism, The Body and Society, Peter Brown wrote (following a section on John Chrysostom):

Far to the East of Antioch, in Edessa and Nisibis...the Syriac hymns of Ephraim the Syrian...served as the equivalent of the urban rhetoric of John Chrysostom. They filled the basilicas of the city with chants of extraordinary poetic power.

Peter Brown’s dramatic portrayal of Ephrem as an Edessan Chrysostom had legs. It surely echoed in the background of Christine Shepardson’s provocative study of Ephrem’s anti-Judaism. Shepardson’s reading of Ephrem assumed a public context, in which Ephrem’s words did something to the public that heard them. She wove the data that others had set at the margins—that Ephrem’s madrashe were sung by women—into the center of the portrait she painted. Her Ephrem was decidedly public: “Ephrem’s renowned choir of Christian women sang to his congregation, warning of the danger that he perceived in the unleavened bread of the Jewish Passover....Through their own voices, Ephrem...charged his church members to ‘loathe’ and ‘flee from’ the unleavened bread.” For both Brown and Shepardson, Ephrem’s performative context not only shaped their interpretation of him; their presentation of that context also reflected their broader historiographical questions. By insisting on Ephrem’s public persona, Brown was able to articulate the fascinating conundrum of a celibate man delivering songs to a married congregation. For Shepardson, the public character of Ephrem’s works aided her larger thesis of his life as a milestone in the “parting of the ways” between Judaism and Christianity on the edge of the Roman Empire.

Other scholars, too, have affirmed the public character of Ephrem’s madrashe, and also with larger historiographical questions in mind. In his edition of the Life of Ephrem, Joseph Amar stated that Ephrem’s “liturgical compositions were public events in the church in his day.” Amar’s identification of the public nature of Ephrem’s madrashe is tied up with a larger project of reclaiming Ephrem from the monastic re-write he received in the fifth- and sixth-century Greek and Syriac hagiographical sources. The monastic Ephrem—the Ephrem produced by the later hagiographical tradition—was a monk who only occasionally condescended to deal with the problems of the people in the city. The real Ephrem—the fourth-century Ephrem—lived in the city, among the people, even though celibate.

Susan Ashbrook Harvey has dealt primarily with the generation just after Ephrem—that of Rabbula and Jacob of Sarug. But her portrait of fifth-century women’s choirs looks back partially to Ephrem and his madrashe. In this context, she too has emphasized the public nature of Ephrem’s madrashe, specifically as a way of demonstrating the formative role women played in Syriac Christianity. For, unlike the convent choirs of the Christian West, the Syriac Churches placed women at the center of civic worship when they performed the madrashe. And this is a practice that sat at the very beginning of Christian worship, in the madrashe of Ephrem.

Sidney Griffith, too, has in several places implied a public context for Ephrem’s madrashe, though his exact stance is slightly harder to pin down. In speaking directly of the performative context of the madrashe, Griffith restated Jerome’s report that they were sung in the liturgy. But Griffith’s overall reading of the madrashe seems to assume a public context. For Griffith, the goal
of Ephrem's madrashe was to win “the allegiance of the Syriac-speaking populations in Osroene to the twin loyalties of the Roman Empire and Nicene orthodoxy.” (“Clash,” 454.) These songs were thus sung before the people, with the goal of firming up a particular type of Christian identity in Edessa. They were, in short, public, popular events.

And finally, in a slightly different vein, Gerard Rouwhorst has done an exhaustive study of Ephrem's Madrashe on Pascha. Rouwhorst's concern is more with the themes of the madrashe cycle, and the Mesopotamian rituals of Pascha that these madrashe reveal. In this exploration, Rouwhorst has made the most concrete and detailed attempt to discern precisely how Ephrem's madrashe fit into Mesopotamian liturgical life. His conclusion is that the Madrashe on Pascha formed a portion of the liturgical material which would have been performed between Holy Friday and Easter itself. But Rouwhorst's concern is with one cycle only, and one which is more obviously liturgical in its orientation.

When we thus survey scholarship on Ephrem of the last fifty years with an eye towards establishing their performative context, we find two general camps. On the one side, there are those who affirm basic points about the performance of the madrashe (they were sung, by women, perhaps by a soloist, mostly for liturgical feasts), but whose interpretations of Ephrem are not really affected in any way by these points. On the other side, there are those whose interpretations of Ephrem depend upon their performative character. The way these scholars—Brown, Shepardson, Amar, Griffith, and Rouwhorst—understand the purpose of the madrashe is deeply connected to the role the madrashe played in fourth-century Northern Mesopotamian urban society.

By reading Ephrem's madrashe as a genre forged in performance, the latter group seriously advances our understanding of Ephrem and fourth-century Syriac Christianity. But their treatments of the performative context of the madrashe also raise questions. Most basic among these is simply definitional – when we speak of Ephrem's madrashe as “liturgical,” what do we mean? There seems to be a consensus that Ephrem's madrashe were “liturgical” (a report that began already in Jerome). But how should we define “liturgy”?

The scholars who have identified Ephrem's madrashe as “liturgical” have not really spelled out what they mean by this term. Nevertheless all seem to assume that “liturgical” means public, and communal. So, while these scholars have not defined the term, we could perhaps say that the term “liturgical,” when applied to Ephrem's madrashe, connotes that these songs were performed publically, before the Christian community, and in connection with some ecclesial event – perhaps a feast (Nativity, Epiphany, and Pascha being the three that Ephrem references), a saints’ day, a Eucharistic or baptismal service (these specific occasions are typically not spelled out), or as part of the daily office. Importantly, moreover, the term “public” seems to imply a lay, non-monastic audience—or at least an audience composed of monastics and non-monastics alike. Thus, to speak of Ephrem's madrashe as liturgical implies that they were written for public Christian services, attended by monastics and non-monastics alike. In this sense, Ephrem's madrashe – even if we cannot always identify the specific services to which they would have been attached – would have accompanied in some way the rituals of Eucharist, Baptism, the daily office, the feasts and vigils associated with Christmas/Epiphany and Easter, and various saints' days. Theoretically, they could have actually been part of these services, or offered catechesis loosely related to these services.

What I would like to suggest is that there is a part (perhaps a large part) of Ephrem's madrashic corpus which does not cohere with this definition of liturgical – a large part of that corpus that does
not really speak of Eucharist, Baptism, Nativity, or Pascha; that does not reference any liturgical feast of which it is a part; that seems to assume a specialized audience. As one example of this aspect of the corpus, I would like to turn to Ephrem’s Madrashe on Heresies 3.

The Madrashe against Heresies is, after the Hymns on Faith, Ephrem’s largest collection. It encompasses fifty-six different madrashe, and these fifty-six can be grouped into 15 smaller cycles which all share the same meter and melody. For the most part, all these madrashe deal with the teachings of Bardaisan, Mani, and Marcion, but Ephrem also occasionally criticizes subordinationist Christians and Jews. There is nothing special about the third madrashe in this collection. It is the third not only in the overall cycle, but in a smaller subset of hymns that includes the first ten madrashe (all of which are numbered as a distinct subset). All these madrashe consist in six line stanzas, with a meter of 5+5, except for the second hemistich of the fourth lines, which is always three syllables.

All of these madrashe also carry a refrain, though it differs from poem to poem. The refrain of Madrashe 3 is “Blessed is the one who has refuted the sons of error with his books.” The poem never references its audience directly, and offers no insight into the occasion of its composition. The first stanza reads:

Let’s refute the deniers like thieves,
For the wealth they stole screams against them. (It can speak).
They stole names and put them on a thing that is nothing.
Again and again they have put the name of God on
The idols of their devotion, so through [God’s] titles,
Beings that do not exist have been worshipped and named [as God].

According to the poem that will follow, Bar Daysan takes two nouns— God (’allâhå) and Being (’îtyê)—and applies them to two different types of things. “God” (’allâhå) refers to the One God, while “Being” can refer to a series of quasi-divine “beings” (’îtyê). According to Ephrem, Bar Daysan is attracted to this solution because it allows him to affirm the unity of God, while at the same time positing a series of lesser deities who exert some control over the cosmos. Ephrem’s argument against Bar Daysan is simple: Bar Daysan has taken two nouns that refer to the One God as referring to two different orders of beings.

This is the main point of Against Heresies 3. Ephrem will also wrap Mani and Marcion into his critique of Bar Daysan. He will then use this critique as a segue into a discussion of, first, subordinationist Christians (so-called “Arians”) and then Jews (whom he criticizes for accepting the activity of the Holy Spirit in creation, but not the activity of the Son of God).

So much for the content of the poem. What can we discern about its performative context? We can begin by speaking of what the poem lacks. In its 78 lines, there is nothing that can be taken as a reference to a liturgical service that we know to have existed in fourth-century Mesopotamia. There is no apparent Eucharistic reference, and no reference to a feast day or a saint. Perhaps it could have occupied a place in the daily office, but there is no way to tell whether it did – no reference to the time of day, no apparent reference to a Psalm which it may have accompanied. There is also little to suggest a scriptural lection which this poem may have followed. There is a vague reference to Deut. 29:29 in the tenth stanza, and Gn 1:2 hovers over the anti-Jewish polemic of stanzas 10-13. Ephrem does, in the concluding stanza, reference his own baptism—“I have been baptized triply in the name of the Holy Spirit.” Perhaps this suggests that we have here a catechetical homily for the newly baptized, but it is difficult to know for sure.
Other aspects of the poem suggest a communal, and even a devotional, setting. The poem has a melody, indicating that it was sung, and a refrain, indicating that it was sung by more than one person. The first line of the poem – “Let’s refute the deniers like thieves!” – suggests the presence of an audience, and the final stanza of the poem is somewhat devotional in tone: “I have learned and acquired the faith, that you are one in your Being. / I have heard and I have affirmed that you are the Father in your only-begotten.” And the final line of the poem hints at a communal act of praise: “Praises to you from all, who have become aware that your are human.”

The content of the poem is not extremely complicated, but at points its logic does become quite dense. In criticizing the ideas of Bar Daysan, Mani, Marcion, the Arians, and the Jews, Ephrem engages in a sophisticated discussion of the relationship between the nature and the names of God; the role of the Son and the Holy Spirit in creation; the unity and multiplicity of the one God. One would assume that his audience was familiar with these quite specialized debates.

My question is this: how does a poem such as Against Heresies 3 fit within our identification of Ephrem’s madrashe as liturgical? Among the services identified as having made up the ritual fabric of fourth-century Syriac liturgical life, where would this madrashe and other like it have fit?

Here is a simple suggestion: Ephrem’s madrashe were used not only in liturgical services, but also in more specialized, perhaps explicitly monastic, scholastic settings. We know from later sources that the mimre—non-stanzaic poems, usually lacking melodies and refrains—were used in scholastic settings. We also know that, within school settings, “choir” was listed among the duties of the scholars. It seems reasonable to assume that not only Ephrem’s mimre, but also his madrashe, were used in such settings. To say this is not to say that the madrashe were not always liturgical. Rather, it is to suggest that, in the mind of fourth-century Syriac Christians, “school” and “liturgy” were not as far apart as we would imagine.
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(No text)
Histoire du texte et histoire du culte :
Remarques sur la tradition du texte des Miracles des saints Cyr et Jean

Pour l’histoire du culte des saints, l’importance des collections de miracles a été reconnue depuis longtemps mais on a moins souligné l’intérêt de l’histoire de leur texte. C’est ce qu’on tentera de faire ici à partir du cas des Miracles des saints Cyr et Jean par Sophrone. Cette collection, centrée sur le sanctuaire de Ménouthis, a été écrite en 610 ou peu après. Peu diffusée, elle est transmise en entier par un seul manuscrit grec (C), en partie par quatre autres. Il faut signaler aussi deux traductions latines : l’une, partielle, de la fin du VIIᵉ s., l’autre du dernier quart du IXᵉ s. Dans l’édition à paraître dans la Series Graeca du Corpus de Leuven, j’ai pu proposer le stemma suivant :

Les deux traductions latines, précieuses pour l’édition, sont révélatrices aussi de la diffusion du culte. L’existence de la première est connue par Anastase le Bibliothécaire qui dit ceci : « À la demande du primicier Théodore, défenseur de l’Église, Boniface le Conseiller, autrefois, a traduit douze de ces miracles, avec la préface. » Boniface est connu pour avoir participé à la traduction des Actes de concile de Constantinople III commencée sous le pape Léon II (682-683) et achevée sous Serge Ier (687-701). L’existence d’une traduction de l’œuvre de Sophrone à Rome dans le dernier tiers du VIIᵉ s. peut être mise en relation avec l’histoire des reliques des saints Cyr et Jean, transférées au VIIᵉ s. après la conquête arabe, d’Égypte à Rome, où une chapelle qui leur est dédiée est attestée sous Benoît II (684-685).

La deuxième traduction latine a été faite en 875 ou 880 par Anastase le Bibliothécaire à la demande d’un prêtre de l’église romaine où étaient conservées les reliques des saints Cyr et Jean. Les traductions d’œuvres hagiographiques grecques par Anastase, assez nombreuses, ont répondu à
divers motifs, mais plusieurs sont liées au développement du culte des saints au IXe s. La traduction d'un texte long et difficile comme l'œuvre de Sophrone montre la volonté de réactiver un culte autour du sanctuaire qui prendra le nom de Santa Passera. Elle est à replacer dans l'atmosphère de l'époque à Rome.

Les traductions latines sont liées à des temps forts de l'histoire du culte des martyrs et à des lieux spéciaux. Les manuscrits grecs sont plus difficiles à faire parler. Les cinq témoins grecs des Miracles de Cyr et Jean se divisent en deux catégories : quatre d'entre eux contiennent un choix de récits (de deux à quinze) ; seul le cinquième (Vat. gr. 1607 = C) donne un texte complet. Cette opposition correspond aux types de recueil : C contient une collection spéciale de textes ; les quatre autres témoins sont des ménologes de janvier. Dans ces quatre manuscrits, l'œuvre est anonyme. Elle n'est pas transmise comme une œuvre littéraire, couverte par le nom d'un auteur. Il s'agit simplement d'enrichir de quelques miracles la lecture de la Passion. Nous nous écartons de l'histoire vivante et spécifique du culte des saints Cyr et Jean. Les deux martyrs viennent prendre une place modeste aux côtés d'autres membres du sanctoral byzantin et l'histoire qui se dessine est celle des collections hagiographiques et de leur diffusion. D'autres exemples confirment le désintérêt des copistes médiévaux des recueils hagiographiques normaux pour les collections de miracles : ainsi, pour les Miracles de saint Démétrius. Il faut toutefois rester vigilant car, même dans les manuscrits de ce type, on rencontre des exceptions intéressantes.


Le caractère exceptionnel des manuscrits contenant des collections spéciales pourrait faire penser qu'il s'agit de manuscrits savants. C'est peut-être le cas du ms. de Dionysiou. Mais le Vaticanus de Sophrone, comme les autres témoins anciens, sont des lectionnaires, parfois luxueux: ainsi, pour S. Démétrios, le Paris. gr. 1517, ou, pour les deux Théodore, le Torin. gr. 140. Il ne fait donc pas de doute qu'ils se rattachent à un centre vivant du culte des saints qu'ils célèbrent.

L'étude de la tradition du texte des Miracles des saints Cyr et Jean montre ainsi deux phénomènes distincts. D'une part, dans les collections hagiographiques classiques, les collections de miracles, pour la plupart, sont peu et mal diffusées et n'ont pas suscité d'intérêt. C'est sur ce fond que se distinguent certains manuscrits exceptionnels, qui doivent retenir l'attention parce qu'ils sont les témoins, parlants ou muets, de l'histoire d'un culte, à laquelle la tradition des collections de miracles est spécialement liée.
La fonction des miracles dans l’hagiographie serbe

Le miracle, ainsi que des événements surnaturels qui l’entourent, apparaît sous une variété de représentations. Le rôle principal du récit sur le don merveilleux, soit qu’il fasse partie constituante du texte hagiographique proprement dit ou se trouve incorporé dans un recueil des miracles, est de témoigner de la vérité divine. Nous tenterons de démontrer ici que ce récit correspond dans certaines circonstances aux tendances plus vastes de l’ordre politique et idéologique. La capacité thaumaturgique du saint, porteuse d’un message reconnaissable, remplit diverses fonctions au sein de la narration hagiographique. Les miracula servent à transmettre une expérience vécue. En même temps ces récits répondent au désir de l’hagiographe de conserver la mémoire d’un miracle à partir du témoignage direct de celui qui en a été bénéficiaire ou y assisté. C’est surtout cette qualité du témoignage oculaire ou attesté par les témoins, transmis dans la forme écrite, qui permet à faire revivre au lecteur la dynamique de l’événement tout en lui faisant percevoir la relation entre l’événement, son écriture sous une forme particulière et les modalités d’identification du miracle. La façon dont le récit construit la description du miracle dépend largement du type de texte. Ces formes incluent les protagonistes, les témoins, ainsi que le public, voire la place du miracle par rapport à la diversité des sous-genres de l’écriture hagiographique (passions, vies, procès de canonisation) et par rapport à la sainteté individuelle.

Les textes qui font l’objet de cette étude ont été créés dans le but de célébrer les saints serbes. Les vies de saints serbes se distinguent de la tradition de l’hagiographie byzantine par de nombreuses particularités, surtout parce qu’elles privilégient le type de la sainteté royale. Le fait crucial pour leur définition est que la canonisation dans le contexte serbe se déroulait de manière « non-formelle », c’est-à-dire que le culte s’instaurait progressivement grâce aux moyens liturgiques. Cette absence de la canonisation officielle a conditionné le caractère et la fonction particuliers des récits des miracles au sein des vies des saints, ainsi que le choix des moyens de l’identification du miracle. En suivant les processus de la définition du portrait hagiographique du roi saint parmi les Serbes conformément au modèle du rex christianissimus, nous prêterons une attention particulière au rôle qu’avaient les miracles des saints dans l’inclusion du « panthéon » national serbe au chœur de la sainteté chrétienne générale. Ce processus de l’ «inclusion» est considéré comme l’entrée de la communauté entière du « peuple élu » dans l’Histoire sainte. Il s’effectuait sous diverses formes, surtout par la propagation du culte des reliques et des icônes miraculeuses, ainsi que par l’adaptation des hagiographies (vies) des saints serbes à la grande tradition de l’orthodoxie. La qualité thaumaturgique offrait le cadre indispensable pour cette pratique, modelant de manière décisive le type de la sainteté célébrée dans le récit.

En nous appuyant sur le matériau hagiographique serbe, nous aborderons la question du miracle en tant que porteur d’un modèle spécifique de sainteté dans son rapport avec l’évolution du culte. C’est la châsse du martyr où les reliques sont déposées qui sert de point de départ à la diffusion du culte premièrement lié au sanctuaire. L’histoire du don merveilleux peut être considérée comme
partie intégrante d’une multitude de rites, soit qu’il s’agisse des cérémonies opérées dans l’espace réel et concret du sanctuaire ou d’un témoignage écrit du miracle. Qu’il soit question du rite d’incubation, de la participation des fidèles à la veillée en l’honneur du saint thaumaturge (quand ils accèdent à la châsse pour la toucher et prendre le cérat ou le myron, instrument de la guérison), ou que, d’autre part, l’eulogie et l’icône du saint soient le vecteur de son pouvoir thaumaturgique, tous les rites concernant la promotion du miracle se trouvent en relation étroite avec les expériences religieuses et le message contenu dans le récit concret. La fonction spécifique des exploits miraculeux du saint est le mieux perceptible dans la diversité des stratégies narratives et les différentes façons d’insertion des cultes dans leur contexte social.

**Le miracle comme porteur d’un nouveau modèle de sainteté**

a) Le miracle et les stratégies narratives

Pour construire l’image spécifique du saint local, les hagiographes serbes partaient de la topique traditionnelle propre à ce genre littéraire, qui entendant la reprise des clichés invétérés du récit du merveilleux. L’analyse des procédés de l’appropriation de ces modèles et *topoi* dans l’hagiographie serbe permet d’aboutir aux conclusions plus larges. Le choix de souligner le caractère du saint, « élu de Dieu » et thaumaturge, d’une façon reconnaissable aux cercles de l’élite médiévale, conditionne la définition du rapport envers « la mémoire commune », recourant aux parallèles bibliques. C’est pourquoi la première question qui se pose à propos des *vies* de saints serbes est de dégager les manières dont leurs auteurs adaptaient une image tout à fait particulière du saint aux concepts généraux de l’Histoire sainte.

L’introduction de certains stéréotypes relatifs à la mémoire historique de l’époque, ainsi que des modèles canonisés dans la réalité imaginaire de l’hagiographie, avait pour but principal de faire revivre un texte saint devant les yeux des contemporains. Cette stratégie narrative visait à faire des héros de l’hagiographie ceux de l’Histoire sainte aussi, pour que leurs miracles soient reconnus à l’échelle des effets merveilleux du christianisme. Suivant l’idée principale de rendre le passé directement appréhensible dans la réalité de la narration en décrivant les miracles opérés par le héros de l’hagiographie, les écrivains serbes utilisaient le procédé de l’imitation du Christ pour ouvrir au public la voie directe vers un passé saint toujours vivant. Pour ce faire, ils plaçaient les hauts faits des saints locaux dans un contexte compréhensible aux lecteurs grâce à l’utilisation de la typologie biblique. Par cette « percée dans le présent » s’adressant au public/ au lecteur, les auteurs des vies de saints rejoignaient les niveaux temporels différents pour « élargir la vie de saint par le récit des miracles ».

Considérons d’abord les textes hagiographiques ayant une importance essentielle pour la compréhension de la nature de cet élargissement.1 Le sous-texte de ces compositions, où l’auteur

---

s'adresse à ses contemporains, favorise un concept authentique de l'inclusion du héros-thaumaturge dans le processus de la création d'une nouvelle mémoire de la Terre Sainte. Ce procédé associe la narration universelle du récit biblique à l'exploit concret du saint serbe. La pratique en remonte à l'époque des premières hagiographies de saint Sava de Serbie. Il faut surtout y remarquer la fonction des « miracles au voyage » produits par le saint. Il s'agit d'abord de l'exemple du célèbre pèlerinage que Sava avait entrepris à l'instar du Christ, et par lequel il a offert l'exemple à tous ses compatriotes, futurs pèlerins. Ce procédé, dont le moine athonite Domentian se sert dans la première vie de Sava, instaure l'identité chrétienne du « peuple élu », du « nouvel Israël ». Le pèlerinage de Sava, une des expériences religieuses les plus édifiantes, forgeait en même temps sa propre identité du saint ; confirmée par les « miracles au voyage », elle accordait à l'ensemble du peuple serbe l'ouverture vers « la voie glorieuse de Jérusalem ». Le récit des miracles unit en effet deux motifs importants : le pèlerinage vers la Terre Sainte et la manifestation du pouvoir thaumaturgique de saint Sava. Les miracles que Sava accomplis en voyage dans la Terre Sainte, ainsi que les conséquences de ce pèlerinage, donnaient une nouvelle identité au peuple élu serbe qui se forgeait ainsi une place dans l'Histoire sainte. Les stratégies narratives de Domentian appuient explicitement ce dessein. D'abord, l'utilisation des allusions typologiques reconnaissables représentait une stratégie invétérée d'introduire dans le texte saint le monde monacal – aussi bien celui au sein duquel se déroule l'action du récit que celui auquel le récit s'adresse. D'autre part, le récit des miracles avait pour but, tout comme les reliques ou les tombes en tant que lieux sacrés de la manifestation divine, de contribuer à l'efficacité de la prière. Comme les prières de Sava (ainsi que ses actions merveilleuses) représentaient la garantie du salut collectif du peuple que Domentian désigne de 'nouvel Israël', il est évident que l'auteur cherche par cet exemple édifiant à mettre le récit des miracles au service des messages d'une portée plus large.

D'autres auteurs des vie de saints serbes recourent aux mêmes stratégies narratives en tant que moyens littéraires invétérés accentuant la capacité thaumaturgique du saint à servir d’intermédiaire entre Dieu et le peuple entier, une sorte d’enjeu du salut collectif. Les vie des premiers saints serbes, Syméon et Sava, tout comme la célèbre hagiographie de l'anachorète saint Pierre de Korisha, s'en servent déjà : les auteurs incluent dans le récit la description physique des héros, sur le visage, afin de dévoiler « les secrets cachés à l'intérieur du corps ». Inspiré principalement par la Vie de saint Antoine, ce procédé est repris des descriptions hagiographiques des grands ascètes que les pèlerins fréquentaient dans le désert. La rencontre avec les saints, surtout le contact avec leur corps qui fait objet des descriptions minutieuses à l'instar des grands modèles bibliques, permet aux pèlerins d'atteindre le passé saint. Le corps du saint, avec lequel le pèlerin entre en contact soit en touchant la tombe, soit, dans le cas des fidèles occupant une haute position sociale, par l'interrerement ad sanctos, sert de médiateur du miracle. En se donnant la tâche d'évoquer le contant du fidèle avec le passé saint, le récit hagiographique avait pour but de revivre un monde inaccessible au public.

La stratégie principale dont se servent les récits et les recueils des miracles repose sur l’émulation des miracles du Christ renvoyant au Nouveau Testament. Il représente non seulement la source d’où les hagiographes puisent les thèmes et les motifs, mais également la toile de fond idéologique et esthétique qui est la seule à permettre la compréhension complète des textes. Le nœud liturgique du récit néotestamentaire sert de cadre de réception de la vie du saint, de « code » pour déchiffrer les messages véhiculés par celle-ci. Un bon exemple en est la pratique de l’inscription des chartes sur le mur des églises, surtout des chartes de remerciement pour le miracle accompli. Tout comme l’écriture du texte sacré de la charte sur le mur, la lecture de la Bible, des hagiographies et des offices des saints dans le même espace de l’église indique la fusion des plans spatio-temporels différents. C’est ainsi que le présent actuel du fidèle qui prie, témoin du miracle, est au mieux inclus au présent éternel du texte saint.


Une autre pratique bien répandue est de « noter » le témoignage des événements produits à l’intérieur du sanctuaire par l’entremise de l’agent du merveilleux non seulement dans le catalogue des miracles et dans les textes hagiographiques, mais aussi en laissant des offrandes ou des amulettes. L’inscription des textes de remerciement en guise de chartes de donation « sur la pierre », c’est-à-dire sur le mur même de l’église abritant la relique miraculeuse, est à considérer dans cette optique. La coutume a ses origines dans les dons que les souverains offraient aux institutions religieuses. De tels miracles dans la piété serbe sont usuelslement vus comme résultat de l’action de dynamis auprès de la tombe des saints. Les miracles attribués aux saints souverains de la lignée des Némanides, fondateurs des temples servant de scène aux manifestations miraculeuses concrètes, sont particulièrement importants pour notre sujet. Les textes de célébration, en plus de témoigner de la piété des souverains et de l’éterniser, revêtent davantage le caractère sacré par l’emphase des traits liturgiques. Un même événement miraculeux se trouvait au centre de tous ces textes, aussi bien des chartes témoignant du miracle et exprimant la gratitude pour celui-ci, que des descriptions du miracle au sein du texte de célébration dont on faisait la lecture dans l’église. La charte attestant des guérisons miraculeuses, étroitement associées aux dons offerts aux monastères, acquiert elle-même une nature apotropaïque grâce à l’endroit de son inscription – à l’entrée même de l’église. Ce témoignage écrit et public du miracle obtient donc lui aussi des qualités merveilleuses, car les dons importants garantissent de nouvelles guérisons.

L’écriture des témoignages du miracle sur le mur de l’église, ainsi que les récits des miracles figurant au sein du texte hagiographique, tissent le lien nécessaire avec l’Écriture sainte, qui assure le miracle eucharistique au cours de la liturgie et dont la force expressive est accumulée dans les descriptions des miracles du Christ. Le consécration du texte hagiographique se faisait donc par un
lien métaphorique avec la légende néostamentaire, c'est-à-dire par les processus de l'*identification* et du *transfert de la signification*. Ce procédé des hagiographes serbes se trouve en parfait correspondance avec la tradition hagiographique byzantine. On peut en suivre les analogies à partir du schéma de composition des *vies* byzantines jusqu'aux principes de construction cruciaux pour la compréhension de la structure de ces récits, variant selon le contexte de l'action du thaumaturge par rapport à la communauté. Soit que le miracle se produise en présence d'autrui, vu comme l'entourage social du saint (« le monde des gens en groupes »), soit qu'il résulte du rapport que le saint entretient avec la « nature », c'est-à-dire avec son propre être intérieur, avec Dieu et avec le cadre naturel au sein duquel le saint agit (« le monde de la solitude »), la façon de modeler le récit reposait sur les règles et schémas hagiographiques reconnaissables. C'est précisément par rapport à ces phénomènes qu'il faut lire et interpréter l'identité du saint en tant qu'agent du merveilleux et, plus largement, la fonction du récit des miracles au sein des *vies*.

b) L'identité du saint-thaumaturge

Pour mieux élucider la question de l'identité du saint thaumaturge, cruciale pour la compréhension de la fonction du merveilleux au sein du récit, mais aussi parmi un collectif plus large où agit le saint, il est indispensable de se pencher sur la typologie des miracles dans les hagiographies serbes. Sommairement parlant, on distingue les miracles du saint encore vivant d'une part, et ceux opérés *post mortem* de l'autre, que l'on peut répertorier en sous-catégories citées ci-après.

L'analyse des catalogues des miracles des saints serbes en dégage plusieurs types : la première catégorie regroupe les guérisons miraculeuses opérées soit par le toucher, l'écoulement du *myron*, l'invocation du nom, soit par l'entremise des objets consacrés (croix pectorale). Ces miracles ont lieu grâce à l'action de *dynamis* auprès de la tombe, mais on peut y ajouter la capacité médiatrice d'un vivant d'inciter un saint à l'action merveilleuse – les hagiographes serbes notent cette pratique de l'action commune des vivants et des morts sous le nom de « chœur des saints serbes ». La deuxième catégorie comprend les miracles d'exorcisme et de retour à la vie. Une catégorie à part entière englobe les miracles dits « patriotiques » : il s'agit des prières par lesquelles les saints aident les armes serbes à lutter contre l'ennemi. Y appartiennent aussi les miracles particuliers en vue de la protection de la fondation religieuse du saint des ennemis extérieurs, qui sont le propre, par exemple, du catalogue des miracles de Stefan de Dečani et de sa fondation pieuse. Le culte de Stefan de Dečani est toujours actif, devant sa longévité tant aux effets miraculeux des reliques qu'à l'élargissement continu du catalogue des miracles. Le contexte dans lequel se trouve actuellement le monastère – exemple unique de la vulnérabilité physique d'un lieu sacré sur le sol européen – ajoute un trait particulièrement intéressant à ces miracles.

Les miracles de saint Sava de Serbie, le seul saint parmi les Némanides à avoir accompli les miracles de son vivant, ont une importance considérable pour la typologie des saints serbes. Son portrait hagiographique a été créé selon le modèle typique du saint-thaumaturge. Présentés selon les règles de la littérature hagiographique byzantine, les miracles de Sava unissent les trois éléments caractéristiques pour les recueils des miracles mentionnés dans l'hagiographie serbe. Doté de pouvoirs charismatiques et de l' autorité, Sava guérit, en premier lieu, par l'imposition des mains, par la prière, les larmes « brûlantes » et l'eau sanctifiée par la Vraie Croix ; il accomplit aussi des résurrections et des exorcismes. Son amour envers Dieu, source d'une forme particulière d'énergie (« le feu divin »), est l'agent de ses miracles et de sa force surnaturelle.
Les manières dont les auteurs des vie de Sava définissent sa sainteté méritent attention. Il s’agit des épithètes de « surnaturel », de « merveilleux » ou de « terrible », employés également pour décrire les réactions des témoins qui assistaient aux miracles. La théologie byzantine est profondément marquée par la catégorie du surnaturel, qui engendre une pensée théologique dominée par les notions d’inhabituel et de paradoxal. Enoncés narratifs particuliers que l’on retrouve dans les recueils des miracles - l’inhabituel, le paradoxal, le merveilleux et le terrible - appartiennent aux champs sémantiques du miraculeux. Il s’agit d’une sorte de système de dénomination servant de base pour que le récit du merveilleux puissent être reconnu comme porteur d’une fonction spécifique au sein du texte hagiographique. L’analyse de la réécriture hagiographique, différant de la vita prima du saint, offre une explication évidente des raisons d’une nouvelle commande de l’écriture, dont nous avons déjà démontré la portée politique.2 Cependant, qu’il s’agisse de la vita prima ou de la metaphrase hagiographique, la fonction essentielle du recueil de miracles, voire de l’effet qu’il produit dans la société pour laquelle le récit a été créé, ne peut être analysée que par rapport à l’identité thaumaturgique du saint. Une plus forte récurrence de la collection des miracles dans le monde byzantin apparaît au début du XIVe siècle ; elle coïncide avec le règne d’Andronic II Paléologue, restituteur de l’orthodoxie, et dans une moindre mesure avec celui de son grand-fils Andronic III. Les relations qu’entretenaient la cour serbe avec ces deux emperateurs étaient très intenses. Elles remontent à l’entrée du roi serbe Stefan Milutin dans la famille impériale par le mariage avec Simonide, fille d’Andronic II, pour continuer à l’époque de l’enfermement de Stefan, fils aîné du roi, avec sa famille pendant sept ans à Constantinople, où il tissa une relation étroite avec le vieil empereur. Les rapports ambivalents des deux cours se prolongent dans la période du règne du roi et empereur Stefan Dušan d’un côté, et d’Andronic II Paléologue, Jean VI Cantacuzène et Jean V Paléologue de l’autre. Qu’il s’agisse de l’hostilité directe ou des différends politiques, ils témoignent des liens serrés entre les deux pays, particulièrement importants pour notre sujet du fait des influences sur le plan des positions envers la religion et l’Église. Elles sont particulièrement saillantes dans les manières de l’expression de la piété, modelant conséquemment les regards sur le miraculeux. Surtout après la restauration de l’orthodoxie sous le vieil empereur Andronic, ces modifications deviennent perceptibles dans la création de nouveaux recueils des miracles, le renouvellement de l’intérêt pour les cultes de saints existants, ainsi que pour la rédaction de nouveaux textes de célébration.

Le renouvellement des qualités merveilleuses de certains sanctuaires de la capitale surgit après une période de l’arrêt temporaire de leur effet guérisseur, coïncidant avec l’occupation latine de Constantinople. Maxim, le diacre du monastère de saints Côme et Damien à Cosmidion, donne une description exhaustive de ces cas, relatant les miracles d’autrefois relatifs au monastère, ainsi que leur resurgissement. Une description pareille figure chez Nicéphore Calliste Xanthopoulos qui informe sur l’effet de la source miraculeuse du monastère constantinopolitain de la Vierge de la Source, sa disparition, et son resurgissement. Louant les actions d’Andronic II en vue du renouveau de l’orthodoxie, Xanthopoulos souligne la multiplication des miracles à l’époque de son règne. Le récit des miracles anciens se voit couramment complété par les événements nouveaux, sotut ceux des guérisons, ajoutées au catalogue existant.

La pratique hagiographique susmentionnée de répertorier les nouveaux miracles de la capitale, dont la disparition provisoire était liée aux circonstances politiques, se reflète également

dans le matériau hagiographique serbe. Nous soulignerons ici une coïncidence intéressante des raisons que les hagiographes byzantins et serbes donnent pour la suspension des effets des sources miraculeuses et d’autres formes de guérisons. Le cas serbe le plus important en est la cessation de l’écoulement du myron miraculeux de la tombe de saint Syméon à Studenica, correspondant au niveau temporel à l’occupation latine de Constantinople. On sait bien que le myron miraculeux garantissait la prospérité du royaume des successeurs de Syméon en tant que manifestation de la protection divine dont le jeune état serbe jouissait par l’intermédiaire des saints nationaux. C’est principalement le culte de saint Syméon, fondateur de la sainte lignée des Némanides, qui assurait ce lien direct avec la grace divine, garantissant la protection de l’au-delà. Ce culte était modelé dans tous les points cruciaux, entre autres au sein de la narration hagiographique, à l’instar du culte de saint Démétrius, ce dont témoigne l’analyse du répertoire et de la fonction de ses miracles. L’épisode de la suspension de la myroblitie auprès de la tombe de saint Syméon est décrit dans les deux vies de saint Sava par Domentian et Théodose. À cette occasion, le roi serbe actuel supplie son frère, futur saint Sava, « médiateur dans le miracle », d’intercéder pour la restitution de la source guérisseuse. Ne voulant pas quitter le Mont Athos, Sava rédige une lettre, qu’il envoie auprès de la tombe de son père par l’intermédiaire du moine Hillarion. L’auteur de la vie de Sava commente cet événement en expliquant que les reliques de Syméon ont perdu leur effet myroblite « à cause de nos péchés », pensant probablement à la guerre civile entre les héritiers de Nemanja. Le miracle qui s’ensuivit (le myron recommence à couler) résultait de l’action commune des deux saints, le mort Syméon et le vivant Sava. Cette complicité dans le miracle se déroulait d’une manière étonnante : Sava aurait d’abord écrit une lettre à son feu père (« il adressa une lettre à son père le thaumaturge, vivant même après la mort »). Ensuite, il instruisit son envoyé comment présider la liturgie auprès de la tombe de saint Syméon et lui ordonna de lire la lettre en question, après quoi le myron déborda à nouveau de la tombe et des reliques. Cet exemple illustre parfaitement le lien (perceptible aussi bien dans les récits des miracles) que l’on trouvait entre la suspension des effets guérisseurs et miraculeux des reliques et les péchés actuels des compatriotes, voire les grandes catastrophes politiques.

De cette manière, le miracle devient un paramètre permettant de saisir le lien actif entre deux plans temporels, deux réalités toujours vivantes dans l’hagiographie, toutes les deux également importantes pour la compréhension des ressorts qui ont engendré les nouveaux recueils des miracles. Le premier plan temporel se réfère à la réalisation du miracle même, tandis que le second renvoie au contexte social de la création de l’histoire du miracle. C’est précisément ce lien entre les deux plans, ainsi que le rapport du recueil envers les circonstances dans lesquelles naît un culte concret, qui explique la fonction des recueils des miracles, c’est-à-dire les raisons de la création d’une nouvelle histoire du merveilleux, qu’il soit question de a) décrire un miracle connu, b) en raconter la nouvelle instauration, ou c) de répertorier un nouveau miracle.
Narrative Techniques in the Byzantine (Greek) Collections of Miracles

Both as autonomous texts or as long sections inserted into or appended to a saint's vita, Byzantine Greek collections of miracles make up a rather modest corpus of about thirty texts. Produced between the fifth and the fourteenth centuries, they are characterized by such a remarkable diversity and variety that it would be fair to qualify them as unica. This characterization largely applies to the different narrative paths that the authors of these collections followed in order to assemble the constituent elements of a miracle story: the spatio-temporal setting, the identity of the beneficiary, the description of the 'evil' (usually a sore or illness), the circumstances of healing, and the final praise of the healing saint or healing shrine. The evident need to reproduce this standard framework did not result in stories cast in one and the same mould. The saint and/or the site that they promoted, the target group they aimed at, the period and the milieu in which they were composed, let alone their social status (ecclesiastic, monastic, lay), erudition, and writing skills are all critical parameters that one should consider in order to explain this differentiation. Aside from all these coordinates, one should also take into account the literary priorities of each author seen through the emphasis laid upon the story rather upon the hero (and vice versa), his interest in medical detail, his intention to captivate the reader/listener's attention by playing with his/her expectations. Finally, an additional consideration is the insertion of the author into his own text, his will to assign an autobiographical twist to his collection, a feature that at once would reinforce the veracity of his account and his commitment to the cause of a saint's cult or the reputation of a healing shrine.
Πανταχοῦ προφθάνει
Remarques sur les Miracles de S. Nicolas

Dans son article fondateur sur les collections de miracles, H. Delehaye met de côté le dossier de S. Nicolas et, dans une étude récente, S. Efthymiadis souligne en effet sa singularité. Cette marginalité, jointe à la fortune exceptionnelle du culte de Nicolas à partir du IXe s., incite à reconsidérer le cas de ce grand thaumaturge pour voir ce qu’il enseigne sur les récits de miracles et leurs collections.

Comme l’a montré Anrich, le fait dominant, pour l’histoire des textes, est qu’il ne semble pas avoir existé de Vie ancienne de S. Nicolas, dont le culte était pourtant établi à Myra dès le Ve s. Le premier texte conservé est un long récit de miracle, la Praxis de stratelatis, qui montre Nicolas, évêque de Myra, sauver, dans sa ville, trois innocents condamnés à mort, puis, quelque temps après, secourir à Constantinople trois stratèles injustement accusés de comploter contre l’empereur Constantin, auquel le saint apparaît en songe et révèle la vérité. Ce récit, connu au VIe s., a circulé de façon autonome. Très populaire, il est le noyau autour duquel se forment des ensembles plus complexes.

Pour Anrich, le premier récit biographique est la Vie de S. Nicolas par Michel, du IXe s. Une première section, sur l’enfance et la jeunesse, est marquée par deux miracles : alors qu’il tète encore sa mère, Nicolas respecte le jeûne du mercredi et du vendredi ; après la mort de ses parents, maître de sa fortune, il dépose secrètement trois sacs d’or dans la maison d’un voisin ruiné qui peut ainsi marier ses trois filles, qu’il s’apprêtait à prostituer (Praxis de tribus filiabus). Vient ensuite le récit du choix et de l’ordination de Nicolas comme métropolite de Myra, puis une section consacrée à son activité épiscopale : destruction des temples païens ; Praxis de stratelatis ; récit sur des marins que Nicolas sauve en mer (Praxis de nautis) ; récit sur l’intervention de Nicolas, qui, lors d’une famine, nourrit la Lycie avec le blé que lui donnent des marins convoyant l’annone (Praxis de navibus frumentariis). Michel signale aussi l’action de Nicolas contre les hérétiques, puis, dans une dernière section, raconte la mort du saint, son ensevelissement dans une tombe d’où jaillit le myron, et enfin un miracle posthume. La Vie par Michel est donc un enchaînement de récits sur les hauts faits du saint. Certains ont eu une existence indépendante : la Praxis de stratelatis certainement ; la Praxis de navibus frumentariis sans doute, puisqu’elle est antérieure à la conquête arabe.

Le cycle de saint Nicolas s’enrichit ensuite et, dans un éloge attribué à Méthode de Constantinople, on trouve en particulier, à la fin, trois miracles posthumes, dont l’un au moins est contemporain de l’auteur. On voit naître, au IXe s. également, une petite collection autonome de trois miracles posthumes postérieurs à la conquête arabe. Une autre collection comprend six miracles : les trois miracles finaux de l’éloge par Méthode, et la collection de trois miracles. Dans certains manuscrits, d’autres miracles viennent s’ajouter. Enfin à l’époque des Paléologues, Nicéphore Calliste compose en vers une collection réunissant les miracles omis par le Métaphraste.
Sans parler du dernier texte, qui illustre la renaissance de ce genre hagiographique à l'époque des Paléologues, plusieurs faits apparaissent: la frontière entre collections de miracles et Vies ou éloges est poreuse; il existe des récits de miracles autonomes, qui peuvent même jouer un rôle moteur. De textes divers émerge le cycle des miracles du saint dont il faut souligner l'importance et la fonction.

D'ordinaire, c'est la Passion ou la Vie qui fait le saint et qui explique d'éventuels miracles posthumes. Dans le cas de Nicolas, l'inverse se produit: les miracles font le saint. Nicolas, dans les textes, n'a guère d'existence en-dehors des hauts faits qui construisent sa sainteté. Leur registre est celui qu'on attend d'un évêque: protection contre les abus de pouvoir, les injustices, les impôts excessifs; approvisionnement de la communauté menacée par la famine; action aussi contre les païens et les hérétiques. De façon plus topique, Nicolas, évêque du port d'Andriakê, secourt les marins en mer. Les deux miracles de l'enfance ont un statut différent: le premier, sur la continence miraculeuse de Nicolas têtant sa mère, annonce une sainteté cléricale; le second, la Praxis de tribus filiabus, qualifie Nicolas pour l'entrée dans le clergé, puis dans l'épiscopat. Il s'intègre ainsi au récit mais a lui aussi un relief et une autonomie qui donneront à Nicolas le rôle particulier qu'il assume en Occident.

Ainsi, le cycle des miracles de Nicolas vivant dessine sa sainteté. Il conditionne aussi pour l'essentiel les récits des miracles posthumes qui se développent surtout dans deux directions: le secours à distance des captifs; le secours porté aux marins ou aux voyageurs en mer. C'est ce que montre la collection des six miracles, qui ne contient aucun miracle de guérison.

Cette typologie particulièrre explique déjà qu'il n'y ait pas de collection des miracles de saint Nicolas au sens habituel du terme, centrée autour de sa tombe. Un autre facteur d'explication concerne le rapport de Nicolas avec l'espace. Le récit sur les stratélates peut là encore servir de point de départ. Le premier haut fait de Nicolas se déroule à Myra, où le saint délivre trois prisonniers. Mais l'épisode saillant a pour théâtre Constantinople, où Nicolas, apparaissant à Constantin et au préfet Ablabios, sauve les trois stratélates. Nicolas, de son vivant déjà, agit chez lui à Myra mais aussi plus largement, à distance. Dans les miracles posthumes, on trouve la même relation avec l'espace. La tombe de saint Nicolas, à Myra, est un lieu de miracles et de pèlerinage. Elle occupe une place notable mais nullement centrale, ni même dominante. Sans parler des sanctuaires secondaires, Nicolas, à l'époque médiévale, apparaît comme le saint capable de porter secours au loin à ceux qui l'invoquent. On le voit en particulier dans la prière sur laquelle s'achèvent ses Périodoi et qui, imitée par ailleurs des Actes de sainte Marina, commence par ces mots qui lui sont propres: « Seigneur Jésus Christ... si quelqu'un prend refuge en mon nom, alors qu'il a besoin de ton secours, accorde-lui ce que demande son cœur; si quelqu'un, persécuté par des tyrans, prend refuge en mon nom, accorde lui de les vaincre. Si quelqu'un, menacé par les flots, est englouti dans la mer et qu'il t' invoque par mon nom, foule aux pieds les flots et sauve ceux qui t'invoquent. » Nous retrouvons ici les principales attributions de Nicolas, mais nous voyons surtout que, pour obtenir un miracle, c'est le nom du saint qui est mis en avant. Aisément accessible à tous, l'invocation du nom, jointe à la faculté qu'a Nicolas d'agir au loin, fait de ce saint un thaumaturge disponible pour tous, partout: πανταχοῦ προφθανει, « partout, il arrive à temps ». Ce motif, présent dans plusieurs textes, explique la diffusion générale du culte de Nicolas au Moyen Âge et sans doute aussi le fait que son culte local, à Myra, n'a pas suscité de collection.
Les recueils de miracles de saint Eugène de Trébizond : composer, compiler, réécrire

De par sa complexité et par sa richesse, le dossier hagiographique sur Eugénios de Trébizonde se prête à la réflexion autour des mécanismes de composition des recueils de miracles dans le monde byzantin, et plus précisément à l’époque paléologue. Grâce aux travaux de J. O. Rosenqvist, les principales pièces du dossier sont désormais accessibles, dans une édition critique solide et une traduction anglaise fiable. Ces documents, qui ne sont transmis dans leur ensemble que par le ms. Athos, Monastère de Dionysiou, 154, sont les suivants : a) l’Encomium du saint par Constantin Loukitès (BHG 609), b) les Miracles par Jean Xiphilin (BHG 610), c) le Logos (BHG 611) et d) la Synopsis (BHG 612-613) par Jean Lazaropoulos. Ces pièces constituent une mine d’informations et sont souvent mis à profit par les historiens dans maints domaines : l’histoire de l’empire de Trébizond, le culte de saint Eugénios, marqué par une discontinuité flagrante, la culture matérielle, par exemple les fameuses lampes du saint qui reviennent sans cesse, la médecine paléologue, avec une orientation sensiblement érudite.

A l’origine de ce recueil, tel qu’on le lit dans le ms. de Dionysiou, se trouve Jean Lazaropoulos, métropolite de Trébizonde (1364-1367), à qui revient non seulement la rédaction des deux textes les plus riches du dossier (le Logos et la Synopsis) mais aussi la conception à proprement parler du dossier, le travail d’édition et de compilation des documents. Cette entreprise est empreinte d’une forte couleur politique, qui frôle la propagande : c’est un recueil réuni à la gloire de l’empire de Trébizond, et plus précisément, à la gloire du monastère de Saint-Eugénios. Le couronnement d’Alexios III en 1349 dans ce même monastère est révélateur du rôle politique que l’endroit serait appelé à assumer ; ce contexte constitue la toile de fond de cette compilation, dans laquelle Fallmerayer voyait déjà le « codex national » de l’empire de Trébizond. Par ailleurs, les recherches récentes sur les manuscrits et les bibliothèques de la région peuvent éclairer les circonstances de sa genèse : les liens avec le monastère de Dionysiou que son sort illustre bien, les textes qui circulaient à Trébizond au XIVe s. dans les bibliothèques des personnages comme Constantin Loukitès et Andréas Libadènos, intimement liés à la confection de ce recueil.

Le présent travail se propose de reprendre le dossier en examinant le processus éditorial, que sa composition impliqua. Si le travail de Rosenqvist est précieux pour les realia et les aspects historiques, il nous semble qu’une étude littéraire de la structure des récits de miracles reste à faire et que l’apparat des sources et des lieux parallèles pourrait être souvent étoffé. Nous examinerons surtout les deux textes composés par Lazaropoulos, afin de pénétrer dans son « atelier » de travail.


et de voir plus clair dans la façon dont celui-ci et ses collaborateurs traitaient du matériau qu’ils avaient à leur disposition et dont le noyau remonte au IXᵉ s. Comme Rosenqvist le met en évidence, les difficultés textuelles laissent entendre que les sources étaient souvent en piètre état, ce qui ne facilitait pas la tâche. On a parfois l’impression de se trouver face à un copier-coller maladroit qui nuit à la cohérence du récit : si les histoires racontées restent proches dans le temps, les personnages qui y défient apparaissent parfois ex abrupto et l’unité temporelle est souvent fragile.

On the Transformation of the Miracles from the 7th to 14th Century in a Centre of Byzantine Periphery: The Miracles of St. Demetrios, Theodora and Gregory Palamas

(No text)
La Vie et les miracles de sainte Thomaïs de Lesbos

Thomaïs est une femme mariée, née à Lesbos mais qui a vécu à Constantinople dans la première moitié du Xe siècle. La plus ancienne Vie de Thomaïs de Lesbos (BHG 2454) aurait été écrite au milieu du Xe siècle par un auteur anonyme et a peut-être été révisée au XIe siècle. Elle a été éditée par Hippolyte Delehaye dans les Acta Sanctorum Novembris. Cette Vie est intéressante d’une part parce qu’elle est une des rares vies qui retrace la sainteté d’une femme mariée laïque comme pour la Vie de Marie la Jeune. Mais d’autre part, la Vie et le dossier de miracles qui s’y trouve nous donne la possibilité de suivre les différentes étapes de la construction de la sainteté de Thomaïs de son vivant et après sa mort, ainsi que de la constitution de son « espace sacré » à Constantinople dans l’église du monastère de femmes « Ta Mikra Rómaïou » dont sa mère Kalè était la supérieure.

De son vivant la sainte circule parmi de grands sanctuaires constantinopolitains ce qui n’est pas sans rappeler la Vie d’une autre grande sainte mariée de Constantinople: Matrôna de Pergé au Vᵉ siècle qui comme Thomaïs est unie à un homme méchant. Thomaïs subit patiemment les coups infligés par son mari, ce qui la connecte à la figure du martyr, mais aussi aux récits hagiographiques de saints fous ainsi qu’à certains récits ascétiques protobyzantins de sainte femme. Le tout premier miracle de guérison de la sainte consiste à oindre un possédé avec de l’huile provenant probablement d’une lampe de l’icône de la Vierge des Blachernes, lors d’une procession de cette dernière. Ce n’est pas sans rappeler le premier miracle de Matrôna qui guérit lors d’une procession un aveugle en l’oignant de myron issu de la relique de la tête de saint Jean Baptiste. Thomaïs lors de ses visites aux sanctuaires guérit aussi bien homme, femme ou eunuque, elle n’est pas spécialisée dans un genre spécifique. Son ouverture aux trois genres est un précieux témoignage sur la composition de la société constantinopolitaine au Xᵉ siècle, mais aussi offre un contraste avec les miracles opérés dans un grand sanctuaire constantinopolitain de guérison à la même époque comme la Théotokos de Pégè. La Vie fournit aussi des indications sociales remarquables puisqu’elle mentionne notamment la guérison de prostituées, ses premiers miracles concernent des personnes plutôt modestes jusqu’à ce qu’un puissant personnage, Eutychianos, soit guéri par la sainte.

Après sa mort, le corps de la sainte n’est pas inhumé tout de suite dans l’église, son transfert n’a lieu qu’une fois un miracle opéré. Puis un « arc » (apsida) avec des icônes est bâti au-dessus du tombeau en remerciement d’un autre miracle de guérison.

Bien que les miracles à Byzance ne soient pas nécessaires pour justifier la sainteté, ceux-ci occupent une place essentielle dans la construction de la sainteté de Thomaïs telle que décrite par l’hagiographe. Ces miracles sont essentiellement des miracles de guérison, caractéristique certes traditionnelle dans l’hagiographie byzantine mais qui prennent une coloration particulière au vu de l’importance des sanctuaires où s’opèrent des guérisons miraculeuses à Constantinople comme la Théotokos de Pégè mais aussi au xenon de saint Sampson. Le mode de guérison varie notablement: eau de lavement de la sainte, huile sainte et surtout rêve. La Vie fournit un témoignage important.
sur le réseau et les itinéraires de la guérison à Constantinople. Elle rend compte des difficultés à constituer l'espace sacré de la sainte comme espace de guérison concurrentiel avec les autres sanctuaires de guérison de la capitale alors qu'elle ne dispose pas d'hagiasma, qu'il n'y a pas de myron et que l'on ne recourt pas à l'huile sainte des lampes ou à de la kérotè.
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(Introduzione)

L’arcaismo linguistico è considerato come uno tra gli aspetti più caratterizzanti della realtà culturale dell’Impero d’Oriente. Esso trae origine dallo straordinario influsso che esercitò la produzione letteraria attica del V-IV sec. a. C. sulla civiltà letteraria ellenistica ed imperiale, imponendo un modello che successivamente, grazie al movimento della cosiddetta ‘seconda sofistica’, divenne imprescindibile parametro di riferimento linguistico per qualunque tipo di espressione letteraria. La lingua classica, radicata così nella scuola e consolidatasi come strumento proprio delle élites culturali e nello stesso tempo dell’apparato amministrativo, fu adottata anche in ambito religioso, favorita dalla necessità di padroneggiare il greco dei Settanta e del NT, distante nello stesso tempo da quello classico e da quello parlato. All’interno delle varie realtà sociali e culturali il greco colto poteva atteggiarsi differentemente, dislocandosi su più livelli stilistici e su differenti piani di arcaismo - che potevano talora aprire ampi varchi a registri espressivi di livello più basso - ma in ogni caso questa situazione precluse alla lingua parlata per un tempo lunghissimo, fino al XII secolo, la possibilità di essere impiegata a scopi letterari. I caratteri dell’evoluzione del greco parlato lungo il medioevo possono perciò essere definiti a fatica, proprio per la mancanza di adeguata documentazione, ma certamente il confronto tra il greco dotto e quello volgare che dal XII secolo in poi possiamo desumere da tutta una serie di opere - prevalentemente poetiche - che dovrebbero darci un quadro in un certo senso abbastanza fedele ci pone dinanzi una situazione di chiara diglossia.

Tuttavia, in epoca tardo-paleologa, abbiamo testimonianze che ci indicano che questa non era intesa come tale, perché le caratteristiche del parlato sono descritte, da umanisti italiani che visitarono Costantinopoli nel ’400, in termini che fanno pensare ad una ben percepibile contiguità tra la lingua arcaizzante e il volgare (che d’altra parte è da supporre non si presentasse come un blocco omogeneo in tutti i territori della grecità, secondo quanto attesta anche l’umanista Francesco Filelfo, che distingue nettamente il greco parlato nella capitale da quello della Grecia continentale). Questo pone una questione che non è senza conseguenze per valutare correttamente le modalità di acquisizione della lingua dotta durante tutto il millennio bizantino, vale a dire se il sostrato nativo del greco quotidiano agevolasse - e, nel caso, in che misura - l’apprendimento della lingua arcaizzante, e ne garantisse, insieme con l’impegno di studio, l’impiego fluido e sicuro; e se questo sostrato esercitasse, come è del tutto probabile, anche su di essa una qualche forma di condizionamento (ai nostri occhi, tuttavia, molto difficilmente rilevabile). L’altra questione di capitale importanza per comprendere il successo dei letterati bizantini nel conseguire un più o meno elevato grado di
padronanza del greco antico, sempre più distanziato, sia morfologicamente sia sintatticamente, dal parlato, concerne gli strumenti e i procedimenti che caratterizzavano i percorsi di studio. In larga parte i manuali adoperati dai maestri si sono conservati, ma i loro contenuti non ci mettono in grado di spiegare l'efficacia del processo di apprendimento della lingua, processo in cui necessariamente devono suporsi implicati altri fattori che consentivano di accedere a nozioni escluse dalle trattazioni grammaticali, come quelle inerenti alle strutture sintattiche o al sistema dei segni diacritici e alle regole ortografiche proprie dell'uso bizantino, che troveranno poi applicazione nel passaggio dalla maiuscola alla minuscola nell'uso librario. Il quadro didattico, quindi, se appare ben documentato per quanto concerne le opere grammaticali e i lessici che proponevano più o meno ampie trattazioni degli aspetti morfologici e delle risorse lessicali della lingua, si è sottratto finora alle indagini per quanto invece riguarda la trasmissione di un 'sapere' grammaticale impostato sulle metodologie di lettura degli auctores. I processi di apprendimento che consentirono nei secoli di raggiungere alti livelli di applicazione del modello linguistico antico a Bisanzio rimangono pertanto ancora un fenomeno non perfettamente chiarito in tutta la sua complessità, e l'analisi in parallelo di realtà linguistiche di altre aree geografiche e di differenti contesti sociali e culturali potrebbe offrire un termine di confronto utile, sia nelle differenze sia nelle somiglianze, per comprendere le dinamiche che instaurano una diglossia - nella quale uno dei due poli è una lingua colta non più in uso - e i metodi didattici che consentono di mantenerla in vita.
Diglossia in Byzantium

Abstract

The paper seeks to address the issue of the relationship between the vernacular and the learned written registers in the Byzantine empire, especially in its late stages. It discusses the sociolinguistic notion of diglossia and how it featured in the Byzantine society. Moreover, it argues that the two literary traditions (archaizing and vernacular) should be best viewed as belonging to a linguistic continuum, which could explain the partial overlap of their linguistic features. On the basis of this approach, it proposes that traditional assumptions regarding the merit and chronology of the vernacular texts should be reconsidered in favour of a more nuanced, multifactorial linguistic analysis.

The transformations of the linguistic situation in Byzantium were constant, following the extraordinarily long social and political history of the empire, as expected. However, if one dimension of the situation can be said to have remained unaltered, this can only be the so-called ‘diglossia’ observed throughout the empire, especially in the latter stages of its history.

A sociolinguistic term, ‘diglossia’ is used to describe a situation in a linguistic community whereby the ‘official’ language / the language with the higher social prestige constitutes a greatly differentiated variety of the dominant spoken language in the community. In fact, the differentiation can be so great as to prohibit (or at least substantially undermine) mutual comprehensibility. In other words, the term refers to effectively monolingual communities with a sharp divide between the written (or the official) and the spoken (or the vernacular) linguistic varieties. Modern Greek constituted a classic case of diglossia with a clear differentiation between the so-called ‘katharevousa’, an archaizing variety used in official registers and ‘dimotiki’, which constituted the native variety of the majority of the population; this diglossic situation was eventually terminated in 1976 by the institutionalization of a ‘moderate’ dimotiki.

The key notion that differentiates ‘diglossia’ from other similar sociolinguistic situations is undoubtedly that of the monolingual community. While it is quite common to find two (or more) different languages for use in discrete registers in many linguistic communities, the same cannot be said for the employment of two distinct varieties of the same language. Bearing this important observation in mind, we turn to the issue of Byzantium and ask ourselves: is the notion of ‘diglossia’ relevant for the linguistic reality of the Byzantine empire?

It is well-known that, beginning from the 6th century and the final demise of Latin, the Byzantine state employed Greek as the sole official language of the administration in all its functions. Given the multiethnic and multilingual character of the empire at least till the 10th century, its sociolinguistic situation corresponds approximately to that of various modern states where minority languages are not given official status, which is accorded only to the socially dominant language (see for instance the situation in China, where Mandarin plays the role of the official language often to the detriment of languages spoken by smaller populations). In the later stages of the empire though, especially
from the 11th century onwards, the amassed territorial losses led to a relatively different society from a sociolinguistic point of view: Although many “foreigners” still lived in Byzantine territory (and especially in Constantinople), the latter essentially included areas that had been hellenized for centuries and, as a result, the majority of its population probably spoke Greek as its native (or at least its second) language, while a considerable number of Greek speakers found themselves under Western (mainly Frankish and Venetian) rule, giving rise to various language contact phenomena.

But what accounted for official Greek and what for spoken Greek in the late Byzantine period (ca. 11th-15th centuries)? By definition, because of its relative fixation and consequent long-standing stability through the centuries, the official variety must have been increasingly differentiated from the spoken Greek varieties, which must have undergone a great number of linguistic changes in all relevant levels (i.e. phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics / lexicon). In other words, it is quite certain that by the 11th century (and most probably much earlier) a situation of ‘diglossia’ emerged in the Byzantine state, at least with regard to its Greek speakers: the official variety of Greek reflected—to varying degrees— the Hellenistic Koine, while the spoken varieties continued uninhibited their path towards ever greater differentiation. Byzantine ‘diglossia’ is manifested in the two types of textual sources surviving from the late stages: the one comprises of all official documents and literary texts written in an archaizing manner, and the other of literary texts composed in the so-called ‘vernacular’, a variety arguably close to the spoken registers of the period.

The traditional scholarly literature on the subject appears to emphasize the divide between the two varieties of Greek. It has been re-interpreted (rather erroneously) as a divide between two different societies and, accordingly, the vernacular texts have been forcibly ‘extracted’ from the Byzantine tradition and taken to constitute the commencing of the Modern Greek language and literature (and perhaps Modern Greece in general?). This attitude is still extant and very much alive in the academic environment today, and the nature of those vernacular texts remains a highly debated topic. Obviously, this type of academic questions (e.g. “When does Modern Greek language start?”) depends as much on political and ideological considerations as on linguistic ones. Nevertheless, one can attempt to shed some new light on these issues by restricting one’s enquiry into the linguistic matters that are more readily investigated and accounted for.

Starting from the general picture, it is worth noting that ‘diglossia’ situations seldom—if ever—entail the complete isolation of the two (or more) differentiated varieties of the same language (let alone of their speakers). On the contrary, they often lead to a mixing of the two varieties, at least in written registers. This can be seen, for instance, in Modern Greek, since Standard Modern Greek has incorporated various features from the so-called ‘katharevousa’ while ignoring forms and morphological paradigms previously employed by supporters of ‘dimotiki’, despite the fact that the language question that plagued Modern Greece since its infancy in 1830s was supposedly resolved with the establishment of the ‘dimotiki’ variety as the official language of the state. Obviously, the social and political forces at work in Byzantium differed greatly from those in 20th century Greece and, as a consequence, no standardization of Greek ensued at the time. Nevertheless, there is enough evidence to suggest that the diglossia in question was much more pronounced in the case of the official written vs. spoken registers than in the case of the official vs. vernacular written texts.

Let us consider the former sociolinguistic relationship, i.e. between the official archaizing variety and the spoken registers in late Byzantine times (11th-15th centuries). While the learned variety
employed in official documents, philosophical, historical, ecclesiastical and literary texts remained relatively stable throughout the early and late Byzantine period, the spoken registers must have diverged to a considerable degree, both on the social and on the areal level. Regarding the latter, it is rather safe to argue that by the 14th-15th century most Greek speakers—especially outside the urban centers—had a local dialect as their native language, while the archaizing registers must have been inaccessible to the majority of the population (with the possible exception of ecclesiastical texts, due to the familiarity with the Scriptures which were read at mass). The opposition of the official and archaizing registers with most of the spoken varieties creates the picture of a striking diglossia; it is not far-fetched to argue that it would be more appropriate from a synchronic viewpoint to speak of different languages than of different varieties of the same language, i.e. to replace ‘diglossia’ by bilingualism.

However, the opposition between the written registers employing the archaizing variety and the ones employing the vernacular does not reflect directly the situation of diglossia described above. It is well-known that, in modern societies, written registers exhibit their own peculiarities that set them apart from spoken varieties in various ways; even if the written registers belong theoretically speaking to different varieties (e.g. ‘katharevousa’ and ‘dimotiki’), they share some features because of the largely common literacy background of the various authors and the specific demands of the written medium. This must have been even more likely in the pre-modern Byzantine society, where no compulsory education existed, and the only means to achieve literacy was through a “traditional” educational system that was based on the study of Ancient Greek (and obviously not of any form of contemporary Greek, unless archaizing Greek is regarded as such) as linguistic hallmark. Consequently, it would be expected that all Byzantine authors, independently of the variety they used in their own works, must have been—more or less—familiar with the archaizing registers. Is this conclusion supported by the actual textual evidence?

In order to fruitfully tackle this issue, one must first determine what kind of evidence one is looking for. The relationship between the archaizing and the vernacular registers (and their respective authors) could be illustrated by the presence of some ‘vernacular’ features (possibly in the levels of syntax and semantics) in archaizing texts or, alternatively, by the use of ‘archaizing’ features (extending to all levels of grammar) in vernacular texts. Concerning the former, it remains largely unknown whether the Byzantine texts written in the traditional, archaizing variety offer any glimpse of vernacular features. This is most certainly due to the way they have been hitherto approached by scholars (mostly Byzantinists, and philologists in general): those texts have been considered a core part of the traditional Byzantine culture, which supposedly made small concessions—if any— to everyday culture, and, in particular, to everyday language. As they were considered a priori oppositional to the vernacular material, they have hardly been investigated with the purpose of unearthing possible shared features with vernacular texts. Current linguistic scholarship seems eager to alter this viewpoint, but it is still in its infancy regarding the examination of archaizing texts.

On the other hand, the language of the vernacular texts has long been extensively discussed and looked into, especially from a philological perspective. The initial sharp divide between the archaizing texts (and authors) and the vernacular ones has given way to an ameliorated evaluation of this relationship. It is widely accepted now that most texts in the vernacular exhibit a variety of archaizing features encompassing phonology, morphology, syntax as well as the lexicon: to give a very brief idea, consonantal clusters are found in the archaizing form (e.g. /pt/ instead of /ft/ in phonological pairs such as ‘ptoxos / ftoxos’ etc.), ancient morphological categories already extinct
by Roman times are still occasionally found (e.g. the Ancient monolectic Future Tense, the Dative case etc.), the Infinitive is still occasionally employed substituting for the more vernacular 'na-clause', while ancient words are still utilized. The important element in the above exemplification is the word occasionally: the use of those and many more features belonging to the archaizing registers is only occasionally attested in the vernacular texts, a fact that demands an adequate explanation.

The apparently non-systematic means of exploitation of the archaizing literature constitutes a feature not only of the entire vernacular corpus as such, but also of specific texts and authors in particular. In other words, varying degrees of 'infiltration' of archaizing elements can be observed both among the various texts comprising the vernacular literature as well as among the texts of the same author or belonging to the same genre. Not only that, but it is widely accepted that some authors (most notably Theodoros Prodromos) could very well use the two varieties in their own writings alternatively (consider for instance the contrast between Ptochorpodromika and Rodanthe and Dostikles, both arguably written by Prodromos). Obviously, for scholars such as Prodromos, the use of a particular linguistic variety was quite likely a matter of conscious choice between a number of alternatives, dictated in general by the genre of the text under consideration and the particular literary intentions of the author.

Furthermore, it should be observed that the ‘vernacular’ employed by Prodromos is greatly ‘enriched’ by numerous archaizing features, as perhaps should be expected by a scholar able to write with ease in both varieties. By employing the same reasoning to the other vernacular material, it can be assumed that the amount of archaizing elements in any vernacular text was a function of three factors: the education and consequent exposure of its author to the archaizing literature, the genre of the text as well as the author's intentions. Obviously, this leads to the assumption of a continuum, instead of a sharp divide between the archaizing and the vernacular registers: On the one end are the works of an extreme archaizing character, with a very small number –if any- of concessions to the vernacular registers, and on the other are the ‘extremely’ vernacular texts that exhibit only a very marginal familiarity with the archaizing tradition (e.g. the Chronicle of Morea or the poems of Sachlikis). With regard to the latter though, even in the face of near total absence of archaizing features one need not assume a total lack of knowledge of the archaizing tradition, since, as already mentioned, the very act of writing involves at least a passive familiarity with aspects of the learned Greek literature.

Evidently, this idea of the continuum for the categorization of the Byzantine literature enables us to capture the complicated interplay between the different linguistic varieties employed by the authors at the late Byzantine period. Instead of assuming a rather bizarre divide in the Greek-speaking world, it is possible now to consider a much more unified Byzantine literary production and attempt to isolate the various factors that come into play in the linguistic choices of the authors both inter- and intra-textually, i.e. both among different texts and in the various parts of the very same text. Since the majority of the Byzantine texts and, in particular, the majority of the vernacular texts could be rather medially placed in the continuum, as they exhibit a variety of archaizing features, these texts can no longer be considered as outliers, i.e. outside the scope of the Byzantine literature because of the linguistic form they are written in, contrary to what was traditionally assumed.

A word of caution is in order here: the linguistic continuum between the archaizing and the vernacular registers does not directly reflect cultural influences. In other words, the linguistic form of a work can only constitute a poor indicator concerning the cultural affiliation of the work, whether it is inspired by Western motives etc., although texts belonging to the archaizing part of the continuum tend to be more easily associated with the traditional Byzantine circle of influence.
Finally, the linguistic continuum of registers challenges long-held assumptions about the literary 'value' of specific works as well as the date of their original composition. To be more precise, the inclusion of archaizing features in a text can only partially imply the erudition of its author, since the use of such linguistic elements is not totally depended upon the author's level of education, but is also the result of the specific genre and the author's overall linguistic choices. Accordingly, one needs to reconsider the scholarly tradition according to which the occurrence of archaizing features in an otherwise vernacular text of the late Byzantine period implies an older date of composition in comparison to similar works with less archaizing elements. While this may be true, it is not necessarily so, given the variety of factors involved in the selection of linguistic variables in those texts. Unfortunately, this had resulted in a vicious circle of reasoning between philologists and linguists: the former employed this rather flawed argument to date various texts, and the latter took for granted philologists' assumptions which were based on problematic linguistic assumptions! This circle needs to brake and consequently, chronologies of texts relying too heavily on this linguistic criterion need to be reconsidered, which may lead to a partial or significant makeover of the history of the vernacular literature.

To sum up, the Byzantine empire exhibited the sociolinguistic phenomenon of diglossia, definitely in its later stages and possibly throughout its history. This undoubtedly holds for the spoken registers in relation to the official Greek variety employed by the archaizing scholarship and administration. Nevertheless, the divide between archaizing and vernacular literature is increasingly likely to be regarded as much less stable and impenetrable than traditionally assumed. The partial mixing of the two written varieties can be arguably explained by the notion of a sociolinguistic register continuum, where each text is placed according to its unique combination of linguistic elements. Accordingly, the divide between the study of the archaizing and the vernacular literature of Byzantium is only epiphenomenal and can only hinder a better understanding of the cultural, linguistic and social environment which gave it birth.
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The ‘Language of the Script’ and the ‘Language of the King’:
Diglossia and Traditional Education in Ethiopia
from Late Antiquity to the Middle Ages

Come noto, nella prima metà del IV sec. la classe dirigente del Regno di Aksum (Etiopia) aderì ufficialmente al cristianesimo per iniziativa di un intellettuale straniero, Frumenzio di Tiro, che in maniera quasi accidentale si trovò a svolgere un ruolo apostolico in quella parte del mondo ‘pagano’. Secondo il racconto di Rufino of Aquileia (Historia Ecclesiastica I, 9.10) ancora in giovane età Frumenzio e il coetaneo Edesio si misero al seguito di un certo Meropio, Tyrius philosphus, che aveva organizzato un viaggio d’istruzione nelle regioni dell’India ulterior. Sulla via del ritorno, in un qualche punto della costa (da identificare con la sponda africana del Mar Rosso, nell’attuale Eritrea), la loro imbarcazione fu attaccata dalla popolazione locale, l’equipaggio e lo stesso Meropio furono uccisi, e i due giovani furono portati alla corte del re, ovvero la figura storicamente documentata di Œlle ‘Amida. Questi dette ad Edesio l’incarico di ‘coppiere’ (sibi pincernam fecit) e nominò Frumenzio ‘suo tesoriero e segretario’ (rationes suas scriniaque commisit). Tali eventi devono essersi svolti verso il 320. La più autorevole fonte etiopica, l’anonima Omelia su Frumenzio, trasmessa da due manoscritti ge’ez del XIV sec. e risalente certamente a fonti tardoantiche, afferma che egli fu nominato ‘amministratore del palazzo’ e ‘custode della legge, ovvero scriba di Aksum’. Dopo la morte del sovrano, poiché il successore ‘Ezana, il cui nome è noto grazie a svariate fonti, non era ancora in età per governare, la regina madre chiese a Frumenzio di occuparsi della formazione dell’erede al trono; ed egli, in quella sua posizione di autorità, si dedicò ad organizzare e a promuovere le attività degli stranieri di fede cristiana già presenti nel Paese. Verso il 330, il nuovo sovrano si convertì al cristianesimo, e Frumenzio fu inviato ad Alessandria, dove fu consacrato vescovo dall’allora Patriarca, Atanasio I. Intorno al 356 egli era ancora vivo perché viene menzionato in una lettera, trasmessa dallo stesso Atanasio nella sua Apologia ad Constantium, con la quale l’imperatore Costanzo II intimava ai sovrani di Aksum, ‘Ezana e Sazana, di invalidare la prima consacrazione episcopale di Frumenzio, avvenuta per mano di un Patriarca considerato eterodosso dal sovrano di fede ariana.

La vicenda di Frumenzio fornisce il più antico ritratto di intellettuale cristiano attivo alla corte di un sovrano etiopico. La sua azione fu certamente facilitata dalla diffusa conoscenza che della lingua greca si aveva nel Regno di Aksum, in particolare fra i marinai e i commercianti che vivevano nella città portuale di Adulis e negli ambienti di cultura che gravitavano intorno alla capitale. ‘Ezana è noto non solo come il primo re cristiano d’Etiopia, ma anche come autore di iscrizioni bilingui in ge’ez e in greco. Per quanto ci è dato sapere, nessun altro sovrano di Aksum ha sentito l’esigenza di produrre epigrafi nelle due lingue, e ciò autorizza a riconoscere dietro questa sua attività ‘letteraria’ l’influenza di consiglieri e segretari di madrelingua greca, forse coordinati dallo stesso Frumenzio nella sue veste di ‘scriba di Aksum’. D’altra parte, testimonianze diverse – dal Periplo del Mare Eritreo, che riferisce di un sovrano ellenizzato della regione etio-eritrea di nome Zoskales (I sec.), all’iscrizione del re aksumita Sembrouthes (II-III sec.), a quella sul trono di Adulis (acefala, adespota
e di controversa datazione), che fu letta e copiata da Cosma Indicopleuste nella sua *Topographia Christiana* – permettono di affermare che l’uso della lingua greca nell’*entourage* reale e nei circoli colti di Aksum risale alle prime fasi della storia del regno. Questa ellenizzazione fu un fenomeno profondo e di lunga durata, principalmente collegato alle attività economiche e sociali di comunità grecofone di provenienza alessandrina impiantate ad Adulis.

Sulla base di questi dati possiamo anche affermare che una parte almeno degli abitanti di Adulis e Aksum era bilingue e che il greco era considerato dalla classe dirigente del regno lingua di prestigio. Dopo che la corte reale ebbe adottato il cristianesimo come religione di stato, la circolazione di testi greci nel regno dev’essere considerevolmente aumentata, e le nuove autorità ecclesiastiche inaugurarono un ambizioso programma di traduzioni in ge’ez di testi liturgici. Contatti e interferenze tra le due lingue hanno lasciato un buon numero di tracce nel vocabolario del ge’ez. Finché ad Alessandria si parlò greco questo vento ellenico non cessò mai di soffiare su Aksum, fornendo agli intellettuali etiopici tutti i modelli necessari per la costruzione di una letteratura religiosa nazionale. Conseguentemente, si può dire che il processo attraverso il quale il ge’ez divenne lingua letteraria fu avviato e determinato dal suo contatto con il greco scritto e parlato ad Adulis ed Aksum, e successivamente fu consolidato e rafforzato dal passaggio al cristianesimo della *leadership* del regno.

Se consideriamo tutto ciò che resta della letteratura aksumita di età tardoantica (testi sacri e patristici, apocrifi giudaici e cristiani, letteratura canonistica e agiografica, e altro ancora) e poniamo le iscrizioni reali a confronto con le traduzioni etiopiche dei testi greci, possiamo apprezzare una sensibile differenza tra due tipi di ge’ez. In particolare, nelle iscrizioni reali registriamo la presenza di materiali lessicali il cui significato resta fino ad oggi oscuro. Ovviamente, si deve tener conto del fatto che la comprensione delle traduzioni dei testi greci è agevolata dal fatto che possiamo ancora leggere gli originali. Tuttavia, è riconosciuto che il vocabolario delle iscrizioni reali, particolarmente di quelle anteriori all’adozione del cristianesimo, mostra alcune specificità e che una parte del lessico del ge’ez più antico non è confluita nel vocabolario della letteratura cristiana. Ciò significa che la cesura religiosa e culturale costituita dall’adozione del cristianesimo si risolse in una vera e propria discontinuità linguistica e dette origine a una differenziazione di registri, se non a una forma di ‘diglossia’. Per un tempo imprecisabile – e comunque non oltre la prima metà del VI sec., quando ad Aksum regnava il re Kaleb – nella capitale e ad Adulis il cristianesimo convisse con i culti tradizionali, e nell’ambito di ciascuna delle due religioni i fedeli dovettero praticare uno proprio tipo di ge’ez. Pertanto, il passo in questione dell’iscrizione di ‘Ezana può essere tradotto con ‘e (il re) ha immolato come sacrificio di ringraziamento a Maḥrəm, che lo ha generato, 100 buoi e 50 prigionieri’.
Non vi è dubbio, poi, che l'affermarsi del cristianesimo imposte un’esigenza elementare come quella di costituire una gerarchia ecclesiastica, sul modello di quella egiziana, cui dovette collegarsi necessariamente l’apertura di scuole religiose. La comunità cristiana aksumita, sotto la guida di un vescovo nominato dal Patriarca di Alessandria – e da lui considerato alla stregua di responsabile di una diocesi egiziana – si dotò così di un propria forma di ge’ez, che l’interferenza con il greco scritto e parlato contribuì per qualche secolo a modellare. Basti considerare la mole di prestiti ellenici nella lingua dei cristiani d’Etiopia, in massima parte foneticamente giustificabile solo se inquadrata nella cornice di un contato diretto fra le due lingue in età tardoantica.

L’Etiopia aksumita e quella medievale sono separate da un intervallo cronologico lungo più di mezzo millennio, compreso tra gli inizi del VII sec., quando s’innesca il declino di Aksum come centro economico-politico di rilevanza internazionale, e la prima metà del XII sec., allorché si registra la formazione del regno cristiano guidato dalla dinastia Zagwë, con un nuovo centro amministrativo e religioso a Lalibâla, circa 400 km a sud di Aksum, nella regione oggi denominata Wâllo (distretto del Lasta). Di quel che è avvenuto in quei cinquecento anni o poco più non sappiamo pressoché nulla, se non che si produsse uno iato culturale fortissimo, che la massima parte dell’eredità aksumita andò perduta e che nel nuovo contesto storico non restò più alcuna traccia delle dinamiche linguistiche dell’epoca precedente.

In particolare, l’uso vivo del ge’ez venne totalmente abbandonato a causa dell’emergere di altre lingue appartenenti allo stesso ceppo linguistico, in particolare l’amarico. Tuttavia, il ge’ez conservò la funzione di lingua della preghiera personale, delle cerimonie liturgiche e di una imponente letteratura religiosa che, proprio a partire dall’età degli Zagwë (1137-1270), conobbe un lungo periodo di splendore durato fino agli inizi del XVI sec. Anche in questa fase l’Egitto cristiano restò il punto di riferimento istituzionale e spirituale, ma quanto al modello linguistico cui guardarono traduttori e autori etiopici dei secc. XII-XVI esso non fu più il greco – che subì la stessa sorte del ge’ez come lingua parlata, ed entrò presto in disuso anche nelle prassi liturgiche e letterarie – ma l’arabo, introdotto in Egitto dai nuovi governanti di cultura e di confessione islamica e presto utilizzato anche dai cristiani che seguivano la fede di Alessandria.

Dopo l’estinzione del ge’ez come lingua dell’uso vivo, attraverso passaggi che restano per noi ignoti, il gruppo dirigente dello stato cristiano, i sovrani Zagwë e tanto quanto i successori della dinastia Salomonide (subentrati a partire dal 1270), adottarono per la comunicazione quotidiana il nuovo codice linguistico fornito dall’amarico. Pur essendo anch’esso un idioma semitico (se non derivato dalla lingua di Aksum), l’amarico si rivela nella sintassi e nel lessico una lingua che molto più del ge’ez ha risentito del lungo contatto con parlate di tutt’altra derivazione, in particolare le lingue agaw appartenenti alla famiglia cuscitica. Se la sua origine – come pure le ragioni della sua diffusione – restano un problema aperto, è invece chiaro che fin dal XII sec. l’amarico s’impose come lingua di corte, cioè come codice linguistico adottato per convenzione dal gruppo dirigente dell’Etiopia cristiana. Nel quadro di una politica di espansione dello stato cristiano, l’amarico era la lingua che il sovrano parlava con i capi militari delle province che riconoscevano la sua autorità, anche se in molti casi essi non erano di madrelingua amarica (basti pensare agli ufficiali e ai soldati originari del Tigray e dell’Eritrea, le regioni più settentrionali dell’Etiopia medievale, in cui era ed è parlato il tigrino, altra lingua semitica totalmente distinta dall’amarico).

Anche all’interno della Chiesa era avvertito un problema di comunicazione fra ecclesiastici di provenienza geografica e linguistica molto diversa. L’acquisizione di nuovi territori da parte della
Corona si accompagnava regolarmente alla fondazione di chiese e conventi, il cui clero in massima parte proveniva dalle regioni di nuova conquista. Queste strutture ecclesiastiche funzionavano sia da centri di irradiazione religiosa, sia da regolatori nello sfruttamento delle risorse agricole, sia da avamposti per la difesa delle terre inglobate dallo stato cristiano. Nella loro vita quotidiana l’amarico s’impose non in quanto lingua di corte, ma perché vigeva la norma consuetudinaria per cui l’istruzione religiosa doveva essere impartita obbligatoriamente in un unico idioma in tutto il Paese, e cioè in amarico. Conseguentemente, monaci e preti che avevano seguito un regolare percorso formativo conoscevano il ge’ez, in quanto lingua letteraria, l’amarico in quanto lingua che era servita per la loro istruzione religiosa, e spesso anche una terza lingua, ad es. il tigrino nel caso di ecclesiastici originari del Tigray e dell’Eritrea. La stessa tradizione etiopica ha elaborato una distinzione concettuale fra gli appellativi di ‘lingua dello scritto’ (ləssanä ʂəhf), con riferimento al ge’ez, e ‘lingua del re’ (ləssanä nəgus), ovvero l’amarico. La prima era conosciuta e insegnata con finalità liturgiche e letterarie soltanto dagli ecclesiastici e da quei laici che in gioventù avevano comunque percorso un cammino di formazione religiosa. La seconda non aveva dignità letteraria, ma una specifica funzione politica, perché era il codice che l’élite militare del regno era tenuta a conoscere per le comunicazioni fra apparati di uno stato multietnico e multilinguistico.

Dentro questo schema generale le occasioni di contatto e interferenza furono logicamente frequenti. In primo luogo, ci furono alcuni tentativi di uso letterario dell’amarico. Significativamente, il primo di cui si ha notizia è costituito dalla cosiddette ‘canzoni reali’, composizioni di lunghezza variabile (da 8 a 115 versi), che celebravano le gesta dei sovrani ‘Amdä Ṣəyon (1314-44), Yəshaq (1414-29/30) e Gälawdewos (1540-59). Ogni verso è composto normalmente da due parole, talora tre, di rado quattro o più, ed è caratterizzato dalla presenza martellante di una rima ‘imperfetta’, che più spesso si preoccupa soltanto del suono consonantico finale, indipendentemente dalla vocale che lo precede (ad es., -äṣ è in rima con -äṣ, con -uṣ e con -oṣ), più raramente tiene conto di tutta una sillaba, purché associata ad una consonante lunga (ad es., -amma è in rima con -ämma, con -omma e con -omma). Concepite con ogni probabilità negli stessi anni in cui i tre sovrani sedevano sul trono, le ‘canzoni reali’ ebbero in principio una circolazione orale e solo più tardi conobbero anche la dignità della trasmissione scritta. Sebbene la loro comprensione sia ancora parziale, esse rivelano che intorno alla corte ruotavano personaggi di cultura ‘alta’, che si sforzavano di applicare al codice linguistico dell’amarico le regole della composizione letteraria in ge’ez. Ad esempio, il meccanismo con cui i versi sono collegati fra loro è lo stesso che troviamo nella cosiddetta ‘prosa rimata’, caratteristica dei proemi e delle dossologie trinitarie con cui si aprono i testi agiografici redatti nello ‘stile fiorito’ dei secc. XIV-XV. E nel lessico queste composizioni presentano un numero talmente alto di parole del vocabolario ge’ez da giustificare sia la definizione di ‘canzoni ge’ez-amariche’ sia l’ipotesi che esse siano state concepite da ecclesiastici che si impegnarono in un vero e proprio esperimento di elaborazione linguistica e creazione letteraria. Di tali ecclesiastici, che dovevano caratterizzarsi sia per la raffinatezza della loro formazione tradizionale sia per il loro stretto legame personale con la corte, abbiamo notizia precisa. Essi costituivano un collegio saerdotale, quello dei kəhənätä ʂəbtä, letteralmente ‘preti della tenda’ o ‘del tabernacolo’, con riferimento alla loro funzione di addetti alla liturgia nel sacrario dell’accampamento reale.

Le vicende di alcuni dei più celebrati personaggi della storia letteraria etiopica, da Giyorgis di Sägla a Yostënos di Däbrä Maryam, sono almeno in parte collegate al ruolo politico-religioso svolto da questo gruppo di ecclesiastici, in particolare negli anni del regno di Zär’a Ya’qob (1434-68). A
partire dalla metà del XVI sec., la loro funzione di promotori dell’impiego dell’amarico nella sfera letteraria ricevette nuovo slancio dallo sviluppo dei rapporti diplomatici e militari fra Etiopia e Portogallo, cui seguì un’intensa attività missionaria da parte dei missionari cattolici presenti nel Paese. In realtà furono proprio questi ultimi a ricorrere per primi all’uso sistematico dell’amarico come lingua scritta, sia per alimentare anche così la polemica religiosa nei confronti del clero tradizionale – che tradizionalmente usava solo il ge’ez in quanto ‘lingua sacra’ – sia per favorire la comprensione del dibattito religioso da parte di un uditorio più ampio. In ciò essi furono presto imitati dagli stessi ecclesiastici etiopici gravitanti intorno alla corte, che raccolsero la sfida e scelsero di ricorrere all’amarico come lingua letteraria, dapprima al puro scopo di tradurre nella ‘lingua del re’ testi da secoli trasmessi solo nella ‘lingua dello scritto’, poi con l’intento dichiarato di creare una letteratura teologica nella lingua parlata da buona parte del Paese e da secoli utilizzata dal suo gruppo dirigente. E in questo modo, una volta affermata sul terreno religioso la piena dignità letteraria della lingua ‘volgare’, non fu più possibile arrestare il processo storico che avrebbe portato alla costituzione della moderna letteratura nazionale amarica.
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A Byzantine Comprehensive Textbook: Manuel Moschopoulos’ Περὶ σχεδῶν

Manuel Moschopoulos’ Περὶ σχεδῶν is one of the most popular grammatical manuals used for the teaching of Greek grammar in Palaeologan Byzantium as well as in the West. This is attested not only by the vast numbers of extant manuscripts preserving the Moschopoulean text but also by the statements of other Byzantine scholars, such as Constantine Laskares who declared that “καὶ σχεδὸν μόνος Μοσχόπουλος ἐμονάρχησεν”. So far no critical edition has been published. For this reason scholars have been using the 1545 editio princeps by Robertus Stephanus.

One of the major questions raised by scholars is the method Moschopoulos used to compose his manual. The extant manuscripts bear usually the title: «ἀρχὴ σὺν Θεῷ ἁγίῳ τῶν σχεδῶν τῶν διορθωθέντων παρὰ τοῦ σοφωτάτου κυροῦ Μανουὴλ τοῦ Μοσχοπούλου». This suggests that Moschopoulos selectively drew his material from the previously existing tradition adjusting it accordingly. The question is which were his criteria? Was the teaching of grammar his only aim or did he conceive his manual with a broader scope in mind? This paper will attempt to answer these questions.

Schedography was a method the Byzantines developed from the 11th century onwards in order to teach the students the vast grammatical theory of the Classical Attic language. Its primary aim was the mastery of orthography, along with grammar, syntax, etymology and the enrichment of the vocabulary. All these aspects are served in the analysis following every schedos.

Moschopoulos’ composition consists of 22 schede along with their analysis. Each of the 22 schede has a primary goal, either grammatical or syntactical. A closer look though at the schede themselves reveal that each one of them had a multi-faceted role.

First of all each schedos contains specific grammatical and syntactical issues, as follows:
1. Aorist imperative along with the adjectival participle and the function of the genitive case.
2. Third declension nouns and the verb ἀφαιρέω-ω along with temporal participle, participle of manner and instrumental dative.
3. Passive Aorist along with the prepositional modifiers.
4. Imperative along with the descriptive apposition and the participle.
5. Nouns of the 1st and 2nd declension along with the syntactical function of the object.
6. Verbs in -mi (δείκνυμι) and the indicative mood of the Aorist along with embedded declarative clauses.
7. Contracted verbs in -έω, nouns of the first, second and third declension along with adjectives.
8. Contracted verbs in -άω, -έω, the verb φημί along with conditional, comparative relatives and final clauses.
9. Nouns and adjectives of the 3rd declension along with the syntactic function of the infinitive.
10. Neuter of nouns and adjectives of the 2nd declension along with the comparatives of the adjectives
11. Noun ‘ἡ ὀρνις’ and the verb ἀπίημι along with conditional clauses
12. Nouns ‘ἡ ναῦς’, ‘ὁ παῖς’, the Perfect and the Pluperfect along with the adjectival (attributive) clauses and the descriptive apposition
13. Nouns ‘ἡ χείρ’, ‘ὁ παῖς’, the comparatives of the adjectives along with partitive genitive and objective dative
14. Participle of the Perfect tense along with the appositive, the descriptive apposition and the predicative
15. Participle
16. Passive Aorist and contracted verbs along with predicative participle and the agent
17. Passive Aorist and contracted verbs along with genitive absolute
18. Verbs ‘δίδωμι’, ‘ἐστημι’, ‘ἡγοῦμαι’ (verbs in – μι and contracted) along with partitive genitive and genitive of comparison
19. Verb ‘ἐστημι’ and the Passive Aorist along with the predicative and the genitive absolute
20. Verb ‘κεῖμαι’ and the Aorist Indicative along with conditional clauses and the embedded declarative clauses introduced by ὅτι
21. The Aorist Infinitive along with coreference construction and the dative of reference
22. Verb ‘ἡμι’ and noun ‘ὁ παῖς’ along with the relative clauses.

Leaving aside the specific grammatical and syntactical phenomena the Moschopoulean schedography covers, a panoramic view of the whole work shows a larger scope and aim.

Already in 1983 in his seminal article ‘Nota sulla schedografia di Moscopoulo e suoi precedenti fino a Teodoro Prodromo’, Bollettino dei Classici III.4 (1983), 3-35, Carlo Gallavotti noticed a certain order of the 22 schede, with 1-6 being religious texts, 7-10 admonitory ones, 11 being an Aesopian fable, while schede 12-22 are of mythological content drawn from the beginning of the Iliad. He also surmised that the mixture of schedography with these texts must have been made during the 13th century.

Manuel Moschopoulos’ selection and composition was indeed a decisive turning-point in the development of schedography. Having grammar as a primary goal in his mind, Moschopoulos succeeded in covering broader learning fields. Thus from the previous schedographic collections he drew 22 schede which cover the following sections:

Schede 1-6 and 9 are of theological content. Demosthenes Stratopoulos in his article ‘Ἡ παρουσία ὑμνογραφικῶν κειμένων στὶς σχεδογραφικὲς συλλογές: ἡ περίπτωσις του κώδικα Lesbiacus Leimonos 91’, Byzantina 33 (2013-2014), 75-87 expounds the use of hymnographical texts, unaltered or paraphrased, in schedographic collections. More specifically Stratopoulos identified schede 2, 3, 4 and 9, as very well-known hymnographical works from the liturgical books of the Greek Orthodox Church. In particular schedos 2 is a faithful reproduction of an apolytikion of Good Friday, schedos 3 is a very well-known kontakion on Saint George, schedos 4 is an apolytikion of the middle-Pentecost, schedos 9 is an enriched paraphrase of the apolytikion to the Holy Apostles adapted to the schedographic needs.
To Strategopoulos’ findings we can now add that schede 5 [Ἀνήλθεν ὁ Ἰσσοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἱερουσαλήμ στοὰ τοῦ Σολομώντος, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ κολυμβήθρα, ἵνα ἁγιελος Κυρίου κατὰ καιρόν διετάρασσε. καὶ ὁ πρώτος ἐμβεβηκώς ὑγάζετο, καὶ τοῦ τρύχοντος νυσσάματος, ἀπηλλάττετο. ἱδὼν τοιαρόν ἄνθρωπον παρακληθείης, ἄφητεν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἔδει, ὅρον τὸ σῶν κλανίδοιο, καὶ περιπάτει. καὶ τῷ λόγῳ εὐθέως ἤκουσον ήθεραπεία and 6 [Δεικνύστα ὁ Χριστὸς ὦτι καὶ κατ’ ἄρχαις τὸν ἄνθρωπον αὐτὸς ἐξημοῦργησε, καὶ ἀπὸ χοῦς διήρτισε, πηλῷ καὶ νῦν χρησάμενος, ὁμάματο τὸν πεπηρωμένον, καὶ ὡς παντοδύναμος, τῶν ὑπῶν, ἤτοι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, τό φῶς αὐτῶ χαρίζεται] are paraphrases from the Second Gospel of John, chapters 5.1-9 and 9.11 respectively.

Schede 1 [Κύριε Ἱσσοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν, ὁ ἀσπόρος εὐδόκισις τεκθῆναι εκ τῆς ἀγίας Θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας, ταῖς πρεσβείαις αὐτῆς καὶ τοῦ χρυσορρώματος]. These three texts represent the simplest paraphrases from the Second Gospel of John, chapters 5.1-9 and 9.11 respectively.

As is well known, theological and religious texts were incorporated in the teaching process and were used for the teaching of Greek language from the elementary level onwards. Thus, the Psalms were used in the first stage, the ἵερα γράμματα, when pupils learn how to read and write, while in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the preparatory exercises to the course of rhetoric exercises, known as progymnasmata, could have religious themes” (see Mary Whitty, ‘Rhetorical Questions’, in Liz James [ed.], A Companion to Byzantium [Chichester, 2010], pp. 239-50).

Apart from the theological/religious schede (nos. 1-6 and 9) progymnasmata are represented in the Moschopulean textbook by schede 8, 11 and 22. These three texts represent the simplest exercises, listed in all extant Greek treatises on progymnasmata and attributed to Theon (1-2 AD), Hermogenes (2-3 AD), Aphthonius (4-5 AD) and Nicolaus of Myra (5 AD). Each of the three Moschopulean schede represents a single category: chreia, myth and diegema.

In 1930 and 1932 Francesco Sbordone, in his articles ‘Una citazione d’Isocrate nel codice Brancacciano IV A 5’, Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica XIV (1930), 100-101 and ‘Recensioni retoriche delle favole esopiane’, Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica XVI (1932), 35-45 respectively, dealt with the presence of progymnasmata in the schedographic collections preserved in codex Neapolitanus Brancacianus IV A 5 (dated to the 15th century). Schedos 8 is a chreia ending with an admonition: Πόνοι γεννύσι δόξαν, καὶ κάρματοι προέχουσι ταινιας, ἀστερ σφιν ὁ Μέγας Βασιλείος. καὶ χωρὶς πόνων οὐδὲν καταρθόθησαι χρηστόν· eи δὲ τοῦτο ἄλληθες, πονεῖτε καὶ ὑμεῖς, καὶ φιλεῖτε τὴν μελέτην, καὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει πρόσκεισθε, ἵνα σοφώτατοι γένησθε.

Theon in his treatise underlined the multiple importance in the curriculum of the chreia, the first progymnasma in his own list: γυμνάζονται δέ κατὰ τὰς χρειας τῇ ἀπαγελλα τῇ κλίσει τῇ ἐπιφωνήσει τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ ἐπεκτεινομένε τε καὶ συστέλλουμεν τὴν χρείαν, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἀνασκευάζομεν καὶ κατασκευάζομεν. Thus the chreia could perfectly fit in a grammar-course, since one of its benefits was the inflection and the declension of parts of the speech at the same time (e.g. article, adjectives, nouns, verbs, adverbs) used in the study of the grammar.
nouns, verbs and participles). In this way the student could avail himself to a lesser or greater degree from the use of *chreia* according to the individual abilities and circumstances and the goals his teacher aimed to achieve.

Schedos 11 is a *myth* with an *epimythion* at the end of the fable (in this case Aesopian): Αἴλουρος εἶσω χεῖς κατοικίδιαν ὀρνίθον δεδωκάς, καὶ ὄφως ὀρνῖν νόσω αἴνῃ συνεχομένην, ἥρωτικει ταυτίν, πῶς ἔχεις: ἢ δὲ ἐφι, εἰ σὺ ἀπίς τῶν ἐνταύθα τῶν, κρειττών ἔχω. οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἀνθρώποις ἢ παρουσία τῶν ἔχθρων ἀποθύμοι.

Theon pointed out that *myth*, the second *progymnasma* in his list, as well as the *chreia*, has manifold advantages for the student: καὶ πολλαπλοὺς ἔστι, καὶ τοῦτο τὸ γύμνασμα καὶ γὰρ ἀπαγγέλλομεν τὸν μῦθον καὶ κλίνομεν καὶ συμπλέκομεν αὐτὸν διηγήματι, καὶ ἑπεκτείνομεν καὶ συντελέσομεν, ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ἐπιλέγειν αὐτῷ τινά λόγον, καὶ αὐτῷ λόγου τινὸς προτεθέντος, μῦθον ἑοίκοτα αὐτῷ συμπλάσασθαι. Ἐτι δὲ πρὸς τούτοις ἀνασκευάζομεν καὶ κατασκευάζομεν. Thus the myth could also be used in the teaching of grammar since its simple content and diction would enable the student to overcome the difficulties of the comprehension of the text and focus on the grammatical and syntactical points the teacher aimed at clarifying and teaching.

The schedos of the Aesopian fable in the Moschopoulean schedography precedes schede 12-21 which draw their mythological content from the *Iliad*. In this way it is a transition and it acts as an intermediary link to the remaining part of the Moschopoulean manual.

Schedos 22, the last one in the Moschopoulean composition, is a *diegema*, narration, with its topic drawn from *Iliad* 24.602-17: Νιόβη Ταντάλου θυγάτηρ ἦν· Ἀμφιόνι δὲ ὠμενύτει. ἐκ τούτου γοῦν ἐσχηκυῖα παῖδας ἐξ ἅρρενας, καὶ ἔθησε. καὶ ἐπὶ πληθεὶ παῖδων ἐπαρθεῖσα, σκωπτόκλεισον λόγον ίει πρὸς τὴν Λητ., ὡς εὐδαμονεστέρα λέγουσα γένοιτο. συνενή γὰρ τὴν Δητὶ παίδας δύο τετοκέναι, τὸν ἀκεφέκομην Ἀπόλλωνα, καὶ τὴν κελαδεινὴν Ἀρτεμιν. μὴ φέρουσα γοῦν τόν ὑβρισμόν ἡ Λητ., τῶν αὐτῆς παῖδας ἀνήκειν ἀφεικάνει τόξον ἵνα κατὰ τέκνων Νιόβῃς. καὶ οὐτῶ φόνων ἐργον ἐγεγόνεισα. θησυνοσής δὲ τῆς Νιόβης τὸ πάθος, ὁ Zeit. φικτίσατο, καὶ εἰς λίθον ταύτην μετέβαλεν. ὃς, ὡς λόγος αἰρεί, πηγάς δακρύων ἀφήσω.

According to Theon, ἀρεταὶ δὲ διηγήσεως τρείς, σαφὴνεα, συντομία, πιθανότης while Aphthonius added also τῶν ὀνόματών ἐλληνισμόν. Σαφὴνια καὶ ἐλληνισμός τῶν ὀνόματός *justifies* the reason why *diegema* could perfectly fit in a grammar course. These virtues could only be achieved through the correct and exact use of the Attic Greek language, in other words through the mastery of grammar and the enrichment of vocabulary, two of the main goals of schedography.

Schedos 10 is an admonition in order that the teacher encourages the students to be diligent: Ἐχε ἐπί λογισμῶν ὃν παί τα γραφομένα σοι ρησειδία καὶ λεξειδία, τὰ τιμιώτερα ἐπάνω χρυσίων, καὶ προτιμώτερα ἕπερ μυρίδας ἄργυρων καὶ ἤδετε ἐπάνω μέλι καὶ κηρίων ταύτα γὰρ σε θήσει κλεινόν καὶ ἄρδηλον, καὶ ἄριζηλον, καὶ ἀριδεῖκτον, καὶ ἐν βροτοῖς περιώνυμον. This schedos placed in the middle of the textbook, encourages the student in his efforts to acquire knowledge, which will compensate him for his hard work and labour earning honour and respect among his peers and society at large. Thus he should not hesitate or lose his faith in front of the difficulties he might face.

The remaining schede 12-21 emanate from the *Iliad*. It is important to note that in cod. *Neap. Branc. IV A 5, f. 72v*, before these and other schede drawn from the *Iliad* we read as a title in red ink: ἄρχῃ τῶν ἐλληνικῶν σχεδαρίων. The Moschopoulean schede are as follows: 12. Ο τοῦ Πράιμου παῖς Ἀλέξανδρος τὰς ἄρχεκάκους ναύς εἰληφὼς, ὃς Φέρεκλος ἐτεκτήνατο, ἐπὶ τῶν τῶν Λακώνων
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χῶρον κατέπλευσε. καὶ Ἑλένην τὴν τῆς Λήδας παῖδα, ᾗ ὡμευνέτει νομίμως ὁ ̓Ατρείδης Μενέλαος,
ἡρπακώς, ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκείαν αὐτοῦ ᾤχετο ἄγων τὴν Ἴλιον καὶ Τροίαν κεκλημένην, καὶ ὠνομασμένην.
καὶ πολλοῖς ὀλέθρου αἴτιος ἐγεγόνει. 13. Ἀχιλλεὺς ὁ Πηλείδης καὶ Αἰακίδης, ὁ Θέτιδος τῆς Νηρέως
θυγατρὸς παῖς, ἀνδρειότατος ἦν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ γενναιότατος. καὶ μέγα ὄφελος τοῖς Ἀργείοις,
καὶ Ἀχαιοῖς ἐχρημάτιζε. καὶ τὴν στρατιὰν τῶν Τρώων ἐλύπει, κτείνων ἀφειδῶς καὶ ἀνοικτὶ τοὺς
χερσὶ ταῖς αὐτοῦ περιπίπτοντας. 14. Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Πριαμίδης, ὁ καὶ Πάρις ὠνομασμένος, καὶ Ἰδαῖος
κεκλημένος, τὴν Λάκαιναν Ἑλένην ἡρπακώς, εἰς Ἴλιον ἐπανῄει. ὁ δὲ Ἀτρείδης Μενέλαος ὁ τῆς
εἰρημένης ὁμευνέτης, ἐστράτευσεν ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς Ἰλίου τόπον μετὰ τοῦ ὁμαίμονος αὐτοῦ ̓Αγαμέμνονος·
καὶ ταύτην κατασκάψας ἐπανέζευξεν οἴκαδε. 15. Εἶχε μὲν ὁ Πριαμίδης Ἀλέξανδρος Ἑλένην τὴν
ὁμευνέτιν Μενέλεῳ. ἣν ἐκ Λακεδαίμονος ἡρπακώς, ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκείαν αὐτοῦ ᾤχετο ἄγων, τὴν Ἴλιον
καὶ Τροίαν κεκλημένην καὶ ὠνομασμένην· ὁ δὲ ταύτης ὁμευνέτης Μενέλαος πλεῖστον στρατὸν
συναγηοχὼς καὶ συνηθροικώς, καὶ στόλον οὐ ῥᾳδίως ἀριθμητὸν εἰληφώς, ἅμα τῷ ὁμαίμονι αὐτοῦ
Ἀγαμέμνονι, ἐπὶ τὸν ἰλιακὸν ἐστράτευσε χῶρον. καὶ χρόνον ἐνναετῆ τὴν Τροίαν πολιορκήσας,
τῷ δεκάτῳ ἔτει κατέσκαψεν. καὶ ὡς ἕδη κατήρειψε· καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν πάλιν πατρίδα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ
γυναῖκα λαβὼν ἐπανέζευξεν. 16. Ὁ μὲν Χρύσης μεθ’ ὑβρισμῶν σφοδρῶν ἀπεπέμφθη τῷ Ἀγαμέμνονι,
τῷ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα Χρυσηΐδα ζητεῖν. ἣν πολέμου νόμῳ πλήθη ̓Αχαιῶν ᾐρήκει, καὶ εἰδῶν
εὖ ἔχουσαν, καὶ κάλλει νικῶσαν ἄλλων φῦλα γυναικῶν, τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἀγαμέμνονι ὡς καλλιστεῖον
σκύλων πολεμικῶν ἐδεδώκει. μὴ λαβὼν δὲ τὸ αἰτεῖν ὁ γέρων, ἀλλ’ ἐπιπλέον τῷ ὑβρισθῆναι δηχθείς,
ἐπηρᾶτο τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ ἧξαι τῶν νηῶν. τουδὶ γὰρ ἱερεὺς ἐχρημάτιζε. καὶ πλείστων αἰλίνων αἴτιος,
πλήθει Ἑλλήνων ἐγεγόνει. 17. Εἰπόντος καὶ εἰρηκότος τοῦ μάντεως, ὅτι διὰ τὸν προπηλακισμὸν
τοῦ ἱερέως ὁ λοιμὸς τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς ἐπεισέφρησε, καὶ τοῦ Αἰακίδου Ἀχιλλέως τὸν θεὸν κελεύσαντος
ἐξιλάσκεσθαι, ὠργίσθη ὁ Πελοπίδης Ἀγαμέμνων, καὶ διηνέχθη πρὸς τὸν Ἀχιλλέα, καὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ γέρας
ἀφείλετο τὴν Βρισηΐδα. ὁ δὲ λυπῶν πληροῦται, καὶ ὀργῇ καὶ μήνιδι βαρείᾳ, ὡς εἰκός, κατέχεται, καὶ
τῆς συμμαχίας τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀφίσταται. 18. Ὁ Ἀτρείδης Ἀγαμέμνων τὸν τῆς Χρησηΐδος ἔρωτα, τῶν
στεμμάτων τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος προτιμότερον ἡγησάμενος, καὶ τῷ πατρὶ Χρύσῃ τὴν εἰρημένην παῖδα μὴ
ἀποδούς, λοιμώδους ἀρρωστίας τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς καθίσταται αἴτιος. ἣν ὀργισθεὶς ὁ Λητοΐδης, ἐπήνεγκε
καὶ τῆς στρατιᾶς τὸ πλεῖστον διέφθειρεν. 19. Χρύσης διωχθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀτρείδου Ἀγαμέμνονος μεθ’
ὑβρισμῶν, εἶξεν ἀδημονῶν. πρὸς δὲ τὸν νηὸν τοῦ ̓Απόλλωνος ἰών, καὶ πλεῖστα εὐξάμενος, ἠλείφει
αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ πλήρη αἰλίνων ἀποφῆναι πλήθη Ἑλλήνων. ὠργισμένων δὲ κατ’ ἀλλήλων Ἀχιλλέως καὶ
Ἀγαμέμνονος, ὁ Νέστωρ ἐξαναστάς, τὸν λόγον τοῦτον ᾖσε τῶν θώκων, ὄντως γηθήσει Πρίαμος
ἅμα παισίν, ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες, τῷ τοὺς κρείττονας τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀντιφερίζειν. ἀλλά μοι πείθησθε
γενναιότατοι ἐπεί γε νεώτατοι ἐστὲ τὸν χρόνον ἐμοὶ παραβαλλόμενοι, καὶ τὸν χόλον καταπαύσατε.
20. Ἐννέα ἡμέρας ἡ λοιμώδης νόσος τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐπεβόσκετο. καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν Αἴᾳ ἔκειντο
ἀποθνήσκοντες. τῇ δεκάτῃ δ’ ἕῳ, Πηλείδης Ἀχιλλεὺς τὸν λαὸν συνήθροισε, καὶ τῶν λοιμῶν ἐζήτησε
τὴν αἰτίαν. Κάλχας δὲ ὁ Θεστορίδης τὸ ἀληθὲς διεσάφησε, καὶ εἰρήκει ὅτι διὰ τὸν προπηλακισμὸν
τοῦ ἱερέως, ὁ λοιμὸς τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς ἐπεισέφρησε. καὶ οὐ παύσεται ὄλλων τὸ στρατόπεδον, εἰ μὴ τὴν
Χρυσηΐδα τῷ πατρὶ οἱ Ἀχαιοὶ ἀποδώσουσιν. 21. Ἐστράτευσεν ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς Ἰλίου τόπον μετὰ τῶν
λοιπῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ Διομήδης ὁ Αἰτωλός, καὶ προθύμως κατὰ τῶν Τρώων ἐξώρμησεν. εἶχε γὰρ ζῆλον
τῶν πατρικῶν ἔργων, καὶ τὰς ἀριστείας τοῦ Τυδέως ἐπὶ λογισμῶν ἔστρεφε. καὶ περιφανὴς κατ’
ἐκεῖνον γενέσθαι ἱμείρετο, καὶ τρόπαια ἐγεῖραι ἐν αἴᾳ τῶν πολεμίων, καὶ δεῖξαι ὅσον βαρβάρων
Ἕλληνες ὑπέρτεροι φρονήσει τε καὶ τῇ κατὰ πόλεμον ἐμπειρίᾳ. These schede are actually prose
paraphrases of Homeric passages, which either summarise the whole story of the Iliad in different
versions and styles or present an important single episode from the Iliad, but at any rate either of
them are of great importance for the teaching of both poetry and rhetoric.
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Paraphrase was the 15th *progymnasma* in Theon’s list. Michael Roberts in his study of *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity* (Liverpool, 1985) refers mainly to two kinds of paraphrase, the grammatical and the rhetorical one, with comprehension or style as the primary goal of each one of them. Roberts also pointed out that the grammatical paraphrase was used either as ‘an exercise written by the student to demonstrate his understanding of a particular passage of poetry or as an exegetical tool by the teacher to aid the student’s comprehension of a passage with Homer being the favourite subject of it’. According to Theon, ‘τῇ παραφράσει ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ... ὅταν ἔξιν τινὰ περιποιησώμεθα underlying in this way that the exercise of paraphrase could be used from the very beginning depending on the student’s competence (cf. Roberts, p.13).

All these schede – *progymnasmata* underline the essential and central role in the curriculum that the teaching of rhetoric held. The summarised way though the story of the *Iliad* is afforded could perfectly serve also as an introduction to the teaching of poetry, familiarising the students with the topic of the set-text of the *Iliad*. The thread running through all of the schede was grammar, the *téchnē tēxhōn καὶ ἐπιστήμη ἐπιστημῶν*, the foundation of all sciences.

It is clear therefore that Moschopoulos selected and successfully intertwined in his schedography material of theological, Homeric, rhetorical content which could be adapted to the needs of different courses. This reminds us of Psellos’ poems on religion, grammar and law composed for Emperor Michael VII Doukas (1071-1078) and which, as Walker in his article (‘Michael Psellos on rhetoric: a translation and commentary on Psellos’ synopsis of Hermogenes’, *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31 [2001], 5-40) had aptly noticed, ‘reflected a curricular sequence beginning from elementary religion-lessons ... proceeding thence to the ancient arts of grammar and rhetoric, and thence to law, and finally to medicine.’ Whether Psellos’ endeavour and example exercised influence on Moschopoulos’ composing his schedographic work remains to be attested. What is clear, however, is that even though Moschopoulos’ *Περὶ σχεδῶν* was used for less advanced courses than Psellos’ poems, Moschopoulos enhanced the utility of his manual securing thus a place not only in the curriculum of his own times but well beyond.
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Gli Erotemata di Manuele Moscopulo nella tradizione grammaticale greca

L’Ars di Dionisio Trace, nella forma in cui è stata tramandata, ha avuto una straordinaria influenza sulla composizione dei manuali grammaticali successivi. I suoi capitoli iniziali trattano degli argomenti introduttivi alle parti del discorso, dando definizioni della γραμματική, della ἀνάγνωσις, del τόνος, della στιχιμή, della ῥαφωδία, dello στοιχεῖον, della συλλαβή, della λέξις; seguono le trattazioni delle singole parti del discorso (ὄνομα, ύπομη, μετοχή, ἄρθρον, ἀντωνυμία, πρόθεσις, ἐπίρρημα, σύνδεσμος), di impostazione teorica e prive della descrizione della morfologia flessiva, necessaria alla comprensione delle strutture della lingua. Evidentemente, il manuale di Dionisio doveva fornire essenzialmente la griglia entro cui distribuire la varia fenomenologia grammaticale oggetto di trattazione all’interno della attività didattica che si esplicava nella scuola. Un elemento di questa griglia era costituito dalla sintetica indicazione delle terminazioni nominativali dei nomi:

telika arsevnikon onomatax kai enikhein ptoxon stoixeia esti pentete; v xi r σ ψ, oion Dwn, Phoinix, Néstor, Páris, Péloψ. θηλυκων dè oktω- a η ω v xi r σ ψ, oion Mousa, Έλενη, Κλεω, χελιδων, ελιξ, μητηρ, Θέτις, λαίλαψ, ουδετέρων dè εξ- a i v r σ u, oion árma, mêli, déntroν, ðwfr, dépas, dórwn. tineês dè proosthésai kai to o, oion álllo. Δυικων dè tria- ' a e ω, oion Ατρειδα, Ἐκτορε, φίλω. Πληθυντικων dè téssara- i σ a η, oion φιλο, Ἐκτορες, βιβλία, βέλη (GG, I. 1, pp. 15-16).

Fu Teodosio Alessandrino (IV sec.) a costruire il complesso edificio dei canoni, individuando 35 όνοματα maschili, 12 femminili e 9 neutri che potevano esemplificare tutta la varia fenomenologia clitica della lingua: si tratta di un sistema che ebbe un successo duraturo e assoluto nella scuola bizantina, e fu per questo sottoposto alla minuta esegesi di Giorgio Cherobosco (IX sec.), il cui commentario suggellò, col dispiegamento di un ampio tessuto normativo, l’opera del predecessore. La teoria relativa alla morfologia del nome rimase impiantata sui canoni teodosiani per gran parte del millennio bizantino. Ma è chiaro che essa richiedeva un grande sforzo mnemonico per acquisire tutta la lunga serie di nomi canonici, distinti secondo la terminazione del nominativo, in base ai quali sarebbe stato possibile declinare qualunque altro nome. Il procedimento era complicato per il fatto che i singoli nomi andavano memorizzati insieme con le caratteristiche proprie di ognuno, ma una volta padroneggiato il complesso sistema di regole, esso veniva a costituire quasi un insieme di caselle nelle quali tutti gli altri vocaboli potevano automaticamente essere collocati. Se consideriamo, per esempio, il primo canone maschile (Διάς), con la regola annessa per la formazione del genitivo (tā eis a kal₃αρoν όνοματα διςυλλαβα βαρύτονα) poikikataληκτα δι του ντ κλινεται, si può facilmente comprendere come l’indicazione delle proprietà di questo canone consenta di riportare ad esso, e quindi alla declinazione con genitivo in -ος, tutti i vocaboli con quelle specifiche caratteristiche formali, che li distinguono da quelli enunciati per il secondo canone (κοὖлежа), con la medesima terminazione nominativa, ma che, facendo parte dei nomi eis a kal₃αρον ἕπερ δυο συλλαβάς ἀπλα βαρύτονα, presenta invece il genitivo in -ου; e allo stesso modo, il canone ottavo dei femminili (λαμπάς) prevede il genitivo in -δος proprio di tutti i femminili in -ας così come il canone nono...
(philòtis) quello in -tòς perché τά eis τής θηλυκά μονογενή διά τοῦ τος κλινεται. Lo svantaggio della memorizzazione di questa mole di osservazioni era in qualche modo compensato dal fatto che la declinazione di tutti i vocaboli, riconducibili a quelli dei canoni, era resa quasi automatica. Non occorreva, insomma, l’ausilio di alcuno ulteriore strumento per ottenere ragguagli relativi alla formazione dei casi partendo dal nominativo, e d’altro canto in una certa misura era possibile anche il processo inverso, per il quale si risaliva alla terminazione del nominativo da quelle degli altri casi.

Un punto di svolta che condurrà agli sviluppi rivoluzionari della teoria morfologica a cavallo fra XIV e XV secolo è rintracciabile nella grammatica di Teodoro Prodromo, di cui finora è passata inosservata l’innovazione rilevante che egli introduce nel sistema dei canoni. Teodoro infatti, che compone un manuale associando ai capitoli sulle singole parti del discorso (con la trattazione in prima posizione di articoli, pronomi, preposizioni, avverbi e congiunzioni), secondo il modello dionisiano, la discussione dei canoni teodosiani, formula - a quanto pare per la prima volta, circa due secoli prima di Nilo Diassorino, a cui Hilgard invece la assegna (GG, IV, 1, p. LIV) - la fondamentale distinzione, ai fini della corretta e immediata individuazione delle declinazioni, tra nomi imparisillabi e nomi parisillabi. Per quanto concerne gl’imparisillabi:

-apa σο τοίνυν κλίσεις ονομάτων ἐκ τῆς εὐθείας εἰς τήν γενικήν κλημομένη καὶ τρεπομένη [... ἢ περιττοσυλλάβως γίνεται ἢ ἱσοσυλλάβως· εἰ μὲν οὖν περιττοσυλλάβως, ἄθρετοι μοι τὴν ἀκολουθίαν· τιμικά ἡ γάρ ἐκ μὲν τῆς εὐθείας ἢ γενική γίνεται καὶ λήγει εὐξ ἀνάγκης εἰς οὐ, ἐκ δὲ τῆς γενικῆς ἢ δοτική πάλιν γίνεται καὶ λήγει καὶ αὐτή ἐξ ἀνάγκης εἰς ἑκφωνούμενον κτλ; 

su parisillabi:

tον τοίνυν ἵσοσυλλάβως κλημομένων ονομάτων ἐκ μὲν τῆς εὐθείας ἢ γενική γίνεται καὶ λήγει ϑας ἐπιτοπλείστον εἰς οὐ, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ εἰς α, ὡς Λουκάς Λουκά καὶ Θωμᾶς Ἡρακλῆς· ἐκ δὲ τῆς γενικῆς ἢ δοτική κανονίζεται, καὶ ὅταν μὲν εἰς μακρὸν φωνῆν λήγη, ἀντίστοιχον <ἐχει,>, ἔχει δὲ ἀεὶ τὸ ὑποκατωγραφόμενον καὶ μὴ ἑκφωνούμενον κτλ.

È da osservare che Teodoro comprende nei parisillabi, come si ricava dalla successiva trattazione dei canoni, i nomi maschili in -ας -ης, quelli maschili e femminili in -ος, i neutri in -ον e i femminili in -α -η, e che vanno quindi idealmente integrate – a meno che l’omissione non sia addebitabile a una lacuna nella trasmissione –, al fianco della desinenza genitivale -ος, le desinenze del genitivo dei femminili -ας -ης.

Quanto alla serie dei canoni, va qui precisato che la grammatica di Teodoro aggiunge un dato alle osservazioni di Pertusi relativamente agli Erotemata anonymi tramandati in manoscritti dislocati fra XII e XIV-XV sec. Teodoro opera infatti alcuni accorpamenti: il canone VI Ἡρακλῆς viene inglobato nel V come osservazione conclusiva (τὸ γὰρ Ἡρακλῆς καὶ τὸ Περικλῆς ἐπεὶ ἀπὸ ὀυδέτερου ὀνόματος σύγκειται τοῦ κλέος διὰ τοῦ εος καὶ ταῦτα ποιοῦσι τήν γενικήν Ἡρακλέους γὰρ καὶ Περικλέους λέγομεν), ma è anche omessa sul margine la relativa numerazione, che pertanto, rispetto a quella teodosiana, scende di un’unità. I canoni maschili assommano in questo modo a 34, ben prima di quanto attestino sia Moscopulo sia gli Erotemata anonymi del Marc. gr. X. 41, contenuti in un manoscritto del XIV sec. (si noti che la numerazione in Goettling, editore della grammatica di Prodromo, è erronea). Inoltre tratta di δρις, canone VIII teodosiano, all’interno del VI (Πάρις, e di πλοις, canone XIV, nel canone XIII (βοῦς). Anche Teodoro sostituisce nel canone IV dei femminili τρυγόναl τεodosiano τρήρων e nel V dei neutri δέλεαρ a ἣμαρ.
L'assunzione della distinzione di imparisillabi e parisillabi come criterio per stabilire il tipo di declinazione ritorna, come si è detto, in Nilo Diassorino. A f. 22r del ms. Magdalen. 1447 della Biblioteca Universytecka di Wroclaw egli infatti così si esprime:

gίνωσκε ὅτι πολλοὶ κανόνες εἰσὶν ἀρσενικοὶ κύριοι, ἀρ᾽ ἃν εἰσὶν οἱ κυρίωτεροι δύο, ὁ Αῖας καὶ ὁ κοχλίας. τοῦ μὲν Αἰαντὸς ἡ γενικὴ περιττοσυλλαβεῖ, τοῦ δὲ κοχλίου ἱσοσυλλαβεῖ πάντα γοῦν τὰ ὁνόματα, εἰτε ἀρσενικοῦ γένους εἰσὶν εἰτε θηλυκοῦ εἰτε οὐδετέρου, ἡ ισοσυλλαβοῦσι, γίνωσκε, καὶ κλίνονται ὡς ὁ κοχλίας καὶ ἐχουσι καὶ τοὺς κανόνας τοῦ κοχλίου, πλὴν τῶν γενικῶν αὐτῶν τῶν ἔνικων· ἐκεῖνα γὰρ ἰδίους ἔχουσι κανόνας (il riferimento è ai nomi femminili in -α -η con genitivo in -ας-ης, l'unica desinenza che li differenzi dai maschili in -ας-ης)· εἰτε περιττοσυλλαβοῦσιν, ὡς ὁ Αῖας, καὶ ἔχουσι τοὺς κανόνας τοῦ Αἰαντος. Γίνωσκε ὅτι ἄν περιττοσυλλαβῆ ἡ γενικῆ τοῦ ὁνόματος, ἡ δοτική ἕνι πάντοτε διά τοῦ ι, καὶ ἡ αἰτιατικὴ διὰ τοῦ α, καὶ ἢ εὐθεία τῶν πληθυντικῶν διὰ τῆς ες υλόν, οἰον τῷ Αἰαντί, τὸν Αἰαντα, οἱ Αἰαντες· εἰ δὲ ἱσοσυλλαβεῖ, ἡ δοτική ἕνι ἀνεκφώνητος, ἢ εἰς α, ὡς τῷ κοχλία, ἢ εἰς η, ὡς τῷ Χρύσῃ, ἢ εἰς ω μέγα, ὡς τῷ πλῶρ, ἔχει δὲ καὶ τὴν αἰτιατικὴν δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ν, ὡς τὸν κοχλίαν, καὶ τὴν εὐθείαν τῶν πληθυντικῶν εἰς αἱ διφθογγον, ὡς τὸ οἱ κοχλίαι.

Gli Erotemata di Moscopulo entrano nel panorama della storia della grammatica bizantina senza apportare, essenzialmente, elementi significativi, soprattutto se si considera il contributo innovativo di Teodoro Prodromo, ma anzi, inserendosi nel solco della pura tradizione teodosiana. Il titolo ha in genere una formulazione pressappoco identica a quella che si legge, per esempio, nel Neap. II D 13, di mano di Giovanni Roso: ἁρχὴ σὺν θεῷ ἀγίῳ τῶν ἑρωτμάτων διορθωθέντων παρὰ τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογωτάτου κυροῦ Μανουήλ τοῦ Μοσχοπούλου. Isolati i casi in cui esso include altre indicazioni: così nel Bern. 316 gli Erotemata vengono definiti βραχυνθέντα. E in effetti, come già aveva osservato Hilgard, il manuale di Moscopulo si presenta come una redazione rielaborata ma anche ridotta della produzione erotematica precedente - in particolare, Hilgard esamina gli Erotemata contenuti nel Guelf. Gud. gr. 112 –, a cui, tra l'altro, risale la suddivisione tra κανών e παράδειγμα che ritorna in Moscopulo ma che è assente in Teodoro Prodromo: il κανών fornisce il modello nominale per la declinazione, il παράδειγμα è l'esempio di un nome con terminazione uguale a quella del nome canonicò ma che può essere soggetto a diversa declinazione in virtù di peculiarità accentuative o quantitativi o morfologiche.

L'opera di Moscopulo presenta aspetti che ne garantiscono un solido successo, destinato a durare anche dopo l'apparizione delle fortunate grammatiche umanistiche composte dai Bizantini che operarono in Italia. Per quanto riguarda l'articolazione della materia, anche Moscopulo, seguendo il modello di Dionisio Trace, dedica la sezione iniziale del suo manuale alla definizione di προσωπία, τέχνη, στιγμή, γραμματική, στοιχεία, συλλαβή, λέξεις e λόγως, e alla esposizione delle otto parti del discorso. La seconda ampia sezione comprende invece la trattazione dei canoni teodosiani – anche in questo caso ridotti di un'unità per l'omissione del Β'Τραχλῆς –, il cui impianto include informazioni etimologiche e grammaticali – particolarmente ampie nei primi canoni maschili – inclini alla tecnica degli epimerismi e non strettamente funzionali alla comprensione della morfologia del singolo nome-canone. A scopo di esemplificazione riporto qui l'esposizione del XV canone (XVI teodosiano), quale si legge nell'editio princeps del 1493, curata da Demetrio Calcondila:
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pótheν γέλως; parà tò ħew, ħélwos, kai tróπh tòu χ eis γ, γέλως· δò ħár γέλως áπò diakhevménhs ψυχῆς gínetai. Tò ħe ψιlóν ēk tòu χéw· tò δìa tòu eō ῥήμαta δυνάμενa épì deuτhroú kai trítoù prosoúpou suνaíresein épideξáσαι dià tòu ħ ψιlóu γράφονται, òiōn ħéw, χέhεis χεís, ῥéw, réeis réiς, ᾧlw, ᾧlēς χεís, pléw, tò metà nèwos thaláttaν perwò, plèëws plèës kai êtera. Tà δè mh δυνάμενa épì deuτhroú kai trítoù prosoúpou suνaíresein épideξáσαι dià tòς ai diφhóγγou γράφονται, òiōn palaìw, lilaìomai, tò épithumìw, kai êtera. Pòws klínetai; Tòu ħélwòtòs. O kanývò· tòns eis ws ἀρσενικῶν βαρυτόνων tà méν βραχεία παραληγόμενa dià tòu tòς kλíνονtai, γέλως γέλωτòs, νέpωs νέpωtòs, tà δè makrà δìa kαθαρού tòu òs, Míνwos Míνwos, ἡρως ἦρως.

Παράδειγμα

Pótheν ἦρως; Parà tò ἦρως κατά Πλάτωνα· γεγόνασι γάρ, φηςι, οἱ ἦρως ἀπὸ ἦρωτος, ἢ θεοῦ πρὸς θυτὴν ἢ θητητὸ πρὸς θεάν, ἢ pará tò ħérein tò légein, ὅτι, φηςι, σοφοὶ ἦσαν οἱ ἦρως καὶ ρήτορες καὶ δεινοὶ καὶ διαλεκτικοὶ καὶ ικανοὶ ἐρωτάν. Ἔτι τὸ δευτέραν· τὸ ἐπιφερομένων tòu ρ μετὰ φυσικῆς μακρᾶς δαυοῦνται, εἰ μὴ ἐγκλίσεως εἶη, οἴον Ἡρα, ἦρως. Ηρώδης· ἐγκλίσεως εἰρηται diὰ τὸ ἡρήρειστο καὶ ἦρα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπεθύμει· ταῦτα γάρ ψιlοῦνται ὡς ἀπὸ ἐγκλίσεως ὄντα. Tò ἦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἦρως κατὰ τρόπh τòu ε ἦ ἦ.


Il manuale di Moscopulo, sostanzialmente, non fa quindi che riprendere testi erotematici elaborati da anonimi maestri che condensavano, rendendola più funzionale alla pratica didattica, la tradizionale, vasta materia grammaticale, articolandola nella scansione di domanda e risposta per agevolarne l’apprendimento mnemonico. Moscopulo suggerì col suo nome – col nome di un grande maestro e filologo impegnato tenacemente nella preservazione della letteratura classica e della sua lingua – un ‘genere’ grammaticale che aveva ormai due secoli di vita, in modo non diverso dalla schedografia, di cui, pure, egli divenne il più illustre rappresentante. Tramite la sua figura gli strumenti più recenti per mantenere efficace a Bisanzio la faticosa trasmissione del greco arcaizzante, elaborati per adeguare i materiali antichi a nuove esigenze didattiche e a nuove, più delicate, dinamiche culturali, trovarono un accesso definitivo e autorevole nella scuola
e si impiantarono stabilmente nel curriculum di studi dell’ultima Bisanzio. Il loro impiego – cui evidentemente si potevano aggiungere i trattati sintattici di Planude, Michele Sincello, Gregorio di Corinto o Giovanni Glica – accompagnava il lungo e impegnativo training sui testi, le cui modalità ci sfuggono ancora quasi del tutto, pur costituendo il basilare processo che garantiva di conseguire familiarità con le strutture sintattiche e le movenze stilistiche del greco antico. Sotto questo aspetto, potrebbe dare risultati molto utili prendere in esame i testi contenuti nelle antologie scolastiche bizantine di livello secondario – e anche in questo campo l’opera di Moscopulo ebbe grande influenza –, sia in sé e per sé, per le loro caratteristiche formali, al fine di individuare i punti di contatto con gli aspetti linguistici della produzione bizantina in lingua dotta, sia per le osservazioni lato sensu grammaticali contenute nei commenti ‘tecnologici’ che spesso accompagnano le sillogi e che possono fornire elementi idonei a riconoscere i canali di trasmissione delle competenze linguistiche di quanti ricorrevano al greco arcaizzante. In definitiva, la lingua della produzione di età paleologa, che più che mai nella storia letteraria di Bisanzio dà prova di aderire al modello formale delle opere classiche, andrebbe sottoposta ad analisi attente proprio nel rapporto mimetico che ha con quest’ultime, e le opere comprese nelle antologie scolastiche potrebbero essere da questo punto di vista un facile parametro di riferimento. Se da un lato Moscopulo ci dà un valido ausilio per ciò che concerne la sistemazione della dottrina morfologica, dall’altro, in assenza di documentazione ‘in atto’ di provenienza scolastica – anche se in una certa misura le recollectae degli allievi occidentali dei maestri Bizantini possono offrirci utili spunti di riflessione –, è la commisurazione della lingua dei testi con quella degli auctores a poter fare emergere quanto – se non è possibile come – la lezione di questi fu correttamente trasmessa ai loro epigoni nella scuola bizantina.
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‘Atticismo’ ed excerpta lessicografici in miscellanee erudite durante l’età paleologa

§ 1. Negli studi sulla civiltà letteraria di Bisanzio il termine ‘atticismo’ è invalso a designare una speciale attitudine arcaizzante linguistico-stilistica, riscontrabile nell’ambito della Hochsprache già tra X-XII sec., e solo parzialmente sovrapponibile all’omonimo movimento del I-II sec. d.C., sia per i mutati presupposti ideologici, sia per le forme più variegate che esso assunse: molto più ampio il canone ideale di autori-modello o ritenuti esemplari (da Omero ai Padri della Chiesa e oltre) rispetto alle selezioni puristiche operate da lessicografi come Frinico o Polluce, più pervasiva l’ossessione per il recupero di tratti ortografici, morfologici e lessicali caduti in disuso e veicolati come arcaismi consapevoli, talora associati a forme ipercaratterizzanti e solo astrattamente possibili nei modelli. Siffatta attitudine si riverberava, sul piano concreto, nella capacità dei singoli autori di operare una vera e propria ‘mimesi’ dei modelli del passato, con gradazioni ed esiti diversi nelle differenti epoche.


Il dominio della lingua attica si poneva al traguardo di un percorso di studio che dall’istruzione elementare conduceva alla retorica e alla lettura dei modelli, come Platone, Tucidide, un gruppo di retori e oratori che includevano Demostene, Elio Aristide, Sinesio, Libanio, e Padri della Chiesa come Gregorio di Nazianzo. Attraverso questi studi il retore doveva essere in grado di comporre declamazioni e pezzi di bravura oratoria, a volte commissionati da membri dell’élite intellettuale e politica dell’epoca con i quali affascinare uditorio e lettori. Non infrequenti sono i giudizi di valore che si leggono sull’abilità stilistico-lessicale dei grandi intellettuali dell’epoca: Niceforo Gregora (Hist.Rom. 1.163.12-14) diceva di Giorgio/Gregorio di Cipro che τὴν Ἀττικίζοντας γλώσσαν ἑκεῖνην, πάλαι πολὺν ἣς χρόνον λήθης κρυβέντά βυθόν, φύεσις δεξιότητι καὶ φιλοπονία τελεωτέρα πρὸς φῶς ἤγαγε; sezioni scelte delle sue epistole furono incluse in collezioni di excerpta come i Ῥοδωνία

§ 2. Meno noti sono invece i processi concreti avviati all’interno dell’istruzione superiore che consentivano il raggiungimento di tali competenze: se infatti il presupposto iniziale è costituito da una perseverante e incessante attività di lettura e introiezione dei ‘modelli’, sul piano pratico occorrevano strumenti di consultazione e di lavoro come dizionari atticisti, repertori ortografici, lessicali ed esegetici, antologie di pezzi ritenuti esemplari; poiché la composizione in prosa necessitava non solo del lessico, ma anche della sicura padronanza dei tratti morfologico-sintattici della lingua, questi andavano estrapolati dai modelli, inventariati e raccolti secondo determinati criteri di organizzazione dei lemmi.

Genesi, composizione (fonti utilizzate, modalità di assemblaggio dei materiali) e trasmissione di molti di questi strumenti restano ancora in larga misura da chiarire, così come andrebbero indagate incisivamente le tipologie grafiche e librarie adottate, identificati i copisti e gli ambienti di produzione e circolazione dei libri. All’interno di questa galassia di testi, si isolano, almeno a grandi linee, tre raggruppamenti:

i) lessici e repertori atticisti generali e/o particolari (come i lessici sintattici, sia nominali sia verbalì) dallo statuto ‘autoriale’ ben delineato, ossia ascritti dalla tradizione a eruditi come Massimo Planude, Giovanni Glici, Costantino Armenopulo, Andrea Lopadiota, Tommaso Magistro, Giorgio Lacapeno. Tra di essi ebbero una vasta diffusione il περὶ συντάξεως di Massimo Planude (ed. in Bachmann 1828, 105-166; comprendeva trattazione generale delle otto parti del discorso, interrogative, articolo, pronome, participio e congiunzioni); il περὶ ὀρθότητος συντάξεως di Giovanni Glici (ed. in Jahn 1839; era organizzato per singoli *zetemata* su reggenze casi, participi, solecismi e barbarismi); il περὶ τῆς συντάξεως τῶν ἡμᾶτων ἀρχαίων ἀπὸ τῶν ὄνοματα καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν μετὰ προθέσεως di Costantino Armenopulo (ed. in Hermann 1801 353-421 e Guida 2000). Del tutto peculiare è il caso di Giorgio Lacapeno, a cui si deve l’allestimento di commentari lessicografico-grammaticali alla propria raccolta epistolare: questa fu dotata di glosse esplicative interlineari e di *Epimerismi* di matrice sintattico-morfologico-etimologica a singoli lemmi che seguivano il testo stesso di ciascuna epistola; si tratta di un’opera a metà tra l’istruzione media di stampo grammatico-etimologico (peculiare ad esempio dei commentari approntati da Manuele Moscopulo) e l’istruzione superiore a cui mira la parte sintattico-stilistica (vd. Lindstam 1910 e Nuti 2014, 202-204).

ii) antologie scolastiche di larga diffusione e dall’assetto interno stabile, come quella isolata da Carlo Gallavotti: legata ai nomi di Massimo Planude e Manuele Moscopulo essa comprendeva (i) una selezione delle *Imagines* di Filostrato Maggiore (I 1-26), (ii) la c.d *Sylloge Vaticana* (circa 70 epigrammi desunti dal primo libro della scelta antologica di Planude), (iii) il poemetto sulle terme pitiche ascritto a Paolo Silenziario e (iv) un florilegio di estratti da Marco Aurelio e Eliano (panoramica aggiornata in Canart 2011).

iii) raccolte - sotto forma di zibaldone erudito - di testualità autonome di varia estensione (dalla singola pericope/sintagma isolato all’estratto di varie linee di testo), in cui *excerpta* di autori classici e bizantini si coagulano - in proporzioni spesso difformi nei singoli casi - a osservazioni lessicali, costruzioni di verbi o di preposizioni e congiunzioni (con relativi *exempla*), lemmi attinenti a *Realiens*,
materiali spesso estrapolati e rimaneggiati da dizionari d’uso corrente e repertori preesistenti. Si tratta di “nicht-thematischen Exzerptensammlungen” (secondo la recente ricognizione di Kotsabassi 2010) per pratiche di studio individuali o collettive e finalità retoriche: esse possono essere autoriali e anonime; possono avere uno statuto testuale proprio (e quindi trasmissione in più copie, sebbene caratterizzate da tradizione ‘aperta’, dunque soggetta alla formazione di recensioni interne plurime: cfr. la Synagôgê di Massimo Planude [vd. ora Ferroni 2015], i παρακολουθηματα και ζητηματα γραμματικα άναγκα ιωκαι ascritti a Niceforo Gregora) o sopravvivere in copia unica, in quanto copia d’autore del compilatore/fruitore (o compilatori/fruitori, in caso di raccolte collettive frutto di cerchie dotte, ‘circoli di scrittura’ secondo la formulazione di Guglielmo Cavallo; il tipo è esemplificato dalla succitata raccolta di Macario Criscoefalo).

Sul piano bibliologico troviamo le tipologie sopra elencate sotto forma di (1) unità librarie autonome (Hausbücher autoriali come l’Escol. X.I.13 di Gregorio di Cipro, Heid. Pal. gr. 129 di Niceforo Gregora e sodali, i Par.gr. 1220 e Chis. R.IV.12 realizzati dal monaco Gabriele/Giovanni Critopulo, le raccolte di excerpta nei Par.gr. 2022 e Burney 112 di Matteo di Gabala, le raccolte di excerpta costituite dai Vat. gr. 1144 e Neap. Il C 32 realizzati da Giorgio Galesiota (su cui vd. infra; l’identificazione per il Vat. gr. 1144 è in Harlfinger 2011; per la ricchezza del Neap., di cui qui si propone l’attribuzione alla mano del Galesiota, si vd. almeno Guida 2008), anonime raccolte di estratti come quelle approntate dal copista del Vat.gr. 1852, ff.1r-104v, un collaboratore di Niceforo Gregora); (2) testualità di media o limitata estensione, inserite sia all’interno di volumi monoautoriali o miscellanei di vario contenuto (non solo erudito) a mo’ di completamento/addizione, sia in spatia vacua, fogli di guardia e/o liminari, spazi marginali di volumi di contenuto vario.

§. 3. Quest’ultima categoria è di gran lunga la più sfuggente, non solo per la difficoltà di identificazione dei segmenti testuali raccolti negli excerpta, a volte descritti in modo sommario o negletti del tutto nei cataloghi a stampa, ma anche per l’apparente eterogeneità dell’assemblaggio che sembra sfuggire a ogni criterio razionale. In questa sede discuto brevemente due casi, uno già noto, l’altro ancora inedito, che ritengo esemplificativi del fenomeno e dei meccanismi sottostanti alla formazione di tali micro-raccolte.


Accanto ai testi principali compaiono poi nei ff. liminari o in ff. bianchi alla fine di fascicoli (indizio di cesure tra un blocco testuale e il successivo a volte dovuto anche ad un cambio di modello)
testualità minori, ovvero quattro brevi sillogi di scoli al *Filebo* e al *Simposio* di Platone (f. 1v e 374r-377r, questi ultimi però di altra mano), alle *Epistole* di Sinesio (f. 90v ll. 22-37) al *Falaride* di Luciano (f. 374r ll. 1-21, a.i.), copiati dallo stesso Galesiota e in larga parte identici alle brevi sillogi di scoli edita da Bühler 1987, 360-365 dai *Laur.* 58.29 e *Vat.* gr. 878. Se si eccettuano i ff. finali con gli scoli platonici, negli altri casi si tratta di succinte sezioni di riempimento del blocco testuale maggiore.

Altri due escerti, ospitati ai ff. 87v, ll. 27-40 e 186rv (ovvero nei fogli bianchi finali di fascicolo come integrazioni a unità codicologiche omogenee) sono state editi da I. Pérez Martín (Pérez Martín 1999) come segmenti di una ‘tecnoología léxico-gramatical’ senza ‘una ordenación alfabética ni de otro tipo’; la studiosa indica a fianco dei singoli lemmi possibili minimi di una ‘tecnología léxico-gramatical’ senza ‘una ordenación alfabética come integrazioni a unità codicologiche omogenee) sono state editi from *I. Pérez Martín (Pérez Martín 1999)*.

In realtà, come già intuito in parte da Bühler 1987, 360, i due escerti sono costituiti in larga misura da segmenti estrapolati dal *corpus* di scoli alle *Epistole* di Sinesio (copiati ai ff. 307r-374r) che il Galesiota ha ripreso verbatim (cfr. e.g. nr. 9 e quanto si legge a f. 325r marg. inf.), quasi un prontuario ridotto di espressioni, Realien, usi linguistici peculiari. A f. 87v su 12 lemmi ben 7 sono stati estratti dal *corpus* sinesiano:

5. ἀποκρίνεται ὃ ἐρωτόμενος, ἀπολογεῖται δὲ ὃ ἐγκαλούμενος, κατηγορεῖ ὃ ἐγκαλῶν· καταδικάζει δὲ καὶ καταψηφίζεται ὁ κριτής (= *Schol. SYN. EP*. 41.297 G. [ed. in Garzya 1960, 247-8])
6. διοικεῖν τὸ ἄρχειν, παραδιοικεῖν τὸ ἔλλαττον τίνα εἶναι μετὰ τοῦ ἔρχοντος (= *Schol. SYN. EP*. 41.281 G. [ed. in Garzya 1960, 213])
7. ἔδωκεν δίκην ὁ τιμωρηθείς, ἐλαβε δίκην ὁ τιμωρήσας (= *Schol. SYN. EP*. 45.32 G. [ed. in Garzya 1960, 234])
8. ἀκαπήλευτον· ἄδολον, καθαρόν, ἀκάπηλος, ἀπὸ τοῦ κακύνει καὶ μιγνύει τὸν πηλὸν καὶ τὸν οἴνον. (= *Schol. SYN. EP*. 51.6 G. [ed. in Garzya 1960, 241])
9. πεμπτέος ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄξιος πεμφθῆναι. ψιλόν, πεμπταῖος δὲ ἠλθὲ τις ἀντὶ τοῦ κατὰ πέμπτην ἡμέραν (= *Schol. SYN. EP*. 53.9 G. [ed. in Garzya 1960, 242])
10. ἐδώκεν τῷ λιμένι, ἦγουν ἐγενόμεν ἐν τῷ λιμένι (= *Schol. SYN. EP*. 53.2 G. [ed. in Garzya 1960, 242]).

Anche nel secondo gruppo di lemmi (f. 186rv) abbiamo un nucleo facilmente identificabile, che ha la medesima origine: su 16 glosse, ben 10 provengono da *Scholia* alle *Epistole* di Sinesio, sempre in blocchi ben definiti; sono nr. 4-9 (f. 186r) e 11-14 (f. 186v):

4. πλαίσιον· σχήμα τὸ τετράγωνον (= *Schol. SYN. EP*. 104.56 G. [ed. in Garzya 1960, 271]).
5. ἀφοσίωσαν ἀντὶ τοῦ καθαίρω καὶ ἀφανίζω· ἀφοσίωσαν καὶ ἀφιερώσασθαι τῷ ἔτελς ποιησά, ἀλλ’ ἤστερ οὐκεί, καὶ ἀράτος ἐκεῖνο, παρὰδὲ τῷ Θεολόγῳ Ἱργορίῳ (Or. 43.1) ἀφωγηθέν τοι δεξιά λέγεσθαι, τῷ ἀποδεδομένῳ ἀντὶ τοῦ καθαίρω (= *Schol. SYN. EP*. 103.2 G. [ed. in Garzya 1960, 228]).
7. κάθοδος ή ἐκ τῆς ἔξοριας ὑποστραφή, καὶ κατήχηθην οἱ φυγάδες εἰς τὴν πόλιν (= Schol. Syn. Ep. 12.9 G. (ed. in Garzya 1960, 229)).

8. Ὡκκαρικὸν ἀπὸ τῆς Ὡκκαρίας, ψιλὸν καὶ β´ κκ´. Ἰκάριον δὲ πέλαγος ἀπὸ τινὸς Ἰκάρου, ፣ καὶ ἐν κ´ (= Schol. Syn. Ep. 3.29 G. (ed. in Garzya 1960, 218)).


12. ὁμόγνιον τὸ τῶν ὁμογινῶν ὀσπερ συγγενικόν τὸ τῶν συγγενῶν· ὁμογενεῖς δὲ εἰσὶν οἱ ὁμοθένες (= Schol. Syn. Ep. 43.118 G. (ed. in Garzya 1960, 238))

13. ἔχατον τὸ μέγα καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον (= Schol. Syn. Ep. 5.43 G. [ed. in Garzya 1960, 222])

14. Μόρα τὰ φαλάγγα (ἄλλαγμα) παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀφʼ ή συμμορία (= Schol. Syn. Ep. 104.56 G. (ed. in Garzya 1960, 252)).

La presenza preponderante, ma non esclusiva, dei materiali scoliografici a Sinesio rispecchia anche la conformazione della raccolta sinesiana di f. 90v ll. 22-37, in parte sovrapponibile con quella edita in Bühler 1987, 364-365 sulla scorta del Laur. 58.29: sezioni sinesiane accanto a materiali di altra provenienza.

Un elemento non notato da Bühler, che accomuna ulteriormente i testimoni implicati (incluso il Vat. gr. 878, dello stesso torno di tempo), è la loro contemporaneità, giacché anche il Laur. 58.29 risale alla prima metà del XIV sec. essendo stato realizzato (ad eccezione dei ff. 9-16 di mano di un copista coevo) dallo stesso scribe, ancora anonimo, attivo sui margini del Vat. gr. 7 (lessico di G. Francopulo, completato nel 1310) a cui si devono anche gli Ambros. L 39 sup., L 44 sup. e il Vat.gr. 2228 (identificazione in Turyn 1964, 108-109).

§ 3.2. Il secondo caso è tratto da una compilazione contenuta in manoscritti di matrice planudeo-moscopulea, ora all’interno di raccolte lessicali più ampie (come nel caso dell’Ambros. L 44 sup.), ora isolata dal titolo περὶ ῥημάτων come nel Vat. gr. 15 da cui esso è tratto. Si tratta di un manoscritto cartaceo (ff. I-IV, 298) datato al XIV-XV sec. nel catalogo vaticano (Mercati-Franchi de’ Cavalieri 1903, 11-14) in quanto frutto dell’unione di almeno tre unità codicologiche differenti; la prima, di nostro interesse (ff. 1r-60v), può essere ricondotta ai decenni centrali della prima metà del XIV sec. per tipologia grafica (la mano attiva ai ff. 41r-45v presenta forti affinità con quella di Nicefora Gregora, per quanto alcuni elementi ne sconsigliino l’identificazione) e aspetti codicologici (le filigrane ‘cercle’ da me rilevate per esempio ai ff. 6r+9; 18+23; 20+21 e ‘fruit’ ai ff. 36+37; 35+38 sono simili rispettivamente a Mošin-Traljić 1937 [1336] - Briquet 3206 [1342] e Mošin-Traljić 4276 [1341] - Briquet 7373 [1335-41]).

Il blocco iniziale (otto fascicoli) doveva essere costituito da quaternioni e un ternione, secondo una diversa sequenza rispetto a quella attuale, in parte mutila; essi contenevano una serie di testi lessicografici (sintattici e non) e raccolte di lexēs, oggi non ancora tutte identificate. All’interno del primo zibaldone lessicografico (ff. 25r-30v) fu inserito il nostro estratto (a partire da f. 28v l. 10 a.i. sino a f. 30v con titolo in rosso e senza alcun stacco con la sezione precedente).
L'apparente farragine dell'escerto, in cui i lemmi si susseguono senza ordine alfabetico si dissipa non appena si identificano i testi addotti come *exempla*; ai ff. 29rv, ad esempio, si possono isolare i seguenti blocchi e i due testi da cui sono stati effettuati i prelievi (qui indicati con linea tratteggiata):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. μακαρίζωσε ἐπὶ τῷ κύριῳ τῷ πράγματι, ἐμακάριζον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ αἴματι τῶν ἐν τῇ Λακωνίκῃ (Λακο- Vat.) θαλάττη κοχλίδων.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Διαλιμπάνω καὶ τούτῳ μετὰ μετοχήν κατολόγησε. Λουκιανός οὗ διαλέψαναι τὰ ρητὰ διείδεαντες. (= Cal. 1.10)</td>
<td>Luc. Calumniae non temere credendum 1. Δεινών γε ἢ ἁγνῶς καὶ πολλὸν κακῶν ἀνθρώπων αἰτία, ὅσπερ ἁγνὸν τίνα καταχέουσα τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τῆς ἀλήθειας ἀμαυρώδους καὶ τῶν ἐκάστων βίων ἐπικιαζόμουσα, ἐν σκότῳ γοῦν πλανώμενοι πάντες ἐσόκαμεν, μᾶλλον δὲ τυφλοῖς ὁμοῖα πεπόνθαμεν, τῷ μὲν προεπετοιοτάτῃ ἀλόγῳ, τὸ δὲ ὑπερβαίνοντες, οὐδὲν δεόν, καὶ τὸ μὲν πλησίον καὶ παρὰ πόδας οὐχ ὀρῶντες, τὸ δὲ πόρρῳ καὶ πάμπυλοι διεστίκος ὡς ἐν χολικω δεδομένος καὶ ὅλος εἰρ’ ἐκάστων τῶν πρατομένων οὐ διαλέτουσαν τὰ πολλὰ διείδεαντες, τοιγάρτῳ μυρία ἣδε τοῖς τραγῳδοδιδακάλοις αἴρομεν εἰς τὰ δράματα τὸ τοιοῦτο παρέχεται, τοὺς Λαβδακίδας καὶ τοὺς Πελοπίδας καὶ τὰ τοῦτον παραπλήσασι· σχέδον γὰρ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ ἀναβιοντῶν κακῶν εὗροι τις ἄν υπὸ τῆς ἀγνοιας καθάπερ ὑπὸ τραγοῦ τινος δαιμόνος κεχορηγημένα. Λέγω δὲ καὶ ἐκ τὰ ἀλλὰ μὲν ἀποβλέπων, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐκ τὰς σοῦ ἀληθείας κατὰ τῶν εὐνυθίων καὶ φίλων διαβολάς, ὥρ’ ἢν ἢδε καὶ ὅλους ἀνάκτοτοι γεγόνας καὶ πόλεις ἄρδῃς ἀπολλάσας, πατέρες τε κατὰ παῖδαν ἐξεμαύσαν καὶ ἀδελφοὶ κατὰ τῶν ὁμογενῶν καὶ παῖδες κατὰ τῶν γεινεμένων καὶ ἐραται κατὰ τῶν ἔρωμένων· πολλαὶ δὲ καὶ φίλαια συνεκοῖπαν καὶ ὅρκοι συνεχύσαντο ὑπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὰς διαβολὰς πιθανότητος. 2. ἐν’ ὅν τὸ ἥκιστα περιπέπτωμαι αὐτάς, ὑποδείξαι βούλομαι τῷ λόγῳ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν γοργοῖς ὑποτίς τί ἔχειν ἡ διαβολή καὶ πόθεν ἀρχεῖαι καὶ ὅποια ἐργάζεται</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Si tratta quindi di epimerismi sintattico-esegetici che rispecchiano pratiche didattiche fondate sulla lettura di due opuscoli di Luciano, i cui verbi sono stati prelevati, lemmatizzati (ora riportandoli alla prima persona del presente, ora nella forma in cui essi compaiono nel testo) con indicazione della reggenza, seguita dalla citazione lucianea; l’indicazione del nomen auctoris non compare sempre (nn. 1.3.5) a riprova che l’intero escerto nasce dalla giustapposizione di blocchi di lemmi luciani; l’ordine interno nei miniblocchi rispecchia la sequenza testuale; in un caso (n. 5) il lemma e relativo interpretamentum sono ampliati con materiale di altra provenienza (Schol. Aristoph. Ran. 776) agglutinato per analogia (si tratta di un altro verbo composto dal semplice μαίνομαι). In un altro (n. 6) il verbo lucianeo non è presente come lemma dal testo e riportato senza modifiche (περιπίπτωμεν), ma è ripreso nella pericope περιπέπτεται ἀτυχία (non altrimenti attestata: un exemplum fictum?) prima presente in Luciano (προσπταίοντες): forse qui è stata sunteggiata una spiegazione più ampia che dal testo lucianeo transitava a usi idiomatici del verbo.

Quale dunque la genesi di questo opuscolo? Si tratta di appunti presi durante letture per finalità didattiche di auctores come Luciano, poi organizzati accanto ad altri materiali tramite giustapposizione di blocchi di lemmi?

§ 4. Lo studio di una limitata selezione di questo materiale, ancora largamente inesplorato, conduce a un problema di portata più generale: che grado di incidenza tali raccolte ebbero sul piano della composizione in lingua ‘alta’ a Bisanzio? La questione andrà affrontata tramite uno studio capillare della lingua letteraria tra XIII e XIV sec. che tenga in debito conto sia il grado di mimesi esibito dai singoli autori, anche tramite il ricorso a espressioni ed elementi nominali o verbalí per i quali gli excerpta lessicali possano offrire adeguata comparazione, sia l’utilizzo di Realien attici nel tessuto dell’opera che presuppongono la lettura e lo studio dei testi classici con l’ausilio di strumenti esegetici. Si tratta di un’indagine a largo raggio che sarà sicuramente remunerativa, ma che è ancora bel lontana dall’essere pienamente realizzata.
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Le glosse alle Pitiche di Pindaro da Magistro a Triclinio

Troppa spesso utilizziamo l'opera esegetica dei tre grandi maestri dell'epoca paleologa, Magistro, Triclinio e Moscopulo, per rintracciare in essa ciò che noi filologi moderni desideriamo per confermare le nostre letture del testo antico. Molto meno di frequente immaginiamo i tre maestri nelle proprie classi, a contatto con i discenti o meglio con un potenziale variegato insieme di studenti, non per forza tutti dello stesso livello, tantomeno della stessa origine etnica. Entriamo, quindi, molto poco, sia con l'immaginazione sia con gli strumenti propri dell'analisi testuale, nella 'stanzuccia' - cito un termine che fu già del Pasquali e poi ripreso da Cavallo - tessalonicese di Magistro o di Triclinio per provare ad ascoltare la loro voce di magistri ex cathedra. Quanto, insomma, facciamo più agevolmente con gli schedografi o più in generale con l'insegnamento inferiore, ci riesce forse più difficile per l'insegnamento superiore bizantino.


Vorrei cominciare innanzitutto con una breve descrizione delle glosse. Leggendole ci troviamo dinanzi ad un materiale non del tutto uniforme. In alcuni casi una singola parola è spiegata nell'interlinea tra i cola lirici con una sola voce che molte volte traduce soltanto dal dialetto dorico all'attico il testo di Pindaro, rimanendo fedele alla radice della parola originaria. È il caso, ad esempio, delle innumerevoli occorrenze in cui gli articoli dorici vengono glossati con quelli attici o le parole con desinenza attica sovrapposte nell'interlinea a quelle pindariche con desinenza dorica. Faccio alcuni esempi:
Un'ultra tipologia di glosses è quella che semplicemente giustappone sopra il vocabolo una voce greca di uso forse più comune al tempo di Magistro o comunque maggiormente familiare ai suoi studenti, ma della stessa radice di quella pindarica. Si veda, ad esempio:

gl. ad c. 5 (v. 3) σάμασιν] σήμασιν.

Una terza categoria è rappresentata da singole parole di significato affine rispetto a quelle usate dal poeta di Tebe, ma formata morfologicamente a partire da una radice verbale diversa:

gl. ad c. 7 (v. 4a) ἀμβόλας] ἄσματα.

Rimane alla fine da analizzare un'ultima categoria di glosses che si avvicina maggiormente al genere degli scoli se non fosse per la collocazione spaziale nella quale ritroviamo queste annotazioni. Pur essendo collocate, infatti, nell'interlinea tra i cola lirici, esse sono delle volte vere e proprie parafrasi o anche commenti esplicativi che si riferiscono a singole parole o a porzioni del colon. Migliorano la comprensione immediata del testo antico ma non si dilungano eccessivamente, nè tantamento propongono una parafrasi completa dell'intero pensiero, come accade spesso nei commenti marginali di Magistro, o un approfondimento esplicativo dettagliato. Propongo qui un paio di esempi tratti ancora dalla strofe α’ della prima diade della Pítica I.

In questo caso siamo di fronte ad una doppia glossa per la stessa parola o, per meglio dire, a due glosses di tipologia diversa per la stessa parola. Nel primo caso il testo pindarico viene meramente tradotto dal dorico all'attico, nel secondo, invece, Tommaso organizza un commento più ampio che è abbastanza conciso tanto da poter essere contenuto nell'interlinea, ma allo stesso tempo non ha la forma di uno scolio indipendente. Esso rimane strettamente legato al testo pindarico, infatti, attraverso la giustapposizione fisica, nel limitato contesto spaziale tra rigo lirico ed interlinea, dello stesso caso, il dativo plurale (σάμασιν / τοῖς τύποις), e per mezzo di una strutturazione sintattica che in un'altra posizione della pagina manoscritta, lontano dalla parola pindarica cui si riferisce direttamente, produrrebbe solo l'impressione di una frase sospesa e priva di significato. Altro esempio eloquente, dello stesso tipo di quello appena descritto è il seguente:

In questo caso siamo di fronte ad una doppia glossa per la stessa parola o, per meglio dire, a due glosses di tipologia diversa per la stessa parola. Nel primo caso il testo pindarico viene meramente tradotto dal dorico all'attico, nel secondo, invece, Tommaso organizza un commento più ampio che è abbastanza conciso tanto da poter essere contenuto nell'interlinea, ma allo stesso tempo non ha la forma di uno scolio indipendente. Esso rimane strettamente legato al testo pindarico, infatti, attraverso la giustapposizione fisica, nel limitato contesto spaziale tra rigo lirico ed interlinea, dello stesso caso, il dativo plurale (σάμασιν / τοῖς τύποις), e per mezzo di una strutturazione sintattica che in un'altra posizione della pagina manoscritta, lontano dalla parola pindarica cui si riferisce direttamente, produrrebbe solo l'impressione di una frase sospesa e priva di significato. Altro esempio eloquente, dello stesso tipo di quello appena descritto è il seguente:

In questo caso siamo di fronte ad una doppia glossa per la stessa parola o, per meglio dire, a due glosses di tipologia diversa per la stessa parola. Nel primo caso il testo pindarico viene meramente tradotto dal dorico all'attico, nel secondo, invece, Tommaso organizza un commento più ampio che è abbastanza conciso tanto da poter essere contenuto nell'interlinea, ma allo stesso tempo non ha la forma di uno scolio indipendente. Esso rimane strettamente legato al testo pindarico, infatti, attraverso la giustapposizione fisica, nel limitato contesto spaziale tra rigo lirico ed interlinea, dello stesso caso, il dativo plurale (σάμασιν / τοῖς τύποις), e per mezzo di una strutturazione sintattica che in un'altra posizione della pagina manoscritta, lontano dalla parola pindarica cui si riferisce direttamente, produrrebbe solo l'impressione di una frase sospesa e priva di significato. Altro esempio eloquente, dello stesso tipo di quello appena descritto è il seguente:

In questo caso siamo di fronte ad una doppia glossa per la stessa parola o, per meglio dire, a due glosses di tipologia diversa per la stessa parola. Nel primo caso il testo pindarico viene meramente tradotto dal dorico all'attico, nel secondo, invece, Tommaso organizza un commento più ampio che è abbastanza conciso tanto da poter essere contenuto nell'interlinea, ma allo stesso tempo non ha la forma di uno scolio indipendente. Esso rimane strettamente legato al testo pindarico, infatti, attraverso la giustapposizione fisica, nel limitato contesto spaziale tra rigo lirico ed interlinea, dello stesso caso, il dativo plurale (σάμασιν / τοῖς τύποις), e per mezzo di una strutturazione sintattica che in un'altra posizione della pagina manoscritta, lontano dalla parola pindarica cui si riferisce direttamente, produrrebbe solo l'impressione di una frase sospesa e priva di significato. Altro esempio eloquente, dello stesso tipo di quello appena descritto è il seguente:

In questo caso siamo di fronte ad una doppia glossa per la stessa parola o, per meglio dire, a due glosses di tipologia diversa per la stessa parola. Nel primo caso il testo pindarico viene meramente tradotto dal dorico all'attico, nel secondo, invece, Tommaso organizza un commento più ampio che è abbastanza conciso tanto da poter essere contenuto nell'interlinea, ma allo stesso tempo non ha la forma di uno scolio indipendente. Esso rimane strettamente legato al testo pindarico, infatti, attraverso la giustapposizione fisica, nel limitato contesto spaziale tra rigo lirico ed interlinea, dello stesso caso, il dativo plurale (σάμασιν / τοῖς τύποις), e per mezzo di una strutturazione sintattica che in un'altra posizione della pagina manoscritta, lontano dalla parola pindarica cui si riferisce direttamente, produrrebbe solo l'impressione di una frase sospesa e priva di significato. Altro esempio eloquente, dello stesso tipo di quello appena descritto è il seguente:

Definite le tipologie delle glosses di Tommaso alle prime quattro Pitiche, categorie che, naturalmente, sono applicabili anche a tutte le odi Olimpiche, possiamo andare oltre e chiederci se anche questo ausilio didattico, come già sappiamo essere accaduto per la Ecloga vocum Atticarum, superò i limiti spaziali e temporali della scuola tomana e fu riutilizzato con le opportune modifiche dai successori di Magistro. Se leggiamo il codice Laur. conv. soppr. 94, archetipo dell'edizione tricliniana di Pindaro, e facciamo attenzione alle glosses interlineari, ci accorgiamo che l'esegesi di
Magistro fu recepita dall’allievo Triclinio e poi parzialmente ampliata e modificata sulla base delle esigenze proprie e dei suoi studenti. Qui di seguito riporto nuovamente le glosse ai vv. 1-5 della strofe α’ della *Pitica* 1, questa volta secondo il manoscritto tricliniano. In tondo sono trascritte le note tomane, in corsivo le aggiunte di Triclinio così come si leggono nel codice. Sono precedute da un asterisco le parole glossate solo da Triclinio.

**gl. ad c. 1 (v. 1)**  
*χρυσέα] χρυσή.  
φόρμιγξ] ώ κιθάρα.

**gl. ad cc. 1-2 (v. 1)**  
*tó προοίμιον προφωνηματικόν

**gl. ad c. 2 (v. 1)**  
ισπλοκάμων] τῶν ἀνθηρῶν ἐχουσῶν πλόκαμον· ὁποίον ἐστὶ τὸ ἴον.

**gl. ad c. 3 (v. 2)**  
σύνδικον] σύντροπον, κοινόν.  
*Μοῖσαν] Μουσών.  
κτέανον] κτῆμα | κιθαρίζοντι γὰρ τὰ Ἀπόλλωνι αἱ Μοῦσαι χορεύουσι.

**gl. ad c. 4 (v. 2a)**  
tάς] τῆς κιθάρας.  
*βάσις] ἠγουν ὣ ρυθμός.  
ἀγλαίας] εὐφροσύνης.

**gl. ad c. 5 (v. 3)**  
*πειθονται] ὑπακούουσι.  
ἀοιδοῖ] μελωδοί.  
σάμασιν] σήμασιν | τοῖς παρὰ σοῦ τύποις, ἠγουν ὅπως αὐτή τὰ μέλη τυπώσης,  
καὶ ἢ παρ’ ἐκείνων ὕδῃ φέρεται.

**gl. ad c. 6 (v. 4)**  
ἀγησιχόρων] τῶν τούς χοροὺς ἁγόντων. πρὸς γὰρ τὰ ἄσματα καὶ οἱ χοροὶ ἁγόνται.

**gl. ad c. 7 (v. 4a)**  
*ἀμβολάς] ἠγουν ἁσματα- ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναβάλλομαι το προμιᾷσμα.  
τεύχης] ποίης.  
ἐλελιξομένα] ἐλελιξομένη | κινοὔμενη τοῖς κρούμασι.

**gl. ad c. 8 (v. 5)**  
tὸν αἰχματᾶν] αἰχμητὴν | ὅν ὣ Ζεὺς δίκην αἰχμῆς φέρει.  
*σβεννενε[...] παυές, πραννε[...].

Risulta evidente che molto poco è cambiato per le glosse alle *Pitiche* di Pindaro nel passaggio di mano che si ebbe alla guida della scuola di greco di Tessalonica da Magistro a Triclinio. Le tipologie di glosse rimangono le stesse; si può affermare, anzi, che il grosso di questo tipo di lavoro esegetico è sostanzialmente quello di Magistro e che le poche aggiunte tricliniane si inseriscono nel solco della tradizione tomana, ampliano lo spettro delle parole pindariche glossate e quindi migliorano la immediata comprensione del testo lirico. Si proponeva, così, ai discenti un supporto didattico aggiornato e più completo.

In conclusione di questo breve discorso provo a tirare le fila di quanto ho esposto. Abbiamo numerosi indizi per formulare l’ipotesi di un passaggio dell’intero corpus delle glosse interlineari alle *Pitiche* di Pindaro dall’edizione tomana a quella tricliniana. L’allievo di Tommaso utilizzò il lavoro di maestro e, sostanzialmente, si limitò a migliorarlo in alcuni punti. Così come nel caso del *Lessico* di Magistro abbiamo la possibilità di seguire l’evoluzione dell’opera da un primo stadio tomano ad un altro più ampio e completo, frutto della rielaborazione dei suoi allievi, così, anche questa volta, possiamo studiare le glosse alle *Pitiche* in prospettiva sincronica e discernere le due
fasi di lavoro: la prima e più ampia tomana, la seconda e più modesta tricliniana. Infine, all’editore che desideri pubblicare questo materiale esegetico non rimane, a mio avviso, altra soluzione che occuparsi in toto delle glosse a Pindaro e di produrre l’edizione critica sia del lavoro di Magistro, sia di quello di Triclinio. Sarebbe possibile in questo modo superare almeno parzialmente i limiti imposti alla fruizione dell’esegesi bizantina a Pindaro dall’edizione di Jeno Abel, stampata, postuma rispetto al suo autore, a Budapest nel 1891. Essa, benché abbia avuto il grande merito di pubblicare molto materiale sino ad allora inedito o poco noto, è chiaramente un prodotto editoriale che non è stato rifinito a causa della prematura scomparsa del filologo ungherese a soli trentuno anni nel 1889. Si auspica una nuova edizione, resa possibile dai moderni sistemi di indagine dei manoscritti e basata sui rigorosi principi della filologia.
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Introduction

Après avoir commencé à aborder la question des frontières du patriarcat de Constantinople au Congrès international des études byzantines de Sofia en 2011, nous poursuivons notre étude de ce thème en approfondissant sa dimension proprement géographique. Nous souhaitons axer la réflexion sur la définition et la perception de la juridiction patriarcale et de ses limites spatiales. Cette approche doit permettre d’appréhender plus clairement la tension entre l’idéal œcuménique et la réalité de l’autorité patriarcale.

Un nouveau concept a été proposé récemment pour tenter de penser le paradoxe des revendications byzantines à l’universalité face à une réalité territoriale restreinte : la notion d’« œcuménicité relative » (G. Dagron) ou d’« œcuménicité limitée » (T. Lounghis) Cette table ronde cherchera à analyser la pertinence de ce concept pour les questions liées à la juridiction œcuménique du patriarcat de Constantinople. Jusqu’à quel point cette œcuménicité était-elle limitée, et par quoi ? Où ont été placées ses bornes, quand et par qui ? Ces limites étaient-elles idéalement fixes ou ont-elles pu facilement évoluer dans le temps ? Les Romains d’Orient se référaient-ils à un découpage précis du territoire ou les frontières ecclésiastiques sont-elles demeurées floues, ressemblant plutôt à des « marches » comme c’était le cas dans le domaine politique ?

Ces questions sont traitées dans le droit canon, mais leur discussion se limite d’habitude à la confrontation de textes juridiques sortis de leur contexte historique, dans un but souvent soit apologétique soit polémique. En les recontextualisant et en introduisant la longue durée dans notre enquête critique, nous voulons tenter de comprendre l’évolution historique de la notion d’œcuménicité.
L'établissement, l'affirmation et l'expansion du patriarcat de Constantinople jusqu'à Justinien : une question politique ou « hérétique » ?

Constantio VIII et Iuliano Caes. II. His cons. introierunt Constantinopolim reliquiae sanctorum apostolorum Andreae et Lucae, die V non. Mar. et introivit Constantius Aug. Romae III k. Mai. et edidit vicennalia. Telle est la plus ancienne mention de la translation des reliques de l’apôtre André jusqu’à Constantinople. Elle est tirée d’un texte que l’on nomme traditionnellement Consularia Constantinopolitana. Le passage concerné se rapporte à l’année 357. Si l’on traduit la situation en termes de règne impérial, on peut donc insinuer que le règne de Constance II pourrait avoir constitué une sorte d’instant primordial dans le processus menant à l’élaboration de la légende sur laquelle le futur patriarcat de Constantinople allait appuyer ses revendications géo-ecclésiologiques. Le récit de la fondation apostolique de l’Église de Byzance par l’apôtre André ne vit certes le jour qu’entre la fin du VIIᵉ et le début du VIIIᵉ siècle, mais sa création ne fut, en réalité, qu’un élément complémentaire d’un argumentaire déjà bien ficelé, visant à justifier l’élévation de l’évêché constantinopolitain au rang de patriarcat.

Considérant que cette élévation est une pure construction, survenue tardivement au sein d’un ordre déjà établi, il est aisé de comprendre qu’elle fut l’objet d’importants débats dans l’Antiquité. Pour les sièges pétriniens qu’étaient Rome, Alexandrie et Antioche, la situation était tout simplement insoutenable, tant elle semblait relever d’une machination politique. Elle leur était d’autant plus insupportable que l’établissement, l’affirmation et l’expansion du patriarcat de Constantinople découlent en grande partie de pratiques qui se sont établies pendant les différents moments « hérétiques » de l’histoire de l’Église constantinopolitaine.

Effectivement, les périodes hétérodoxes de l’évêché constantinopolitain (arien/homéen : 338-379 ; nestorien : 428-431 ; monophysite/miaphysite : 472-490 et 511-520) sont aussi celles de l’élaboration de plusieurs revendications patriarcales traditionnelles. Dans le but de calmer les esprits, un concile œcuménique fut organisé à l’issue de chacun de ces moments, non seulement pour célébrer le retour à l’orthodoxie, autour de la figure impériale, mais aussi pour faire entrer lesdites revendications dans un cadre canonique et, dès lors, dans la tradition patristique. L’enjeu politico-religieux qui, encore aujourd’hui, entoure l’« orthodoxisation » des prétentions du patriarcat de Constantinople n’a pas encouragé leur étude dans l’optique ici visée, c’est-à-dire celle du contexte hautement polémique de leur apparition. La présente communication propose de faire le point sur la question, en analysant les conséquences du phénomène, principalement en matière de géographie ecclésiastique. Trois temps ont été envisagés : 1- la constitution de l’évêché supra-métropolitain constantinopolitain ; 2- l’élévation de l’évêque de Constantinople au second rang après celui de Rome ; 3- la création formelle et institutionnelle du patriarcat de Constantinople sous Justinien.
1. La constitution de l'évêché supra-métropolitain de Constantinople

Pour bien comprendre les étapes de l'établissement, de l'affirmation et de l'expansion du patriarcat de Constantinople, il est nécessaire de s'intéresser de prime abord à l'origine et au territoire de l'évêché lui-même. Comme cela a déjà été évoqué, le récit de la fondation par André n'est pas antérieur à la fin du VIIe siècle et aurait été construit de toute pièce, suivant un long processus, certainement lié de près à la translation des reliques de l'apôtre aux Saints-Apôtres. L'édit processus peut être séparé en trois grandes étapes :

(1) Dès le deuxième quart du IVe siècle, on associa André à l'évangélisation de la Scythie – le Bas-Danube et déjà le sud de la Gothie ? –, la plus ancienne attestation se trouvant chez Eusèbe de Césarée.

(2) Au VIe siècle, peut-être un peu avant, on fit passer André par Byzance, sans toutefois en faire le fondateur d'une Église, comme on peut le lire chez Grégoire de Tours.

(3) Au VIIe siècle, l'association du Stachys de l'Épître aux Romains à la future Nouvelle Rome dans les listes des Septante disciples de Jésus de Nazareth.

Tout était alors en place pour faire d'André le fondateur de l'Église de Byzance, via la consécration de Stachys comme premier évêque. Somme toute, l'histoire d'André est bel et bien apocryphe. En réalité, c'est la liste de tous les évêques de Byzance jusqu'au début du IVe siècle qui l'est. Effectivement, le premier chef de son Église attesté dans les sources est Métrophane et c'est Socrate le Scholastique qui est le premier à le mentionner, seulement en tant que prédécesseur d'Alexandre, sans plus de détail. La seule source qui nous évoque les dates de ce personnage, la Chronographie de Théophane le Confesseur, le place entre 308/9 et 318/9. En outre, Théophane affirme clairement que Métrophane est le premier évêque de Constantinople, ce qui n'est peut-être pas du tout anodin, du fait que l'auteur de cette affirmation est iconodule et que les iconoclastes utilisaient pleinement la légende d'André pour justifier le caractère apostolique du siège de Constantinople.

Pour revenir à l'époque de Métrophane, lui et ses deux premiers successeurs, Alexandre et Paul le Confesseur, ne furent rien d'autre que les évêques d'une petite communauté, appelée certes à devenir plus grande, mais tout de même petite à l'époque concernée, y compris au lendemain de la fondation de Constantinople. Ce petit évêché ne fut ni présent ni représenté au concile de Nicée de 325, autrement qu'à travers le métropolitain de la province d'Europe, l'évêque d'Héraclée. Dans la phase initiale de l'Église de Constantinople, elle n'occupait donc aucunement une position supra-métropolitaine.

Le changement géo-ecclésiologique se produisit toutefois rapidement, dès 338/9, lorsque Paul le Confesseur fut pour la première fois évincé et qu'il fut remplacé par Eusèbe de Nicomédie. La nouvelle situation qui s'instaura avec l'élévation de cet arien/homéen à la tête de l'Église de Constantinople est certainement à mettre en parallèle avec la situation géopolitique du moment. C'est que Constance II venait de récupérer le diocèse des Thraces tout entier, donc aussi la ville symbolique dont il constituait la banlieue. La nomination d'Eusèbe de Nicomédie, même si elle était illégale, constitue une étape majeure de l'histoire de l'affirmation des privilèges constantinopolitains. En maintenant l'évêque d'Héraclée dans ses privilèges métropolitains (canon 6 du concile de Nicée I) et en ne se donnant probablement pas de véritable successeur à Nicomédie, il réussit à se modeler une sorte de circonscription ecclésiastique de tendance arienne, à cheval entre les deux rives de
la Propontide. Hormis les deux restaurations épisodiques du nicéen Paul Ier le Confesseur, la foi homéenne, dominante dans la ville de Constantin jusqu’en 379, allait marquer l’emprise territoriale de cette dernière, annonçant ainsi, paradoxalement, les prétentions du patriarcat orthodoxe à venir.

Comme il n’était plus question de revenir à la situation antérieure, malgré le rétablissement de la foi orthodoxe sous Théodose, on officialisa la situation dès le concile de Constantinople de 381. Après avoir réaffirmé les privilèges des évêques d’Alexandrie et d’Antioche (canon 6 du concile de Nicée I), le canon 2 établit que les affaires du Pont devaient être traitées par les évêques du Pont, celle des Thraces par les évêques des Thraces et celles des nations barbares, sous-entendues les Goths du Bas-Danube (la Scythie ?), selon la coutume, c’est-à-dire par Constantinople, puisqu’ils ont été évangélisés par le disciple d’Eusèbe de Nicomédie qu’était Wulfila. Jamais Constantinople n’est ici mentionnée, mais on comprend rapidement que le Pont, les Thraces et les Goths correspondent à la circonscription supra-métropolitaine créée en 338/9. Soixante-dix ans plus tard, ce même canon fut repris au concile de Chalcédoine de 451, dans son canon 28, mais cette fois l’ambiguïté fut levée et Constantinople y apparaît sans complexe comme responsable du Pont, des Thraces et des Goths, auxquels on ajoute l’Asie.

2. L’élévation de l’évêque de Constantinople au second rang après celui de Rome

Le lecteur pourrait, de prime abord, rester dubitatif sur le fait que le canon 2 de Constantinople I évoque bien la circonscription supra-métropolitaine de l’Église de la ville de Constantin. Pour lever le voile de l’ambiguïté, il faut se tourner vers le canon 3 de la même réunion, qui affirme : « Τὸν μὲντοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτήν νέαν Ῥώμην. » En 381, Constantinople aurait donc été considérée comme une Nouvelle Rome par les Pères conciliaires. Dans cette optique, les Pères de Constantinople considéraient qu’elle devait se placer au deuxième rang honorifique après l’Ancienne Rome et cela valait aussi pour son Église. Si la conception géopolitique était bien antérieure à la fin du IVe siècle, la conception géo-ecclésiologique était « révolutionnaire » pour cette époque et elle fut à l’origine d’un contentieux très important entre Constantinople et les trois grands sièges traditionnels.

C’est l’Église d’Alexandrie qui fut la première à s’opposer à la nouveauté. Alexandrie avait été jusqu’alors le siège épiscopal oriental par excellence, celui qui cumulait tous les honneurs, plaçant ainsi son Église au deuxième rang honorifique immédiatement après Rome. Cette situation privilégiée avait valu à son évêque la reconnaissance officielle d’une autorité supra-métropolitaine sur l’ensemble de l’Égypte, sur la Libye et sur la Pentapole au concile de Nicée I. Le fait même d’avoir été mentionné en premier lieu, devant Antioche, dans le canon reconnaissant ces droits lui avait permis de se voir attribuer la première place honorifique en Orient dans la hiérarchie ecclésiastique.

La contestation alexandrine des prétentions de Constantinople atteint son apogée au concile d’Éphèse de 431, lorsque Cyrille d’Alexandrie ne manqua pas l’occasion de se poser en garant de l’orthodoxie et qu’il fit condamner et exiler Nestorius de Constantinople, pour ses positions christologiques. Cette situation plaça l’empereur Théodose II dans l’embarras, puisque c’est lui qui avait nommé l’inventeur du nestorianisme sur le siège épiscopal de sa ville. Cette condamnation de la christologie nestorienne permit à Alexandrie d’évincer, pendant un certain temps, l’influence théologique des autres Églises d’Orient, d’autant plus que le nestorianisme découlait d’une théologie créée dans l’autre grand siège, celui d’Antioche, qui perdait alors beaucoup de son prestige.
Théodose II en vint à appuyer les plus ardents ennemis de Nestorius, en premier lieu un moine du nom d'Eutychès qui avait formulé une christologie monophysite extrême, en prétendant s'appuyer sur les écrits de Cyrille d'Alexandrie. L'évêque constantinopolitain du moment, Flavien, défi le protégé de l'empereur. Cela lui valut d'être déposé et exilé en 449, lors d'un second concile d'Éphèse organisé par l'empereur. La situation fut dénoncée à Rome, où Léon le Grand appuyait Flavien dans sa position ni nestorienne ni eutychienne. La mort subite de Théodose II changea la donne. Le vieil officier Marcien lui succéda, grâce au mariage avec sa sœur Pulchérie. Cette dernière étant hostile au monophysisme, elle sentendit avec Rome pour l'organisation d'un nouveau concile œcuménique, celui de Chalcédoine. En 451, c'est la position dyophysite qui fut victorieuse et elle allait dorénavant caractériser l'orthodoxie.

En préparation du concile d'Éphèse de 449, Léon le Grand avait composé un *Tomus* qui résumait la position de Rome. Il fut lu à la deuxième session de Chalcédoine et provoqua l'unanimité derrière la position pontificale. Tout au long du concile, nestorianisme et eutychianisme furent condamnés conjointement. Si du point de vue théologique, le concile fut accepté par le plus grand nombre, les communautés nestorienne d'Antioche et monophysite d'Alexandrie, où ce nouveau courant avait pris racine sous sa forme miaphysite, eurent tout de même beaucoup de difficulté à se voir assimilées dans l'erreur. Ce contexte de concorde entre Rome et Constantinople en matière de dogme semble avoir encouragé l'Église de cette dernière à vouloir discuter d'un sujet qui n'était initialement pas au programme. Sachant que les émissaires romains n'étaient pas prêts à sortir de leur mandat pour négocier sur une question non convenue dès le départ de la réunion, ils ne furent pas conviés à la séance qui produisit le 28e canon, qui n'est rien de moins qu'une réécriture en un seul texte des canons 2 et 3 de Constantinople I.

L'initiative était d'autant moins acceptable pour les envoyés de Rome, que leur Église n'avait pas encore reconnu les canons du concile de Constantinople I. Pour autant, la réaction d'une partie des clerges d'Alexandrie et d'Antioche au concile de Chalcédoine, juxtaposée à la situation politique de l'Empire en Occident, amena finalement l'Église de Rome à se résigner à voir dans celle de Constantinople son principal interlocuteur en Orient, cela malgré le schisme qui était sur le point de séparer les deux communautés.

3. La création formelle et institutionnelle du patriarcat de Constantinople sous Justinien

La circonscription ecclésiastique à cheval sur les deux rives du Bosphore et sa seconde place après Rome relevant désormais de la normalité, du moins par défaut, il restait une dernière étape avant la mise en place effective du patriarcat de Constantinople. Le titre de « patriarque » était aux IVe-Ve siècles une simple appellation honorifique d'inspiration biblique réservée à certains évêques ayant une aura ou une influence particulière. C'est au Ve siècle qu'il se transforma en véritable fonction, le patriarcat étant, dans la conception proprement byzantine, une circonscription ecclésiastique supra-primatiale.

Confiant en sa « nouvelle » position autoproclamée en 451, Constantinople prit, quelques années plus tard, l'initiative de proposer une solution par un acte d'union des Églises, le fameux *Hénotikon*. Dans un premier temps, cette solution fut relativement bien acceptée en Orient, à l'exception principalement des communautés nestoriennes. En Occident, le document fut condamné unanimement, en vertu de la position romaine. Pour la Nouvelle Rome, les Églises de cette partie du monde ne comprenaient simplement pas la « réalité du terrain » en Méditerranée orientale. Pour
l'Ancienne Rome, l'acte d'union était simplement une trahison de Chalcédoine. Ce fut le début d'un long schisme entre les deux parties, le schisme d'Acace, qui dura de 484 à 519.

L'incompréhension grandissante entre l'Orient et l'Occident avait toutefois des racines beaucoup plus profondes que la seule question monophysite/miaphysite. Dès lors que le diocèse des Thraces fut intégré à la Préfecture du Prétoire d'Orient sous Constance II, la tentation fut grande d'y ajouter l'Illyricum oriental, en partie pour des raisons linguistiques. À la mort de Théodose Ier en 395, il en découla un véritable problème, lorsque Stilicon réclama ouvertement les diocèses de Dacie et de Macédoine pour Honorius et que le préfet d'Orient Rufin fit de même pour Arcadius. Cette situation aboutit au fait que la frontière entre les deux parties ne fut pas vraiment fixée avant la mort d'Honorius en 423, malgré ce que les manuels enseignent sur cette question. Après cette date, l'Orient eut le champ libre pour intégrer politiquement l'Illyricum oriental, mais l'intégration religieuse fut plus complexe.

Le schisme acacien fut particulièrement propice au maintien du contentieux, le monde grec égéen penchant plutôt en faveur de Constantinople, alors que l'Épire et les régions danubiennes, y compris dans le diocèse des Thraces, étaient plutôt favorables à Rome. La géo-écclesiologie était alors en plein mouvement, ce que certains événements postérieurs au schisme démontrent très bien. C'est par exemple le cas de l'« affaire Stéphanos de Larissa » de 531, lorsqu'Épiphane de Constantinople destitua ledit Stéphanos et que celui-ci en appela à l'évêque de Rome Boniface II, sous prétexte que l'Illyricum oriental était le territoire privilégié de ce dernier. On peut dire que l'initiative d'Épiphane est un réel acte patriarcal, puisqu'il sortit délibérément du cadre supra-métropolitain traditionnel qui était le sien, probablement en plein accord avec les autorités impériales. Pour la première fois, ce n'était plus ces dernières qui revendiquaient ouvertement le terrain, mais l'évêque de la Nouvelle Rome lui-même. Le patriarcat de Constantinople était en train de se construire et de s'affirmer.

Le schisme d'Acace semble aussi avoir été propice à la normalisation de l'application du titre de « patriarche » à l'évêque de Constantinople, comme si la tendance monophysite/miaphysite alors en vigueur dans la ville impériale avait incité le chef de son Église à s'affirmer comme tel. C'est effectivement dans la documentation relative audit schisme, plus précisément dans divers textes datables de 518, que l'on voit les mentions se multiplier. En outre, c'est dans cette même documentation que l'on peut lire les premières attestations du titre de « patriarche œcuménique », appliqué à Jean II de Cappadoce, le dernier évêque monophysite/miaphysite de Constantinople.

C'est après la résolution du schisme acacien, plus précisément au cours de la seconde moitié du VIe siècle, que les autorités impériales reconnaissent une véritable hiérarchie patriarcale institutionnalisée, en s'appuyant sur une interprétation singulière de la tradition, qui fut loin de faire l'unanimité parmi les sièges concernés : Rome, Constantinople, Alexandrie, Antioche et Jérusalem. Dans ce « nouveau » système, la primauté d'honneur revint à Rome, qui ne reconnaît pourtant jamais pleinement la pentarchie, lui préférant de loin l'ordre « pétrinien » ancien, si bien que son évêque n'usa jamais personnellement de ce titre de « patriarche d'Occident » avant le VIIe siècle et le fit disparaître définitivement de la titulature officielle en 2006.
Rome, Constantinople et l’Illyricum oriental : les limites en question

D’habitude, les cinq patriarcats canoniques de la théorie pentarchique sont conçus comme des entités territoriales structurant la géographie ecclésiastique dans le cadre de l’Empire romain au niveau suprême de la hiérarchie, dès leur formation au Ve siècle. Chacun d’eux englobe un certain nombre de provinces (ἐπαρχίαι), fondées plus ou moins sur le modèle de l’administration impériale : il apparaît donc comme une évidence qu’on peut projeter les limites de leurs circonscriptions respectives de juridiction sur une carte recouvrant ainsi tout l’Empire d’une façon uniforme. Selon cette géographie de l’Église pentarchique, le patriarcat de Rome englobe tout l’Occident, mais aussi une partie considérable des Balkans méridionaux, soit l’ancien Illyricum oriental comprenant l’Épire, la Macédoine et la Grèce avec la plupart des îles de la mer Égée, bien que cette région fasse partie de l’Empire oriental depuis la division de 395. Néanmoins, cette appartenance semble bien logique parce qu’avant cette césure, tout l’Illyricum avait presque constamment appartenu à la partie occidentale de l’Empire. C’est déjà à l’époque des premiers conciles œcuméniques que l’opinio communis des chercheurs a fait remonter la position prépondérante des futures Églises patriarcales dans l’Église. Dans cette brève contribution, nous ne pouvons pas entrer dans tous les détails de cette argumentation, mais il nous paraît nécessaire de souligner les points suivants en tant que thèses :

1. Le canon 6 de Nicée, souvent considéré comme prouvant l’existence de trois Églises supramétropolitaines, à savoir Rome, Alexandrie et Antioche, ne contient pas l’attribution d’un quelconque statut hiérarchique commun à ces trois Églises. Tout au contraire : alors qu’il fixe une ἐξουσία non limitée de l’évêque d’Alexandrie sur l’Égypte et la Libye sur le modèle d’une autorité analogue à celle de l’évêque de Rome (dont la région de référence n’est pas donnée), le même canon garantit la position indépendante des Églises métropolitaines tant dans les environs d’Antioche (κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν) que dans les autres provinces. Tout en acceptant une situation particulière pour Alexandrie et Rome, le canon défend donc le principe métropolitain de la structure ecclésiale, établi précisément par le concile contre les prétentions éventuelles de quelques évêques puissants, surtout celui d’Antioche. Le concile de Nicée ne dépasse jamais une structure hiérarchique à deux échelles : celle des métropoles, y compris les grands évêques de Rome et d’Alexandrie qui ne connaissent pas d’autres métropoles dans leurs circonscriptions de pouvoir immédiat, et l’échelle des évêques suffragants. Néanmoins, le canon 6 est aussi à l’origine du pouvoir patriarcal d’Alexandrie, qui s’étendra finalement sur la même région géographique en se fondant sur une quasi-équivalence entre le statut métropolitain et le statut patriarcal. L’autorité de Rome, par contre, n’est ni définie ni délimitée par le canon, mais présupposée comme un fait évident.

2. En ce qui concerne le concile de Constantinople en 381, c’est avant tout son canon 2 qui a une importance fondamentale pour la géographie ecclésiastique, en introduisant pour la partie orientale de l’Empire à cette date (c’est-à-dire sans l’Illyricum oriental) une troisième échelle de hiérarchisation ecclésiastique, celle des diocèses de l’administration civile. Toute ingérence des
évêques (surtout les plus influents) d’un diocèse dans les affaires d’un autre est strictement interdite ce qui devait bien sûr limiter les ambitions d’Alexandrie, mais devient plus généralement un principe pour toute l’Église. Il a été justement remarqué qu’en même temps, le canon ne crée pas de nouveau pouvoir pour les évêques des capitales des diocèses, à savoir ceux d’Éphèse, Césarée en Cappadoce et Héraclée en Thrace, qui ne sont même pas mentionnés. Tout au contraire il se fonde sur l’ensemble des évêques (métropolitains) d’un diocèse, prenant ainsi la synodalité comme principe.

3. Le rejet des canons du concile de 381 par l’Église romaine s’est surtout focalisé sur l’élévation du statut de l’évêque de Constantinople dans le fameux canon 3 qui transpose les privilèges d’honneur (tà πρεσβεία τῆς τιμῆς) de l’ancienne capitale également à la nouvelle. Ainsi, Constantinople est rangée parmi les Églises principales de l’Empire, mais il convient de souligner qu’il ne s’agissait nullement de l’attribution d’une juridiction territoriale quelconque, ni d’une décision touchant la géographie ecclésiastique, mais d’une attribution de rang. Il faut bien distinguer entre deux « configurations d’ordre » [Ordnungskonfigurationen, selon le concept de S. Weinfurter et B. Schneidmüller] qui structurent l’Église universelle de l’Empire simultanément et indépendamment l’une de l’autre : une géographie des éparchies et diocèses basée sur le modèle de l’administration civile et fondée sur le principe de l’autonomie des entités ; et un ordre selon le rang œcuménique, c’est-à-dire l’autorité potentiellement universelle attribuée à un cercle restreint d’Églises dont les ressources d’autorité dépassaient celles des autres considérablement. Il s’agit des sièges des grands centres urbains du monde méditerranéen, Rome, Alexandrie et Antioche, qui pouvaient en plus revendiquer certains degrés d’apostolicté, puis Constantinople et Jérusalem. C’est donc dans le cadre de cet ordre selon le rang et non dans la géographie ecclésiastique qu’on retrouve en premier le groupe des cinq futurs sièges patriarcaux. Pour cette raison l’émergence de l’institution patriarcale ne saurait être conçue uniquement comme l’introduction d’une nouvelle échelle dans la géographie de la hiérarchie ecclésiale. La caractéristique fondamentale des futurs sièges patriarcaux n’est pas une juridiction bien délimitée, mais leur ambition d’intervention générale dans les affaires de la chrétienté, comme le montrent la bien connue primauté romaine, les immixtions de Théophile d’Alexandrie et de ses successeurs dans les affaires constantinopolitaines, les interventions de Jean Chrysostome pour améliorer la discipline ecclésiastique dans les diocèses du Pont et de l’Asie, et plus généralement le rôle dirigeant assumé par ces sièges lors des grands conciles du Ve siècle jusqu’à 476.

4. A juste titre, le Ve siècle est normalement considéré comme la phase principale dans la genèse de la structure patriarcale dans l’Église. D’un côté on y voit l’apparition du titre de « patriarche », devenu disponible après la suppression du patriarcat juif en 429, comme l’a souligné V. Peri, mais utilisé encore d’une façon très irrégulière. De l’autre, les canons 9, 17 et surtout 28 de Chalcédoine (451) consolident le pouvoir du siège de Constantinople en lui attribuant une position suprême de cour d’appel et le droit de consécration des métropolites dans les diocèses de Thrace, d’Asie et du Pont. À première vue cela semble être un bouleversement total de l’ordre introduit par le canon 2 de 381, mais en fait les deux règles sont compatibles si Constantinople n’est plus considérée comme un siège dans le cadre de la Thrace, mais plutôt comme exempte. L’évêque de la capitale pouvait revendiquer un droit sur les métropolites des trois diocèses, car le pouvoir de leurs exarques ecclésiastiques n’avait (consciemment) pas été défini ; mais le nouveau siège patriarcal ne pouvait pas réclamer un pouvoir immédiat sur les suffragants sans violer les canons de Nicée.

Le canon 28 jeta de cette manière les bases structurelles du patriarcat de Constantinople fondé sur la relation entre le patriarche et les métropolites des trois diocèses de Thrace, d’Asie et du Pont :
le processus fondamental, mais malheureusement inconnu, est celui de la formation d'un synode (permanent) unique, comprenant ensemble tous les métropolites de ces trois diocèses. Pour les trois exarques de Césarée, d’Éphèse et de Héraclée la perte de leur indépendance était compensée par l’attribution des trois premiers rangs dans la nouvelle structure synodale. Le patriarcat de Constantinople nous paraît donc fondé justement sur les lacunes qui existaient dans la structure établie par les canons antérieurs : en lui assignant les trois diocèses mentionnés, le concile de Chalcédoine créa une circonscription territoriale bien définie du pouvoir patriarcal : mais il ne la limita pas pour toujours – la possibilité d’élargissements postérieurs sans violer les canons existait bel et bien.

Il faut surtout souligner la disparité fondamentale de la situation des deux sièges de Constantinople et de Rome, car les conciles n’ont jamais défini une circonscription géographique quelconque de la sphère d’autorité romaine, c’est-à-dire d’un patriarcat romain. Bien que plusieurs papes aient accepté le titre patriarcal dès le Ve siècle, entre autres Léon le Grand, cela n’impliquait pas l’existence d’une structure de patriarcat se référant à l’Occident entier et à l’Illyricum. Tout au contraire. D’un côté les papes ne pouvaient jamais accepter une limitation formelle de leur primauté apostolique au seul Occident – ce qui est surtout souligné par l’intervention vigoureuse d’Agapet Ier à Constantinople en 536. De l’autre côté, englobée dans un monde fragmenté par les invasions barbares apportant à la fois le triomphe temporaire de l’arianisme et l’émergence des structures ecclésiales intégrées dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regroupant tous les évêques ou les seuls métropolitains de l’Occident par des moyens synodaux similaires à la situation de Constantinople. Comme l’a analysé très lucidement Friedrich Kempf, le pouvoir romain ne pouvait que se fonder sur une diversité de prérogatives appliquées dans les contextes divers. On note parmi eux les décisions d’autorité en matière de droit (les decretales) envoyées entre autres dans les divers royaumes, Rome n’avait pas les moyens pour créer un vrai patriarcat d’Occident en regrou
régions. Tout dépendait de la capacité du pontife romain à actualiser effectivement le lien vicarial qui reliait Thessalonique à Rome, comme dans le cas du synode romain de 531, qui donna lieu à la rédaction de la *Collectio Thessalonicensis* en tant que pièce justificative. Mais après cette date, le lien paraît plutôt affaibli et marqué par les crises, dont la plus éclatante avait été la déposition du métropolite Paul de Thessalonique par le pape en 649, dans le cadre de la controverse monothélite. Eu égard au manque total d’une documentation sur les conséquences de cette décision, mais aussi à la disparition quasi complète des structures ecclésiales dans l’intérieur des pays balkaniques à la suite des invasions avaro-slaves, il est impossible de déterminer le développement des relations entre l’Illyricum, Rome et Constantinople dans les décennies suivantes.


Cependant, selon un tel calcul, le premier transfert se situerait dans un contexte de détente entre Rome et Constantinople – ce qui paraît assez peu probable. L’indication d’une appartenance romaine dans les signatures conciliaires de 680 (surtout pour Thessalonique en qualité de vicaire, mais aussi pour Gortyna en Crète en qualité de légat du « synode de Rome ») est un indice délicat, car l’intérêt des autorités byzantines consistait à mettre en relief la présence romaine. Ainsi le métropolite de Crète signe de nouveau comme représentant du synode de Rome en 692 et n’est surtout pas classé comme appartenant au patriarcat de la capitale impériale. Au lieu de chercher de nouvelles dates pour le transfert juridictionnel des régions en question, il nous paraît nécessaire de remettre en cause la supposition d’un tel transfert officiellement imposé par l’autorité impériale : non seulement il n’a laissé aucune trace dans les sources narratives, mais pas non plus dans la mémoire des papes. Ainsi, lorsque Hadrien Ier demandait la restitution des *consecrationes archiepiscoporum seu episcoporum* dans sa lettre à Constantin VI et Irène en 785, il faisait uniquement référence aux évêques *nostrae dioecesis existentes*, c’est-à-dire dans l’Italie méridionale ; et cette revendication occupait seulement le second lieu après celle des *patrimonia*. C’est seulement le pape Nicolas Ier qui, en s’adressant à l’empereur Michel III en 860, soulevait la question de l’Illyricum – en la distinguant des exigences romaines en Italie et sur la seule base de la *Collectio Thessalonicensis*. Ce qui revient à dire que pour les 300 ans après la compilation de ce recueil, Rome ne possédait apparemment aucune autre preuve pour justifier ses
prétentions, ce qui correspond assez mal à une forte appartenance de l’Illyricum à son siège « patriarcal » pendant ces siècles et semble surtout exclure un transfert officiel dans le cadre d’une confrontation majeure. Reste le témoignage des Notitiae episcopatum de Constantinople dont certaines, à dater du IXe siècle selon Darrouzès, ajoutent les sièges nouveaux (italiens et illyriques) à la liste traditionnelle parce que le siège de Rome se trouvait ὑπὸ τῶν ἔθνων. Mais c’est seulement le patriarche Nicolas Mystikos qui décréta lors de son premier patriarcat au début du Xe siècle un nouvel ordre de préséance pour le synode du patriarcat (Notitia 7), pour régler enfin la position des évêques de l’Occident (πρὸς δυόμενον). Un transfert officiel, exécuté par le pouvoir impérial, n’aurait-il pas donné un rang précis aux nouveaux venus pour les intégrer au synode, qui restait toujours une structure fondamentale pour le fonctionnement du patriarcat de Constantinople ?

En guise de conclusion, revenons donc au point de départ : l’image des patriarcats bien délimités au sein de la pentarchie nous paraît un peu trompeuse, surtout en ce qui concerne Rome, qui ne pouvait pas exercer une autorité homogène dans sa sphère d’autorité, à la fois vaste, fragmentaire et jamais définie précisément, tandis que le patriarcat constantinopolitain naquit d’une intégration synodale étroite de trois circonscriptions ecclésiastiques bien définies qui restait néanmoins ouverte vers des élargissements futurs. La place de l’Illyricum se caractérise plutôt par une position fluide entre ces deux configurations géo-ecclésiastiques que par un changement abrupt d’appartenance entre deux « patriarcats ».
Exiled Prelates in Italy and in Jerusalem: The Limits of the Jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (1081–1118)

Records surviving from the Komnenian period testify that the patriarch of Constantinople bore the title ‘ecumenical / οἰκουμενικός’. Niketas, metropolitan bishop of Ankyra, claimed in the 1080s that the patriarch had the right to ordain metropolitans with the consent and contribution of the synodos endemoussa. In addition to this, the patriarch was the common judge and the highest tribunal of appeal for clergymen according to Canon 9 of the Council of Chalcedon. Nonetheless the metropolitan also emphasised that the ecumenicity of the patriarch of Constantinople did not consist in the fact that his authority extended to “Rome, the entire Sicily and Alexandria, Jerusalem and Antioch, Armenia and Persia, India and Ethiopia” (Niketas of Ankyra, On synods, ed. Darrouzès, 222. l. 10–25). Was the metropolitan right in the latter statement? This paper seeks to investigate the limits of geographical extension of the authority the Patriarchate exercised in the field of jurisdiction during the early Komnenian epoch covering the reign of Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118). In this study patriarchal jurisdiction is defined in a broad sense: any action which is subjected to the decision of the patriarch and the synod by the patriarch, the synodos endemoussa, or a third party. After a short overview of the canons and a visualisation of the patriarchal activities by means of a map, I focus on two regions where the patriarchal jurisdiction reached its geographical limits: Southern Italy, and Jerusalem which came under Latin domination during the First Crusade. The paper argues that Southern Italy was lost for patriarchal jurisdiction by the late eleventh century and during the first two decades of the Kingdom of Jerusalem the patriarch of Constantinople gained new footholds which were, though, acknowledged only by Greek Orthodox Christians.

From a theoretical perspective, canon 9 and 17 of the Council of Chalcedon (451) decreed the patriarch’s judicial authority: the patriarchal court was the highest ecclesiastical tribunal to which any clergymen could apply. The geographical extension of patriarchal authority was specified by canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon, defining that the patriarch of Constantinople had the right to ordain metropolitans of the Pontic, Asian, and Thracian dioceses. The Western Balkans and mainland Greece from Thessalonike southwards belonged to the bishop of Rome. The Holy Land was the territory of the patriarch of Antioch, and Jerusalem. In addition to this, the canon set down that the Constantinopolitan patriarch has the right to ordain bishops among the barbarians, as well.

Based on the collection of records compiled by V. Grumel and J. Darrouzès, the following map can be drawn about the patriarchal activities between 1081 and 1118 (map 1). The red dots indicate jurisdictional activity of the patriarch of Constantinople. As the map shows, the Constantinopolitan patriarch functioned as an ecclesiastical judge within the borders of the empire (see the borders with dotted line). The exceptions are Soterioupolis in the North, Rossano and Reggio in Southern Italy, and Jerusalem in the Holy Land.

The archbishopric of Soterioupolis fell within the borders of the empire, but it was united with the metropolitanate of Alania (GD, Regestes, No. 976a, map 2) and a certain John was appointed
there around 1105 upon the decision of the patriarch and the synodos endemousa. Twelfth-century canonists, such as Zonaras and Theodore Balsamon, attested that Alania was one of the barbarian lands where the patriarch could appoint prelates based on canon 28 of Chalcedon.

The region where patriarchal and papal authority overlapped at the very beginning of the Komnenian epoch was Southern Italy. Regulations of canon law had enforcing power also in the twelfth century despite the changed historical circumstances. Pope Urban II (r. 1088–1099) attestedly claimed that he was the ecclesiastical overlord as far as Thessalonike. From the Byzantine perspective this simply was not acknowledged. Canonists, such as Alexios Aristenos and John Zonaras, ignored the problem, while Theodore Balsamon tried to find an explanation arching back to the time of Constantine I. The surviving patriarchal records document that the Balkan peninsula came under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. In Southern Italy, however, the pope became the ecclesiastical overlord. The example of Basil, metropolitan of Reggio in Calabria is a case in point.

The Byzantine rule in Southern Italy gradually diminished until its final demise in 1071. During the period of successive Norman occupation of Southern Italy, the new lords were not hostile to the Greek Church. Recent research has shown that no coherent plan existed to “Latinise” the south Italian Church, but the installation of Latin-rite prelates had strategic reasons rather, especially to avoid any possible Byzantine influence. The Norman conquest was sealed by Pope Nicholas II who accorded recognition to Richard of Aversa as Prince of Capua and Robert Guiscard as Duke of Apulia and Calabria in 1058-1059. The papacy endeavoured to react as a protector of the Church which, however, had to accept the Pope’s control in all ecclesiastical matters. In 1079, the Greek metropolitan of Reggio in Calabria, probably Stephanos (attested in 1036), died. Patriarch Kosmas I (r. 1075–1081) consecrated as successor the monk Basil in Constantinople. Arriving in Calabria, Basil could not occupy his see, because Robert Guiscard decided to install a Latin prelate, Arnulf, to the bishopric. In spite of this fact, Basil remained active in Italy. In 1089, he participated in the negotiations between Patriarch Nikolas III Grammatikos (r. 1084–1111), Alexios I Komnenos and Pope Urban II. The pope sent a letter to the patriarch in order to promote the reconciliation of the two Churches, namely to rewrite the pope’s name into the diptychs and, this way, to be remembered in the liturgy. With the support of Alexios I, the patriarch asked a confession of faith. Nikolaos sent the letter with the help of Basil of Reggio and Romanos, archbishop of Rossano, who acted as messengers. The patriarch’s letter mentioned the situation of the two prelates (Holtzmann, BZ 28 (1928), p. 64.):

“Also the most-God-loving prelates: Basil, metropolitan of Calabria, and Romanos, the archbishop of Rossano, were sent to your holiness. In some respect, they travelled to you compelled by home-issues, in other respect, urged by us. The metropolitan of Calabria needs your decisive influence and help to be restituted to his due power on the basis of the divine canons. The archbishop of Rossano [needs your help] to embrace your highness and to tell what the Latins did in his region”.

Pope Urban II clarified his view in the Council of Melfi some months later. After Basil claimed that he was unjustly disregarded as a canonically installed metropolitan of Reggio, the Pope replied: “Submit to my rule and you will have your Church” (Holtzmann, BZ 28 (1928), p. 65.). The prelate denied this option and a Norman candidate was elected in his place by Duke Roger Borsa and
Urban II. The new prelate paid ten thousand nomismata for his office. The other two Greek prelates, Romanos and the anonymous metropolitan of S. Severina recognised papal jurisdiction and the pope in turn confirmed them as legitimate incumbents of their sees. The dialogue of Basil and Urban II at Melfi marked the end of the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople in Italy.

Another example for the jurisdictional limitations of the patriarch of Constantinople in the examined period is the status of the patriarchs of Jerusalem. They actively participated in the religious life of Constantinople. Euthymios I (?–after 1083) assisted in the trial of the philosopher John Italos, in 1082. His successor, Symeon II (bef. 1092–1099) came to Constantinople in 1094 to join the synod held in the Blachernai-palace which acquitted Leo, earlier metropolitan of Chalcedon. After the synod, Symeon returned to Jerusalem. When the crusaders occupied Antioch (October 1097–June 1098), or, according to other sources, during the siege of Jerusalem, the prelate retreated to Cyprus, where he was last mentioned in 1101. After Symeon had left Jerusalem, the see was vacant. Symeon II’s successor was John VIII (or VII). Concerning the jurisdictional role that the Patriarchate of Constantinople played in his career, different views prevail in modern scholarship.

The main source for John VIII’s activities is a passage in the treatise De translationibus, edited by Jean Darrouzès. In addition to this, John composed two works in 1107 in Jerusalem about the azyms and its use by the Latins. The treatise De translationibus (ed. Darrouzès, No. 55., p. 183.) reads as follows:

“The bishop of Tyros and Sydon, a eunuch, came to Jerusalem after the Turks (Τούρκοι) seized the city and the Church of Tyros. Since the Church of Jerusalem did not have a prelate (ἄρχιερεύς), the inhabitants of Jerusalem appealed to the leader (ἄρχων) of the region of Jerusalem to allow the man to be their bishop (ἄρχιερατεύειν). And this man was appointed to officiate in Jerusalem as a patriarch and in the year 6615 (ϛχιε) [1 Sept 1106–31 Aug 1107], during the reign of Alexios Komnenos, he went to Constantinople where the great synod received him. [The patriarch] performed the sacred ministry, dislodged [from Jerusalem] (διαφόρως), together with the holy synod and with Patriarch Nikolaos, the choice of God by lot, who lived in the monastery of Holy Diomedes”.

The passage about John VIII survived in a late thirteenth-century canon-law collection. The Church historian Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos (ca. 1256–ca. 1335) also preserved an account about John VIII (PG 146 1196D) which is shorter than the thirteenth-century text and differs from that version in that respect that it were the ‘Persians’ who occupied Tyros and the king of Jerusalem was also a “Persian”.

In the secondary literature (V. Grumel, P. Gautier, B. Hamilton, and J. Pahlitzsch) John VIII’s journey to Constantinople is recurrently seen as the occasion when the prelate was canonically approved as patriarch of Jerusalem by the patriarch of Constantinople and the synod.

P. Gautier, in accordance with V. Grumel, reconstructed the career of John VIII in the following way. John VIII was the metropolitan of Tyros. He fled from his see and took refuge in Jerusalem. This happened in May 1097 when the Fatimids of Egypt occupied Tyros. The inhabitants of Jerusalem asked the local Muslim leader, the Seljukid Soqman, or Al-Afdal, the vizir of the Fatimids, who held Jerusalem until 26 August 1098, to appoint the new patriarch. As Symeon II, the previous patriarch, left the city before June of 1098, and was still alive in Cyprus, the election was not canonical, because the see was not in fact vacant. This motivated John’s journey to Constantinople in 1106/1107 where the patriarch of Constantinople confirmed his appointment.
B. Hamilton dated John's flee from Tyros after the events of the First Crusade when the Fatimids of Egypt viewed Christians as plausible Frankish allies. What is more, J. Pahlitzsch expressed the idea that John VIII might have been elected patriarch of Jerusalem only in 1105 based on the fact that John did not appear in the preceding year in the pilgrim abbot Daniel's description of the Easter ceremonies in Jerusalem. If this holds and one also takes into consideration that Symeon II, the previous patriarch of Jerusalem, was last mentioned in 1101, it is plausible that at the time of John VIII's appointment to the throne of Jerusalem, the canonical hindrance of another Greek incumbent in Jerusalem, as previously assumed by P. Gautier, did not exist. Thus the purpose of John VIII's journey to Constantinople might have not been other than to clear himself canonically in this respect.

However, John VIII's canonical status as patriarch of Jerusalem must have been bolstered from other aspects. His election differs from that of the earlier patriarchs that he was appointed, according to all likelihood, by Baldwin I (r. 1100–1118) who is mentioned as the ἄρχων of Jerusalem in the passage just quoted. John VIII's election by the Church in Palestine is not documented. Bernard Hamilton described John VIII's position as "coadjutor" of the Latin patriarch in charge of the Orthodox communities of Palestine. With the arrival of the crusaders the situation of the Greek Church dramatically changed: while the earlier Muslim overlords gave freedom to non-Muslim religious communities under the supervision of their own leaders, the Frankish overlords considered the Greek Orthodox Church part of the one Church encompassing West and East. The Latins felt themselves justified in incorporating the existing structures of the Greek Orthodox Church into the newly created Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The Greek clergy had to accept the supremacy of Latin bishops and of the Latin patriarch, unlike other Eastern-rite Christians who had their religious autonomy. The patriarch of Jerusalem did not have Greek-speaking dioceses under his jurisdiction, unlike the patriarch of Antioch. In the Antiochean Patriarchate the Greek-speaking Orthodox communities were administered further by Greek bishops who were though under the supervision of the Latin patriarch, without canonical freedom, or by Latin bishops who replaced the earlier Greek ones. Bernard Hamilton argues that the position of 'coadjutor' was a third option which meant an ecclesiastical supervisor without territorial jurisdiction. This form is attested in the later twelfth, and early thirteenth century in the Holy Land.

The De translationibus documented two elements concerning John VIII's supposed canonical approval: the patriarch of Constantinople and the synod received him (ἐδέχθη) and John performed the sacred ministry (συνελειτούργησε) together with them. The consecration of a patriarch was performed in a community of metropolitans, and the ritual always ended with the holy liturgy which the newly ordained said together with other prelates (bishops, metropolitans, archbishops) present. The previous ritual steps are omitted in most of the descriptions, which might be the case also here. Thus John VIII's patriarchal position was confirmed in the community of the synod and the patriarch of Constantinople, which could not be performed in the Holy Land where the Greek prelates' status was mutilated after the establishment of the Latin Church. I would also stress an additional element here: John VIII's status as an exiled prelate. He performed the rituals διαφόρως, that is expelled abroad from his see. The synod received John as Alexios I welcomed back to the capital John V, the patriarch banished from Antioch (ἡμῶν βασιλεῖ με ὑποδεξαμένῳ –wrote the prelate, cf. P. Gautier, REB 22 (1964), p. 138.). The monastery of Holy Diomedes which is associated in the passage of the De translationibus with Nikolaos III, Patriarch of Constantinople, should rather be linked to John VIII.

759
The Diomedes monastery, as J. Pahlitzsch observed, was the metochion of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in Constantinople, imitating in its architecture the Zion church and monastery of Jerusalem, and itself was also called New Zion. The later exiled patriarch of Jerusalem John IX (r. 1157–before 1166) had it as his dwelling place. As the excerpt attests, John VIII resided in the monastery of Holy Diomedes after his arrival to the capital as a banished patriarch of Jerusalem. This has to be taken into consideration when evaluating his canonical confirmation: John VIII was not expected to return to Jerusalem, thus it was the confirmation of an exiled status. John's canonical confirmation did not influence appointments by the Latins in Jerusalem. In 1108, Ebremar, the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem (r. 1102–1105, 1105–1108) was deposed and installed to the metropolis of Caesarea Maritima. Sabas, John VIII’s successor, was the Greek prelate of that city. Customarily (which was later canonized: Lateran IV, c. 9), a Latin and a Greek prelate could not occupy the same see at the same time. Sabas became (ἐγένετο, cf. De translationibus, ed. Darrouzès, No. 56, p. 183.) the patriarch of Jerusalem at some point. Around 1116 Sabas was banished from Jerusalem, subsequently travelled to Constantinople and had a status similar to John VIII: reception by the synod and the possession of the metropolis of Maroneia as an epidosis. Therefore the supposed canonical approval of John VIII was taken into consideration only among members of the Greek Orthodox Church. After Patriarch Sabas, the Greek patriarchs of Jerusalem during the twelfth century had been elected and consecrated in Constantinople spending their lifetime there as exiled prelates. They participated in the religious life of the capital, and they were also commemorated by the Greek Orthodox in Jerusalem: the Greek clergy of the church of Holy Sepulchre in 1122 attestedly remembered Nikolaos, the exiled patriarch of Jerusalem (before 1122–1156), in their prayers.

Therefore I conclude that the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople during the early Komnenian epoch reached Jerusalem in a sense that he had also canonical authority within the orbit of Greek Orthodox Christianity. Earlier, the patriarchs of Jerusalem visited Constantinople to assist important jurisdictional cases. However, they were not elected and consecrated in Constantinople, which was the case after the Crusader states came into being. This canonical power, nonetheless, was limited: the Latin Church in the Holy Land made its own appointments regardless the Greek prelates in exile. Compared to Jerusalem, however, the Greek Church in Southern Italy was lost in its entirety for the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople.
Map 1: Jurisdictional activity of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1081–1118

Map 2
Collapsed Boundaries, Renewal of Ecumenicity?
The Patriarchal Power after 1204

1. Introduction

The round table „The Borders and Limits of the Patriarchate of Constantinople“ aims at analysing the relevance of the concept of restricted territorial reality, the so-called “limited oikoumene”, for the ecumenical jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Its focus lies on the limits and limitations, the reasons for those restrictions, and the mental maps the Byzantines may have had about the patriarchal power.

In our paper, we will argue that the developments after the political collapse of Byzantium in 1204 offer an ideal frame for this discussion. The uniqueness of the situation after the capture of Constantinople by the Western crusaders emerges from the transfer of the political and ecclesiastic power to the periphery of Byzantium. The shrunken geographical limits of the revived empire in Asia Minor did not stop the imperial and ecclesiastic claims on ecumenicity. Also as G. Dagron (L’exuménicité politique, 55-56) has argued: „ce n’est pas son extension géographique qui permet à un empire de se dire universel, c’est bien plutôt sa capacité à unir et à maintenir sous un même pouvoir politique des terres que la géographie distingue ou opposent“.

2. The Patriarchal Power in Exile: an overview

After the conquest of Constantinople, three Greek states have been established on the periphery of the former Byzantine Empire: Epirus, Nicaea and Trebizond. Their founders were members of the Comnenoi family or were related to the Angeloi: Michael Angelos Komnenos Dukas in Epirus, Theodore Laskaris, son-in-law of Alexios II in Nicaea, while in Trebizond a branch of the Comnenoi family created a new polity. Latins and Venetians took hold of the former Byzantine capital and replaced the political power by a Latin Emperor, Baldwin of Flandres and the ecclesiastical one through the election of the Venetian Thomas Morosini. J. M. Hussey (The Orthodox Church, 186) argued that „Within the newly conquered Latin lands the establishment of a Latin patriarchate, Latin bishops, clergy, and monastic orders was inevitable“.

The political turmoil for the Greek side is reflected in the ecclesiastic developments. While in Constantinople a system of ecclesiastic organization including bishops, monastic orders and a Latin Patriarch was established, the three successor states were seeking for political legitimation through the presence of a Patriarch. Theodore Laskaris intended to bring to Nicaea the Patriarch John X Kamateros who had fled to Thrace. We can assume that the patriarch declined to accept the invitation for various reasons such as his old age, but also the ties he had with the family of emperor Alexius III. Moreover, if he had gone to Nicaea he probably would have had to crown Theodore as Emperor. In April-May 1206 he resigned from the patriarchal throne and died little later. At some
time between 1204-1206 Kamateros had given his permission to the bishops who had gathered in Nicaea to elect new bishops in vacant sees in Asia Minor (Grumel-Darrouzès, *Regestes* 1201c). The years to follow proved convenient for the Lascarid ambitions also for another reason. The Latins refused to agree to an election of a Greek Patriarch. The Greeks from Constantinople then turned to Nicaea were a synod was convened in the third week of Lent 1208 to elect a new Patriarch (Dölger-Wirth, *Regesten* 1676a-b). The synod elected Michael Autoreianos, former chartophylax of the Great Church (1208). On Easter Sunday 1207/8 Theodore was crowned by the Patriarch. In that way, Nicaea was the first of the Greek successor state to have re-established the Patriarchate and the imperial power. Theodore Skoutariotes praised Laskaris as „father and forefather“, because he had revived the imperial power, the Patriarchate and the military organisation (Theodore Skoutariotes, *Additamenta*, 282).

As the political oikoumene had collapsed into fragments, also the Patriarchate was facing challenges in its power. Nicaea believed to have a Patriarchate and in that way was hoping to prevail politically. However, the states of Epirus and Trebizond did not remain inactive. David Komnenos tried but did not succeed in gaining the independence of the Church in Trebizond from Nicaea. However, Epirus posed the most serious threat for the Patriarchate. Michael Angelos and the Church authorities in his state proceeded in the election of new bishops for vacant bishoprics without the permission of Nicaea. More precisely, a synod in Epirus appointed Dokeianos to the see of Dyrrachium and Kalospites in Larissa. In 1221 Patriarch Manuel I agreed to accept the bishops’ nominations under the condition that it would not be repeated (Laurent, *Regestes* 1227). An escalation of the controversy between the two states took place when Demetrios Chomatenos, archbishop of Ochrid, ordained metropolitans in Epirus; this was a direct challenge to a patriarchal prerogative. In 1224, Demetrios Chomatenos in demand of the epirote clergy crowned Theodore Doukas. Germanos II (1223–1240) reacted vehemently to this action (Laurent, *Regestes* 1244) in fear that Chomatenos was working for the creation of a Patriarchate in Epirus. The Epirotes argued with the difficulties of the time because of the Latins. Nevertheless, they were also unwilling to depend on Nicaea. In one instance Chomatenos argued that due to the paralysing of ancient customs of Constantinople a Patriarch was elected in the eparchia ton Bithynon. Ironically, he noticed the unprecedented case of a Metropolitan of Nicaea who was also Patriarch of Constantinople (Demetrios Chomatenos, *Ponemata*, no. 114, 372–373).

The Schism between Nicaea and Epirus was prolonged until 1231 and the defeat of Theodore Doukas in Klokotnitsa (Karpozilos, *Controversy*, 572; Congourdeau, *L’empereur et le patriarche*, 204). From that point on the Patriarchate in Nicaea had not any strong opponents among the Greek states. A persisting challenge continued to be the Latin Empire of Constantinople and the Latin Patriarchate.

### 3. Mobilities and ecumenicity

In the second part of our paper we will argue that a useful approach to the study of the geographical limits and the ecumenicity of the Patriarchate in the period 1204-1261 is the paradigm of mobilities (Urry, *Mobilities*) closely related to the spatial turn in human sciences. Mobilities encompasses the movement of people, objects, and ideas, while at the same time also societies and systems are seen as being on the move. Our focus will be the ecclesiastic mobility. Its study will allow a better analysis of the existence (or not) of limits of the patriarchal power in a strongly entangled world.
Ecclesiastic mobility is attested in various forms after 1204. Previous political and ecclesiastical structures were able to revive due to the presence of members of the higher clergy and of the patriarchal officials in the periphery. Demetrios Chomatenos argued that many churchmen from the Peloponnese had fled to Epirus while others found a similar refuge in Nicaea. Among the known metropolitans who fled to Nicaea was the Archbishop of Crete Nikolaos together with three of his suffragans and some heads of monasteries. Also the future Patriarch Germanos II was a refugee from Constantinople in the Nicaean Empire. Moreover, in the period 1204-1261 we observe an intensified ecclesiastic mobility due to emerging mendicant orders which were active in the Eastern Mediterranean. Although immediately after 1204 the discussions with the Latin clergy and the papal representatives were undertaken by the Greeks in Constantinople, during the reign of John III Vatatzes various discussions with papal legates took place in the Nicaean Empire (1232-1234, 1249-1250, 1253-1254). Despite the fact that the negotiations were not fruitful, they proved useful for the prestige of the Patriarchs in Nicaea who supported the ideology of the Lascarid emperors and augmented the sphere of Nicaean influence. Finally, mobility is attested in the various ecclesiastic missions. We observe that once the Patriarchate in Nicaea was generally acknowledged, bishops were sent to areas far beyond the political borders. Our aim is therefore to map and analyse with accuracy the mobility of the patriarchal power through persons (delegates) and though objects (patriarchal documents).

To summarize: this paper will present an analysis of the ecclesiastic mobility from and towards Nicaea in order to understand better the efforts made to overcome the geographic limitations of a patriarchate in Exile.
The Frontiers of Administration and the Limits of Income: 
Aspects of the “Management of Shortage” in the Late Byzantine Patriarchate

In his recent book *L’évêque et le territoire* (Paris 2016) Florian Mazel highlights how the medieval Church in Western Europe preserved and modified Roman traditions of spatial organisation and transmitted them to emerging state administrations in the Late Middle Ages. In Byzantium, the development was somehow contrary: while the territory and authority of the Empire dwindled away in the 14th century, the Patriarchate of Constantinople was still able to exert influence in wide areas of its sphere of jurisdiction and took over some functions of the state within and beyond Byzantine borders [Potz 1971; Congourdeau 1991; Papademetriou 2015]. In autumn 1350, Patriarch Kallistos I of Constantinople summarised the calamities of his time: famines, pestilence, earthquakes, floods and fires, civil war and foreign invasions [PRK III, nr. 180, lns. 92-107]. This was not rhetorical exaggeration; Byzantium was definitely in crisis then, and the worst was just to come. Of course, also the Church was affected; a few decades after the triumphal re-conquest of Constantinople from the Crusaders in 1261 and the return of the Patriarchate to the Hagia Sophia, the 14th century proved especially calamitous. In addition to the Church provinces lost already to the Turks in Asia Minor since the 11th century and to the Latins in Greece after 1204, more and more bishoprics fell into *partibus infidelium*. Laymen and clerics fled from the provinces, the remaining Christians were left without spiritual guidance and “threatened” by Catholicism or Islam, as the documents from the Register of the Patriarchate, our most important source for the period from 1315 to 1402, frequently inform us [Vryonis 1971; Preiser-Kapeller 2011]. Besides spiritual losses, also the material basis of the Church was reduced, not only in the lost provinces, but also in the remaining regions. We will concentrate on this aspect of “les frontières et les limites du patriarcat” and some answers the Patriarchate and the *Synodos endemousa* tried to find for these challenges.

As every other bishop, the Ecumenical Patriarch had several sources of supply; in our period, we find a bipartite framework for his finances. The majority of the administrative staff and the clergy was part of the household of the Great Church, the Hagia Sophia; the bigger part of the revenues from the Patriarchate’s estates, rental income and dues as well as fishing, hunting or pasture rights, etc. served for their provision and for the maintenance of buildings as well as of the liturgy. These assets and revenues were, according to canon law, administered by the *Megas Oikonomos* of the Great Church [Darrouzès 1970]. Besides, the Patriarch could also dispose of a private treasure chamber (the *patriarchikon kellion*); it was supplied with a part of the revenues from the patriarchal assets, but also from another source of income: the so-called *patriarchika dikaia*, which consisted of jurisdictional rights over churches, monasteries and entire localities all over the patriarchal sphere of influence and of the annual dues these entities had to pay. The administration of his *kellion*, the Patriarch in our period often entrusted to confidants who were termed “*kalogeros*” [Darrouzès 1970, 307-308; Mitsiou 2013].
For the patriarchal assets, our most important source for the 13th century is a charter of Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos for the Hagia Sophia from the time around 1267; it also provides a history of assets since the installation of the Patriarchate in exile in Nicaea after the catastrophe of 1204: first, the Patriarch could only dispose of the revenues of the metropolis of Nicaea. Since the 1220s the emperors of Nicaea granted several villages and estates to the Patriarchate especially in those regions of Northwestern Asia Minor which they regained from the Latins. After the re-conquest of Constantinople in 1261, Emperor Michael VIII restituted and granted property to the Patriarchate also in the European environs of the capital. The Patriarchate became also a major proprietor within the walls of Constantinople, especially around the Hagia Sophia. Overall, Michael VIII decreed that two thirds of these revenues should serve for the provision of the household of the Hagia Sophia and one third for the patriarchal kellion [Dö. Reg. 1941a; see map 1]. These estates, at least in the European environs of Constantinople, remained in the hands of the Great Church during the 14th century; a charter of Patriarch Neilos from 1384 informs us that he re-populated two of these villages, Oikonomeion and Brachophagos, which had been deserted due to the Ottoman invasions, in order to provide sufficient supply for the destitute clergy of the Hagia Sophia [Mitsiou 2013].

While these assets were concentrated in the environs of Constantinople, the patriarchika dikaiα were distributed across the entire patriarchal sphere of influence. A major part of these dikaiα applied to monasteries which had received the privilege of independence from the local bishop and direct subordination to the Patriarch, who also received an annual due. In this category fell also monasteries in the important centres of Mount Athos, Mount Latmos or Mount Olympus (in Bithynia), which at the same time were among the greatest proprietors in the Empire [Smyrli 2006]. Besides monasteries, the patriarchal supervision could stretch out over churches and entire πατριαρχικά χωρία and καστελλα. On a map [see map 2], we localized all patriarchika dikaiα mentioned in the documents for the period between 1315 and 1402: we recognize a concentration of such rights in Western Asia Minor, the core regions of the Empire of Nicaea, and in the provinces of Thrace and Macedonia, which were regained in the years before 1261. As in the case of patriarchal assets, patriarchal rights were renewed or newly established after the successful re-conquest. But we also encounter patriarchal monasteries and patriarchal localities far beyond the borders of the restored Byzantine Empire: at the banks of the Euphrates, imperial authority had ceased more than 200 years before, yet in 1316 Metropolitan Theodosios of Melitene received rights of supervision over a patriarchal monastery [PRK I 57, 44-48; Dar. Reg. 2088; Korobeinikov 2003/2005]. In 1347, revenues from the patriarchika choria of Komana and Dokea were considered sufficient to support the newly elected metropolitan of Sebasteia in Cappadocia [PRK II, 160, 5–15; Dar. Reg. 2284]. This and other evidence implies that not only these institutions and communities survived Turkish conquest, but also maintained ties of loyalty and obedience with the Patriarchate. The same phenomenon we observe in the regions of Western Asia Minor after the Turkish conquest; until 1394, the Patriarchs appointed administrators for Kios at the Sea of Marmara [MM II 36, 221 (Nr. 470); DarReg 2725, 2966; Paize-Apostolopoulou 1995, 47, fn. 1]. And even patriarchika dikaiα in inland regions were still administered with the help of the metropolitan in Philadelphiea in 1394, for instance. We also get information on the scale of revenues: from dikaiα in Kula, Kolida and Synada, the metropolitan of Philadelphiea was obliged to send 20 hyperpyra per year to the patriarchikon kellion (the equivalent of 6 Gold ducats at this time); and we are also informed that he actually sent 15 hyperpyra to Constantinople with the help of the skeuophylax of Prusa [MM II 209–210 (Nr.
Obviously, the Patriarchate did not neglect the collection even of such modest sums from areas deep within Turkish territory (also due to their symbolic value for the Patriarch's authority in partibus infidelium).

For, although patriarchika dikaia could demonstrate an impressive persisistency, of course the scale of revenues was significantly reduced due to foreign conquest – and the same holds true for the patriarchal assets. Consequently, the Patriarchate had to fall back on other financial sources in order to cover its expenses. Two documents of Patriarch Isidoros I illustrate this: in 1348, the monk Kompas bequeathed three hundred hyperpyra (150 ducats) to renovate the Hagia Sophia. (...). But this money was passed on to the imperial treasury as loan. The imperial treasury after the end of the first phase of the civil war was for sure in a state of emergency [PRK II 149, 1-9; Dar. Reg. 2299]. Yet, the Patriarchate itself was hardly in the position for such generosity, as we learn from the last will of Isidoros I in 1350: the exact knowledge on the extent of the debts is attributed to Theodoretos, a kaloger o of the Patriarch, who most probably at this time administered the patriarchikon kellion. One of the creditors (kyr Andreas) was an ostiarios (door steward) of the Great Church. Another one, Xenos Agapetos (PLP 127) was most probably a relative of Konstantinos Agapetos (PLP 122), about whom we know from a later document that he was a merchant active in Black Sea-trade. Also a further creditor, Manuel Zymarchos may have belonged to the mercantile circles of Constantinople, who served as source of credit [PRK II 156; Dar.Reg. 2309].

The status of debtor seemed of course somehow improper for Ecumenical Patriarchs, who therefore tried to balance their budget permanently. Already in the early 14th century the Patriarchate attempted to compensate for its losses in revenues which were caused by the Turkish expansion in Asia Minor and the devastations in the European provinces by the Catalan Company. Patriarch Niphon in 1310 had the Synod granting him the revenues of 12 metropolitan sees and archbishoprics in Europe and Asia Minor. Our source does not give a sum for the revenues from this considerable number of churches, but Niphon obviously had exaggerated his zeal to balance the budget. Opposition in the synod grew, and in 1314 he was deposed [Nikephoros Chumnos, Elenchos 278–282; Dar. Reg. 2010, 2011. Preiser-Kapeller 2008, LXIX–LXX]. But in July 1315, the synod had to assign once more revenues from four vacant churches to the new, more modest Patriarch John XIII Glykys for his lifetime [PRK I 4, 24-38, Dar Reg. 2032]. However, to permanently deprive certain bishoprics of a genuine bishop for the benefit of the Patriarch's treasury was problematic from the point of view of canon law. Thus, the synod in September 1324 decreed that “those metropoles and archbishoprics, which are prosperous (euporousai) and capable” should each henceforth pay a fixed sum every year to the Patriarchate until its own revenues would become sufficient again [PRK I 88, 39-73; Dar. Reg. 2119]. The document includes a list of the annual contributions of 33 metropoles and archbishoprics which were considered “capable” of supporting the Great Church; as we can see on a map [see map 3], most of these bishoprics were found in the remaining core provinces of the Empire in Thrace and Macedonia, some on the Peloponnese and in the Aegean and only two in Western Asia Minor. The total amount of payments is 3208 hyperpyra (ca. 2100 ducats); unfortunately, we are not informed about the relation of the contributions to the actual revenues of every bishopric. For the Western Church in the 14th century, a very important source are the records on the various dues (servitia) all bishops and abbots had to pay once on the occasion of their recognition by the papacy and which amounted to one third of the annual revenues. There, we also find figures for Latin bishoprics, which had replaced Byzantine eparchies in Greece after 1204 [Hoberg 1949, 13, 34, 42, 44, 48, 82,
All in all, these figures are comparable in order of magnitude to those at the top of the Byzantine list from 1324 [see fig. 1 and 2]. A statistical analysis of the distribution pattern of the contributions highlights the actual inequality of ecclesiastical wealth within the bishoprics of the Patriarchate; we encounter a few rich metropolitan sees at the top levels and a long tail of medium and minor equipped bishoprics, whose material bases would become barely sufficient if affected by the catastrophes of the period [Preiser-Kapeller/Mitsiou 2010].

Therefore, the Patriarchate had also to provide for the supply of all its hierarchs who should maintain pastoral care out there in the provinces also beyond the Empire’s borders; this commitment is expressed in many documents from the Register of the Patriarchate. Common instrument applied by the Patriarchate and the Synod for the provision of their hierarchs were the *epidosis* (the addition of one or more bishoprics with their revenues and administrative rights, temporary or for lifetime), the *metathesis* (the relocation of a hierarch to another bishopric of the same or higher rank) and the entrusting with the administration of *patriarchika dikaia*, from which the hierarch was allowed to retain a part or all revenues [Preiser-Kapeller 2008, LIX-LXIV; Kresten 2003; Kraus 2013].

We undertook a systematic survey of all uses of the most common instrument, the *epidosis*, in the Register between 1315 and 1402 and connected all metropolitan sees, archbishoprics and bishoprics which were combined through acts of *epidosis* in a network model with nodes (the episcopal sees) and ties (the connection through joint administration). We also built a geographic network in order to analyse its spatial dimension. The visualization among other things very much illustrates one important aspect of the Patriarchate’s strategy: the pooling of resources and pastoral care onto regional centres, in most cases the oldest and highest ranking metropolitan sees [see map 4 and 5]. This was the case for Melitene at the Euphrates, for Kaisareia in Cappadocia (the highest ranking metropolitan see at all), also for Myra in Lycia or for Philadelpheia, which had a special position as last Byzantine outpost within Turkish territory until 1390 and which took over the hierarchic position of the ancient Church of Sardeis. Also a structural analysis of the *epidosis*-network demonstrates that the Patriarchate’s and the Synod’s efforts were concentrated around certain points; the top most central nodes, the targets of relatively the most synodal actions in this regard, are mostly located in Asia Minor and were either prioritized due to their high ecclesiastical rank or their special aptitude as administrative centres since they were still in Orthodox hands such as Philadelpheia or Trapezus.

One has to ask if the Byzantine Church was successful in the maintenance of its institutional and geographic framework – in comparison with the Byzantine state for instance. In order to have a quantitative benchmark, we compared a list of all bishoprics of the Patriarchate from the late 12th century with a similar *Notitia Episcopatum* from the late 15th century [Darrouzès 1981]. On a first glance, the loss of bishoprics is dramatic: only 14.8 % of the sees listed in Notitia 13 survived the catastrophes of the 13th to 15th century. But a more detailed analysis makes clear that the loss is most significant in the lowest stratum of episcopal hierarchy (the suffragan bishoprics, more than 90 %), while 27 % of the archbishoprics and more than 46 % of the metropolitan sees were preserved [see fig. 3]. The efforts of the Church were most effective in the European provinces, in Western Asia Minor and around Trapezus, while the success in Central, East and South Anatolia was limited (as also described by Vryonis 1971). At least, 12 out of the 20 most central nodes in the *epidosis*- network made it into the second half of the 15th century.
So finally we have to ask why the “resilience management” of the Byzantine Church was more
effective than that of the Byzantine state? The Nobel laureate Douglass C. North in 2009 stated: “a
perpetually lived organization is one where the identity of the organization is independent from
the identity of its individual members”; and he demonstrated for several medieval and pre-modern
cases that such organizations (such as the Byzantine Church) proved more durable and resilient than
political coalitions and power arrangements based on personal ties of alliance and allegiance alone
[North/Wallis/Weingast 2009; Preiser-Kapeller 2012]. The cohesion of the Church and the coherence
of its politics were also connected to the framework and mechanisms of its central decision making
institutions, the Synod in Constantinople. In most documents of the Register of the Patriarchate, we
read that decisions were made through joint synodal resolution. This was of course also an element
of rhetoric, but consensus was not only an ideal, it also helped “to minimize the risks of decision
making” for the cohesion of the synod. As we were able to show in another study, the synod avoided
direct confrontations and crucial votes and actually decided in consensus in most cases [Preiser-
Kapeller 2013]. The Synod met essential conditions for the functioning of this consensus principle
identified by the German historian Egon Flaig: The almost exclusive recruitment of hierarchs from
monastic communities guaranteed an “intensive socialization”, a “high consensus of norms” and a
strong homogeneity among the members of the decision-making body. And although the political
and theological upheavals of the time of course had a strong impact on the Church – Patriarchs
were installed or deposed, hierarchs who had chosen the wrong theological faction (pro-Union
or anti-Palamas) were banned [Gastgeber 2014] – the institutional framework of the Church and
its principles of management proved to be consistent and durable beyond these crises, thereby
allowing also for the maintenance or even expansion [Prinzing 2014] of earlier established limits of
Patriarchal jurisdiction.
Maps and Figures
(see also: https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?mid=zFF_0-ggg3xI.kANSIEUOG5-o&usp=sharing, for an interactive map)

Map 1: Places of estates of the Patriarchate of Constantinople according to the imperial chrysobull of 1267/1271
(Dö. Reg. 1941a; map: J. Preiser-Kapeller, 2016)

Map 2: Places of patriarcha dikaiá mentioned in the documents for the period between 1315 and 1402 CE; in yellow their clustering according to geographical proximity (J. Preiser-Kapeller, 2016)
Map 3: Churches contributing to the Patriarchate according to the document of September 1324 (PRK I 88, 39-73; Dar. Reg. 2119); places sized according to the sum of contribution (J. Preiser-Kapeller, 2016)

Fig. 1: Contributions of churches to the Patriarchate according to the document of September 1324 (PRK I 88, 39-73; Dar. Reg. 2119; figure: J. Preiser-Kapeller, 2011)

Fig. 2: Payment for the servitium commune from several former metropolitan sees and bishoprics of the Patriarchate, 1320-1340 CE (data: Hoberg 1949; figure: J. Preiser-Kapeller, 2011)
Map 4: Network model of churches connected through acts of epidosis in the years 1315 to 1402 CE; places sized according to their degree centrality (= number of connections) (J. Preiser-Kapeller, 2016)

Map 5: Network model of churches connected through acts of epidosis in the years 1315 to 1402 CE (Balkans and Asia Minor); places sized according to their degree centrality (= number of connections) (J. Preiser-Kapeller, 2016)
Fig. 3: Comparisons of Notitia 13 and Notitia 21 (figures: J. Preiser-Kapeller, 2011).
Le patriarcat œcuménique et la métropole russe au milieu du XVᵉ siècle

Selon l’appréciation de Kritoboulos d’Imbros, le patriarche Gennadios II de Constantinople (1454-1456) était parvenu à détenir, sous les Ottomans, une autorité spirituelle identique à celle des patriarches de l’époque byzantine. En octobre 1454, Gennadios Scholarios lui-même se faisait un mérite d’avoir restauré l’autorité du patriarcat œcuménique, non seulement à Constantinople mais dans sa zone de juridiction (κλίμα) entière. Ces affirmations d’alors soulèvent la question de l’extension effective de la juridiction patriarcale dans les premières années de la conquête ottomane. Et dans ce contexte, la nature des rapports avec la plus grande métropole située à l’extérieur de l’espace byzantin, la métropole de Russie, acquiert une importance particulière. Cette question est d’autant plus cruciale que, pour l’historiographie courante de la question, cette métropole aurait obtenu son autocéphalie, dite de facto, avant même 1453, dans le contexte de la réaction de l’Église moscovite, impulsée par le grand prince, face aux tentatives du métropolite byzantin de Kiev, Isidore, pour imposer l’union de Florence en Russie par le métropolite byzantin de Kiev, Isidore.

Or des recherches sur le dossier de l’autocéphalie de l’Église moscovite ont conduit à des résultats assez contraires à l’interprétation générale qu’elles aspirent à illustrer. Il apparaît désormais clairement que l’arrestation du métropolite Isidore et son remplacement par Jonas de Riazan en 1441 avaient pour fondement la promesse faite à ce dernier par les autorités byzantines, lors de son voyage à Constantinople en 1436, de succéder au prélat grec. Dans une première lettre adressée en 1441 au patriarche de Constantinople, et réadressée en 1443 à l’empereur Jean VIII Paléologue, les évêques russes justifiaient le rejet d’Isidore de Kiev par sa trahison de l’orthodoxie et demandaient respectueusement la confirmation de leur action, en se référant à l’ancienne promesse du patriarche Joseph II de remplacer celui-ci par Jonas de Riazan. Après l’intronisation unilatérale de Jonas en 1448, la même idée était reprise dans une lettre justificative de juillet 1451. La date n’était pas sans signification : à Moscou devait être arrivée la nouvelle du départ du patriarche unioniste Grégoire Mammès vers Rome, interprétée comme une mesure de l’empereur Constantin XI en faveur des anti-unionistes. Dans ce nouveau contexte, on pouvait espérer que l’initiative de l’épiscopat russe fût avalisée par les autorités byzantines. Ces lettres étaient sans doute trop optimistes vis-à-vis de l’attitude religieuse de Constantin XI, qui finit par autoriser la proclamation de l’union de Florence à Sainte Sophie le 12 décembre 1452, par Isidore de Kiev lui-même, en tant que légat pontifical. Mais on peut observer en tout état de cause que Moscou n’a nullement eu l’intention de rompre violemment avec le patriarcat de Constantinople, cherchant au contraire à obtenir son accord pour une mesure dictée par les circonstances, l’initiative russe étant fondée justement sur les promesses byzantines antérieures.

Même si Ia. S. Lurie a pu formuler une série de questions concernant le caractère ambigu de ces lettres, S. N. Kisterev (sur les traces des recherches de N. Sinicyna, de B. A. Uspenski et d’A. Pliguzov) a argumenté de manière assez convaincante en faveur de leur authenticité. La découverte du testament de Jonas a modifié notablement les termes du débat. Ce testament, parvenu dans
une rédaction de 1461, date cependant d'avant la prise de Constantinople par les Ottomans, plus précisément entre le 8 août 1452 et le 29 mai 1453 (dans la mesure où référence est faite à Constantin XI). Dans ce document, le métropolite Jonas exprime son ferme souhait de recevoir la bénédiction de la part du « saint patriarche orthodoxe et de tout son saint synode » (святаго православнаго патриарха и от всего же священного собора) dès que l'orthodoxie serait restaurée à Constantinople. Avoir conservé la formulation respectueuse dans la rédaction de 1461 montre que les prélats russes ne considéraient nullement le patriarche oecuménique comme une sorte de « vizir du sultan pour ses sujets chrétiens », mais gardaient envers lui la même déférence que par le passé.

Dans ce contexte, N. Sinicyna, dans un livre majeur dédié à la question (Третий Рим: Истоки и эволюция русской средневековой концепции [XV–XVI вв.]), a démontré sur la base de toutes les sources russes que les intellectuels moscovites n'ont nullement eu l'image excessivement négative des Grecs que leur prêtait une historiographie plus ancienne, fondée sur quelques accents polémiques sortis de leur contexte. L'hostilité des Russes n'a jamais eu pour cible les Grecs comme peuple ou comme empire, mais a visé d'abord la minorité des unionistes qui ont soutenu l'accord du concile de Florence et surtout l'ancien métropolite Isidore de Kiev. Même le cardinal Bessarion a une image plutôt positive, tant dans le Слово на латынью, écrit viruellement antiunioniste, que dans la chronique grand-princière, en tant que tuteur de Zoé Paléologue, à partir de 1472 épouse en titre du grand-prince Ivan III. L'attitude des Russes par rapport à Constantinople a donc été très nuancée : aucune barrière mentale n'entravait les rapports avec le patriarcat oecuménique.

L'attachement séculaire de la Russie envers Constantinople a réussi à transformer le voeu pieux du métropolite Jonas en réalité, peu après la restauration du patriarchat sous la domination ottomane, confiée, comme on le sait, aux adversaires de l'union ecclésiastique. Selon la chronique de Pskov, en juin 1454 s'y trouvait en visite un métropolite nommé Ignace venu de Constantinople (митрополит цареградский). Celui-ci demeura plus d'un mois hôte de la ville, poursuivant ensuite son trajet, chargé de présents, jusqu'à Novgorod. L'historiographie russe n'a pas encore identifié ce personnage. Mais il ne peut être autre que le métropolite Ignace de Tarnovo, qui resta en fonction jusque vers 1463/1464. Ignace était l'un des membres de la Hiera Synaxis et faisait partie du groupe des soutiens proches de Scholarios, signataires des deux actes les plus importants de ce groupe, en 1445 et en 1452. Lui, ou peut-être un autre émissaire patriarcal, arrivait la même année, soit 1454, devant le grand-prince de Moscou, Basile II Vassilievich et sollicitait son soutien à la Grande Église en difficulté, encourageant le maître de Moscou à envoyer un émissaire auprès du nouveau patriarche. Les archives russes conservent en effet la minute de la lettre expédiée par le métropolite Jonas à un patriarche de Constantinople (son début étant détérioré, il manque le nom du destinataire). La lettre précise que, sur la demande du patriarche, était envoyé à Constantinople un émissaire du grand-prince nommé Ivan Vladimirović, apportant avec lui des aides et demandant une bénédiction. Il était présenté comme un homme de parfaite confiance, qui devait transmettre au patriarche des messages importants tant de la part du prince que de celle du métropolite. Jonas demandait des clarifications sur l'état des choses à Constantinople, sollicitant de même des documents « utiles à l'orthodoxie », dont les exemplaires plus anciens avaient été détruits par un incendie (probablement durant la guerre civile).

Une autre information précieuse provient du starets Paisij Jaroslavov, le maître spirituel de Nil Sorsky, l'auteur de la Skazania du monastère Spaso–Kamenny, établissement près du Lac Blanc (Beloozero). Originaire de ce monastère, Cassien était devenu le starets, entre 1448-1469, du célèbre
monastère Kirillo-Belozerski. En cette qualité, Basile II et le métropolite Jonas l’avaient envoyé à deux reprises à Constantinople pour résoudre certains problèmes disciplinaires et à son retour le grand prince avait octroyé des présents importants au monastère, signe d’une mission couronnée de succès. Le métropolite Macaire Boulgakov, l’historien de l’Église russe du XIXe siècle, suppose que le but de cette mission aurait consisté dans l’obtention de l’accord du patriarcat que la procédure de promotion du métropolite (поставлення) n’implique plus le déplacement à Constantinople, en raison de la longueur du trajet et de la domination ottomane, l’élection par les évêques russes devant être suffisante. Par ces contacts diplomatiques on aurait validé a posteriori la procédure unilatérale déclenchée par l’épiscopat moscovite en 1448.

Pour ce qui est de l’identité du patriarche destinataire de la lettre mutilée de Jonas, le métropolite Boulgakov s’était arrêté à Gennadios Scholarios, alors que d’autres historiens avaient plutôt pensé à son successeur, Isidore II. Il est possible maintenant de préciser cette question. La correspondance entre le patriarche Gennadios II Scholarios (1454-1456) et le despote Georges Branković (1427-1456) circonscrivit le cadre d’une collaboration étroite entre Constantinople et la Serbie entre 1454 et 1456. Dans les réponses adressées par Gennadios II au despote serbe Georges Branković, le patriarche oecuménique donne, entre autres, comme exemple de transfert du siège avec la conservation du titre historique justement le métropolite qui, tout en portant le titre de Kiev et de toute la Russie, ne pouvait résider à Kiev en raison de la domination latine et siégeait donc à Moscou.

« Il est possible (Δύνανται) pour le seigneur du lieu et pour le synode des évêques de créer (ποιῆσαι) archevêque et patriarche quelqu’un dont le siège (καθέδρα) précédant n’était pas dans la même région […] Le métropolite de Russie s’intitule et il est en effet de Kiev et de toute la Russie (Κυβέρνησις Ρωσίας), néanmoins il réside (κάθηται) à Moscou, parce que Kiev est sous les Latins (Λατινικὸν), et ils ne le reçoivent pas parce qu’il est orthodoxe (/authenticatione ὄντα όρθόδοξον) ».

Nous avons de prime abord affaire à un constat d’une pratique liée aux circonstances propres aux métropoles « de frontière » avec le monde catholique. Mais il faut observer ensuite que ce constat devient plus général à partir du cas du métropolite de Kiev et de la situation difficile d’exercice de son autorité dans le grand diocèse nordique. En effet, depuis le XIVe siècle et jusqu’à Isidore de Kiev, les métropoles byzantins de Russie avaient eu – à quelques exceptions près – la possibilité d’exercer leur juridiction dans tout l’espace historique de leur métropole. Isidore lui-même avait séjourné à plusieurs reprises, avant et après le concile de Florence, à Kiev et dans le royaume de Pologne-Lituanie. Son successeur cependant, considéré comme étant trop lié aux intérêts de la principauté de Moscou et farouche opposant à l’union ecclésiastique, avait été interdit d’accès par le roi Casimir IV Jagellon dans les terres de ses comtés.

Dans ce contexte, devient remarquable sous la plume de Gennadios l’emploi d’une formule qui atteste l’adhésion du métropolite de Kiev à l’orthodoxie, car elle provient d’un acteur ayant ardemment débattu à l’époque, avec l’acribie des anti-unionistes, le sens de ce mot. Mais le texte contient aussi une reconnaissance explicite de la légitimité du métropolite résidant à Moscou. Car – et c’est ici le patriarche œcuménique qui s’exprime – le titulaire contemporain du titre de métropolite de Russie (à savoir Jonas) non seulement s’intitulait métropolite « de Kiev et de toute la Russie », mais il l’était également (ὀνομάζεται καὶ ἔστι). Or, un patriarche ne pouvait reconnaître la légitimité d’un métropolite schismatique, mais seulement de quelqu’un qui se trouvait en bonne et due forme en communion avec Constantinople.
Qui plus est, cette position de principe n’a pas seulement une valeur descriptive, mais aussi normative, puisqu’elle est invoquée auprès du despote de Serbie à titre exemplaire, comme un précédent légal pour confirmer la possibilité légale du transfert du siège de l’archévêque-patriarque de Peć à Smederevo, tout en conservant son titre historique. Cet emploi serait entièrement inconcevable dans les conditions d’un schisme, voire même d’une rupture moins grave, entre Constantinople et Moscou à cette époque, comme on le suppose généralement.

Replacé dans l’économie de l’argument entier, l’exemple moscovite était invoqué précisément pour illustrer la capacité du synode épiscopal local, d’un commun accord avec le souverain du lieu, d’instaurer, dans certains cas, ce type de métropolites « de frontière ». Les autres exemples invoqués au même titre étaient celui de la métropole de Naupaktos et celui, plus prestigieux, du patriarcat œcuménique de Constantinople lui-même lors de son exil à Nicée. On peut donc conclure que, malgré les difficultés liées à son avènement, Jonas avait vraisemblablement été reconnu en tant que métropolite légitime de Russie, dépendant du patriarcat de Constantinople, malgré (ou peut-être justement du fait de ?) son impossibilité de se rendre dans la ville de Kiev contrôlée par les autorités catholiques lituaniennes.

Les effets de ce rapprochement entre le patriarche œcuménique et le métropolite russe résident à Moscou ont été ressentis jusqu’à Rome. En décembre 1458, le pape Pie II demanda au roi de Pologne Casimir IV d’empêcher les contacts entre Jonas « le schismatique » et le « pseudo-patriarche et chef profane de Constantinople, institué par le tyran turc » :

Verum non sine ingenti animi molestia et dolore accepius Ionam scismaticum in eandem ecclesiam esse intrusum et quod pseudopatriarcha est profanus antistes Constantinopolitanus a tiranno Turchorum constitutus ecclesie ipso vivente vero et canonice ordinato illius pastore alium proponere et prelicere pro dolor in nostrum et sedis apostolice detrimentum et obprobrium intendit, qui non pastoris officium eidem ecclesie prestet, sed ut lupus rapax oves dissipat et dispersat.

Pour interrompre tout lien direct entre les deux, le pape prenait la décision d’installer comme métropolite à Kiev, dans les territoires ruthènes de Pologne et de Lituanie, un disciple d’Isidore de Kiev, Grégoire le Bulgare (Bougarine), dépendant directement du patriarche Grégoire Mammas, alors résidant à Rome.

Ces rapports étroits entre le métropolite siégeant à Moscou et la Grande Église, attestés par des sources provenant de plusieurs horizons, expliquent la formule un peu inattendue selon laquelle une chronique russe (Воскресенская летопись) présente la mort de Jonas en 1461 :

«Au sujet de la mort du métropolite Jonas. Durant le même printemps [6969=1461] acheva sa vie Jonas, métropolite de Kiev et de toute la Russie, le 31 mars ; et il fut enterré dans l’église de la Théotokos de la ville de Moscou. Jonas avait été consacré métropolite à Moscou par des archevêques et évêques, avec la bénédiction du patriarche de Tsarigrad ; car Jonas était allé à Tsarigrad et avait reçu la bénédiction du patriarche; et c’est à partir de cette époque qu’on a commencé à installer le métropolite à Moscou, sans plus aller à Tsarigrad; car le tsar turc régnait à Tsarigrad et avait tué le tsar [grec] ».

Pour tenter de conclure, il nous semble que la référence (datable 1454-1456) de Gennadios II au statut contemporain de l’Église de Russie atteste le retour du métropolite résidant à Moscou
dans le giron de Constantinople, et que le patriarche le reconnaissait comme métropolite légitime de « Kiev et de toute la Russie ». En raison du caractère extrêmement fragmentaire des documents conservés du registre patriarcal du XVᵉ siècle, il nous manque malheureusement l’acte officiel par lequel cette reconnaissance se serait produite, et nous sommes ainsi dans l’impossibilité d’en connaître les termes canoniques précis. Les évêques russes avaient néanmoins le souvenir d’un tel acte à l’époque de Maxime le Grec en Russie dans la première moitié du XVIᵉ siècle. Cependant, ils furent incapables de le lui montrer sur sa demande. La chronique officielle russe affirme bien néanmoins que Jonas avait reçu la bénédiction patriarchale, et cela n’aurait pu avoir lieu qu’après que son statut a été réglé par Gennadios II.

Du point de vue canonique, la reconnaissance a posteriori de l’élection effectuée par le synode russe, avec l’envoi ultérieur de la bénédiction par le patriarche œcuménique correspondrait précisément à un statut d’autonomie accordé à l’Église russe. Il est difficile de préciser si ce mécanisme de promotion métropolitaine était prévu par le patriarche comme un système fonctionnel destiné à durer, ou comme une simple mesure d’économie, sans instituer une norme. L’idée générale que l’exemple russe illustre dans la correspondance avec le despote de Serbie, aux côtés d’autres cas de figure, est toutefois celle selon laquelle « il est possible (δύναναι) pour le seigneur du lieu et pour le synode des évêques de créer (ποιῆσαι) archevêque (…) », formule qui semble suggérer l’amorce d’une règle. Le même texte n’est pas moins un rappel de la norme et de l’appartenance de Moscou (au même titre que Naupacte) à la juridiction du patriarcat de Constantinople.

Cela nous oblige à prendre nos distances par rapport à la position du métropolite Macaire Boulgakoff et à la tradition historiographique qu’il a engendrée, et qui voyait en Jonas, à tort nous semble-t-il, le père de l’autocéphalie russe. Comme le montre son souci de rendre compte de ses actions aux autorités byzantines ou son testament, Jonas n’a jamais cherché à obtenir l’autocéphalie par un acte de force, mais s’est employé, par l’intermédiaire de plusieurs émissaires envoyés à Constantinople après la chute, à obtenir la bénédiction patriarcale. Jusqu’à sa mort, Jonas était resté dans les cadres d’une autonomie ecclésiale fidèle aux rapports historiques de la Russie avec le patriarcat œcuménique, source d’autorité dont dépendait sa légitimité même.

Les racines de l’autocéphalie de facto de l’Église russe sont donc à chercher non dans la longue administration de la métropole par Jonas, mais dans la crise de succession suivant sa mort, dans le contexte de la réconciliation du métropolite Grégoire Bougarine de Kiev avec le patriarche Dionysios Iᵉʳ, en raison de la tentative de ce dernier de restaurer l’unité de la métropole russe au bénéfice de l’ancien disciple d’Isidore de Kiev (1467), revenu à l’orthodoxie.
Le patriarcat œcuménique aux confins de la mer Ionienne au XVIe siècle. Continuités et ruptures

La restauration du patriarcat de Constantinople, en 1454, marque une période nouvelle de l'histoire de cette institution byzantine, qui est tenue désormais de fonctionner dans le cadre de l'entité politique nouvelle qui domine en Méditerranée orientale, à savoir l'Empire ottoman. Dorénavant, le patriarche puise sa légitimation politique auprès du pouvoir ottoman central, le sultan, qui lui reconnaît le droit de diriger les populations orthodoxes de l'Empire.

Après la prise de Constantinople, la juridiction territoriale du patriarcat byzantin, qui pendant les siècles précédents s'était réduite, dans la mesure où de larges sections de l'Empire romain d'Orient étaient peu à peu passées sous des dominations diverses, acquiert un cadre de référence nouveau, puisqu'elle se déploie, en premier lieu, dans l'espace où le pouvoir ottoman sévère. Pendant les siècles suivants, la conquête ou le rattachement à l'Empire ottoman de territoires nouveaux comprenant des populations chrétiennes et, inversement, le détachement d'autres régions à la suite de conflits militaires, mènent à l'expansion ou à la rétraction de l'espace juridictionnel du patriarcat de Constantinople, ce qui, en ce qui concerne les régions de l'Empire ottoman, est habituellement reflété dans les documents ottomans de nomination des patriarches, c'est-à-dire dans les berat.

Jusqu'à quel point, cependant, les frontières de l'Empire ottoman constituent-elles des limites insurmontables pour la juridiction patriarcale? Plus particulièrement, comment se forme la relation des chrétiens orthodoxes se trouvant sous la domination d'une autre entité politique, celle de Venise, avec le patriarcat œcuménique?

Cette communication examine des aspects de l'administration ecclésiastique des orthodoxes dans des régions qui se trouvent sous domination vénitienne pendant des périodes plus ou moins longues, comme les îles de la mer Ionienne et le Péloponnèse. La conquête vénitienne s'accompagne, cela s'entend, de la présence de l'Église catholique, qui doit coexister avec la population chrétienne orthodoxe locale. Le cadre de la coexistence présente une grande diversité d'une région à une autre, à tel point qu'une catégorisation paraît impossible. Il n'en reste pas moins que les intérêts des Vénitiens ne coïncident pas toujours avec ceux de l'État pontifical, et que dans leur façon de traiter les affaires ecclésiastiques ce sont principalement les objectifs politiques qui prévalent. Ainsi, bien qu'il y ait des tensions et des rivalités, les autorités vénitiennes font montre généralement d'une certaine tolérance à l'égard de l'Église orthodoxe. Le patriarchat de Constantinople, d'un autre côté, cherche à garder et à étendre ses points d'ancrage dans ces régions, en acceptant et en appliquant tacitement des pratiques anti-canoniques que l'on investit d'une apparence de canonicité, et en cherchant à accomplir, enfin, son caractère œcuménique, au-dehors et au-delà des limites juridictionnelles et des frontières territoriales.
La «concession» de la métropole de Kiev au patriarche de Moscou en 1686 :
Analyse canonique

La métropole de Kiev était à l’origine un diocèse unique du trône œcuménique; cependant, à cause des circonstances politiques, elle fut à plusieurs reprises divisée en deux ou trois métropoles. Après l’Union de Florence (1439), une partie de ce diocèse correspondant à la principauté de Moscou se sépara en 1448 de la communion de l’Église de Constantinople, mais des métropolites canoniques de Kiev ordonnés par le patriarchat œcuménique existaient toujours. Cette situation particulière de l’Église en Russie moscovite ne fut résolue que par la fondation du patriarchat de Moscou en 1589, événement qui coïncide aussi avec la création du siège épiscopal canonique dans cette ville.

Après la conquête de l’Ukraine, l’État moscovite agit pour soumettre aussi la métropole de Kiev au patriarche de Moscou. Concernant cette affaire, sont parvenus jusqu’à notre époque dans les archives de Russie dix documents prétendument émis par le patriarchat œcuménique, dont un seul en grec, et le reste en traduction russe; tous ces actes ont été publiés (Архив Юго-Западной России, 1/V, Киев, 1859, p. 166-193; Собраніе государственныхъ грамотъ и договоровъ, хранящихся въ государственной коллегіи иностранныхъ дѣй, 4, Москва, 1826, p. 509-519). Par conséquent, nous n’avons trouvé aucune mention à ce sujet dans les archives du patriarchat œcuménique, ni dans les archives du grand logothète Aristarchis Stavrakis (Bibliothèque Apostolique Vaticane : il n’avait copié que deux traductions du russe), ni dans les éditions des actes patriarcaux, ni dans les sources narratives grecques de la période post-byzantine.

La concession de la métropole de Kiev, d’après les documents a été faite sur la demande des souverains de Russie, du patriarche de Moscou et du hetman de l’Ukraine avec le consentement de l’État ottoman.

Avant que la concession ne soit réalisée, juste après l’annexion d’une partie de l’Ukraine par l’État moscovite, et après une longue vacance du siège de Kiev, les Russes ont agi afin de soumettre la métropole au patriarche de Moscou, et ont introduit dans le traité avec le hetman en 1659 le paragraphe suivant : «et le métropolite de Kiev avec les autres membres du clergé sera sous la bénédiction du patriarche de Moscou» (Полное собрание законов Российской Империи : Собрание Первое, Г.1: 1649-1675, СПб., 1830 p. 494); cependant à l’époque cela n’a pas été appliqué. La même année, fut nommé en tant que locum-tenens de la métropole de Kiev l’évêque de Tchernihiv Lazare, et à cause de cela la métropole fut divisée en deux : dans les territoires sous domination polonaise est demeuré le métropolite légitime de Kiev Denis, tandis que les parties soumises à Moscou furent administrées par Lazare.

En 1661 le locum-tenens du trône patriarcal de Moscou ordonna l’évêque de Mstislav Méthode, qui fut nommé par la suite locum-tenens de la métropole de Kiev ; cet acte fut condamné par le patriarche Nikon de Moscou en 1662, peu après son élection, et ne fut pas accepté par le trône œcuménique ni par le clergé du diocèse.
Vers la fin de 1667, le synode de Moscou promut l’évêché de Tchernihiv en archevêché sans la permission du trône œcuménique, qui ne reconnut pas cet acte. En 1668 fut installé sur le siège de Kiev le métropolite canonique Joseph. Après sa mort en 1675, Lazare de Tchernihiv devint *locum-tenens*.

Les autorités de Russie réclamèrent pour la première fois la métropole de Kiev en 1684, mais à cette époque le patriarche Jacques refusa cette demande. Enfin le 8 juillet 1685, une assemblée se réunit dans la cathédrale Sainte-Sophie de Kiev, à laquelle participèrent peu de membres du clergé (ceux-ci étaient majoritairement de Kiev) et de multiples laïcs. Ignorant la résistance du clergé, l’assemblée élu pour le siège métropolitain l’évêque de Loutsk Gédéon. Le clergé de Kiev pour sa part exprima sa protestation au hetman.

Gédéon, le 8 novembre 1685, fut promu métropolite de Kiev dans la cathédrale de Moscou par le patriarche de Russie, et il prononça le serment d’allégeance à ce dernier, cela sans aucune permission de l’Église de Constantinople. L’annexion du diocèse a été faite sans communication avec l’Église de Constantinople, sans sa permission et de manière anticanonique. Les autorités de Russie ont contacté le trône œcuménique uniquement dans le but de légitimer et valider la situation. Pour cette raison, une ambassade a été envoyée, qui, vers l’été 1686, selon les historiens russes, mena des négociations à Andrinople d’abord avec Dosithée de Jérusalem (alors qu’il n’était pas bien disposé à l’égard de cette concession, il l’accepta finalement) et puis avec le patriarche œcuménique Denis qui donna aussi son accord oral.

Plus tard, au mois de mai, Denis envoya des lettres patriarcales exprimant cet accord (Lettre à Joachim, patriarche Moscou, mai 1686, en russe; Lettre au hetman Samoïlovich, 9 mai 1686, en russe; Lettre aux empereurs de Russie, mai 1686, en grec et russe), et en juin des lettres le confirmant, patriarcales et synodales (Lettre synodale aux empereurs, juin 1686, en russe; Lettre synodale à Joachim, patriarche Moscou, juin 1686, en russe; Lettre synodale ordonnant de reconnaître Gédéon en tant que métropolite et de lui obéir, juin 1686, en russe) et uniquement patriarcales (Lettre au hetman et à d’autres afin qu’ils soient soumis au métropolite de Kiev, juin 1686, en russe; Lettre confirmant Gédéon en tant que métropolite de Kiev, juin 1686, en russe; Lettre permettant au hetman et à tous les dignitaires ecclésiastiques et civils d’écrire le métropolite de Kiev et de l’envoyer à Moscou pour ordination, juin 1686 (?), en russe).

**Analyse**

Certaines de ces lettres affirment que cette métropole a été soumise au trône œcuménique dans passé et dans le présent, et donnent comme raisons de sa concession à Moscou « *la distance du lieu* » et « *les batailles survenues entre deux grands empires* ».

La soumission de la métropole de Kiev au patriarche de Moscou, comme cela figure dans les actes et d’autres sources, a été réalisée d’abord sans l’autorisation de l’Église de Constantinople et par la force des souverains de Russie : le patriarche de Moscou a procédé au transfert de l’évêque Gédéon au siège de Kiev, et cela représente une infraction canonique importante et une violation des canons suivants: canons 35 des Apôtres, 6 du I CO, 13 d’Antioche, 22 d’Antioche, 15 de Sardique; l’intrusion dans une éparchie étrangère est condamnable selon les canons 2 du II CO, 13 et 22 d’Antioche, 3 de Sardique; la soumission des provinces étrangères est expressément condamnée, tout comme la violation de vieux droits des Églises par les canons 8 du III CO, 39 du VI CO. Pour toutes les raisons énoncées, deux lettres accordent le pardon de la violation des canons au patriarche de Moscou et au métropolite de Kiev Gédéon.
Dans plusieurs actes, il est dit que la concession avait été accordée κατ’ οἰκονομίαν, «pour le salut des chrétiens se trouvant là-bas». D’après les actes, la métropole de Kiev, suite aux demandes provenant de Russie, a été subordonnée au patriarche de Moscou. Ces actes autorisent le transfert ou l’ordination du métropolite de Kiev par le patriarche de Moscou. Il est stipulé une seule fois que le métropolite sera soumis au tribunal patriarchal de Moscou.

Les textes traitent de la métropole de Kiev comme «soumise» au patriarche de Moscou et expliquent de quoi il s’agit en réalité : «lorsqu’il y aura besoin de l’ordination d’une personne en vue de la charge de ce diocèse, qu’il soit ordonné par le patriarche de son temps … de Moscou», ou «… la sainte métropole de Kiev sera soumise au … trône patriarchal … de Moscou, c’est-à-dire que le métropolite de Kiev, lorsqu’il y aura besoin, sera ordonné par le … patriarche de Moscou», et cela n’a pas été confirmé comme une prérogative du patriarche de Moscou. Le seul document parvenu en grec stipule que «le patriarche de Moscou … peut avec l’autorisation ordonner le métropolite de Kiev». Les traductions russes ont transformé «l’autorisation» du seul acte conservé en grec en «liberté», et cela probablement aussi dans les autres textes : «nous avons remis la protection de cette métropole au patriarche de Moscou … pour qu’il ait la liberté d’accomplir sans obstacles tout ce qui concerne l’ordination du métropolite», «accepter par lui l’ordination … selon la liberté donnée au trône de Moscou, qui possède notre lettre patriarcale synodale dimissoriale».

On trouve aussi souvent la mention du fait que le métropolite de Kiev doit reconnaître le patriarche de Moscou en tant que «son starets et supérieur» («ὡς γέροντα καὶ προεστῶτα αὐτοῦ»). Plusieurs actes rajoutent «car par lui il a été ordonné». Pour cette raison, le métropolite de Kiev doit commémorer aussi le nom du patriarque de Moscou après le nom du patriarche œcuménique, «ensuite le nom du métropolite de Moscou comme son starets» ou «à cause de l’ordination qu’il reçoit par [le patriarche] de Moscou, et il doit d’après les canon de le commémorer». Le terme «προστάτως», dans les documents ecclésiastiques officiels, n’est utilisé que pour le monachisme (Π. Καρανκόλα, Κλέις ὀρθοδόξων κανονικῶν διατάξεων, Αθήναι, 1979, p. 298-299; Thesaurus Linguae Graecae [http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu], de même «γέρων» (le dernier plutôt au sens du père spirituel). Les textes au sujet de la restitution de la métropole d’Alep à la juridiction du patriarche d’Antioche (1792) utilisent aussi une autre terminologie: «que… la métropole d’Alep à partir de maintenant et pour toujours soit comme auparavant référée et soumise au … trône … d’Antioche, et que les métropoles d’Alep à partir de maintenant soient ordonnées canoniquement par le patriarche d’Antioche actuel et à venir, et le reconnaissent lui seul comme leur patriarche et maître, fidèles et subordonnés à lui comme il se doit … la métropole d’Alep, comme auparavant, sera subordonnée et soumise au … trône … d’Antioche, et le métropolite d’Alep actuel et à venir reconnaitra comme son patriarche et maître celui qui sera le chef patriarchal du très saint trône patriarchal et apostolique d’Antioche, et rendra à celui-ci tout le respect nécessaire et convenable, honneur, obéissance et soumission, comme il faut, comme cela est bon, comme il se doit» (Κ. Δελικάνη, Τὰ ἐν τοῖς κύριοι τοῦ πατριαρχικοῦ ἄρχειοφιλακείου … ἐγγραφα τὰ ἀφορώντα … πρὸς τὰς ἐκκλησίας Ἁλεξανδρείας, Ἀντιοχείας, Ἑροσολύμων καὶ Κύπρου (1575-1863), Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, 1904, p. 218-219 et autres).

Il semble donc qu’il s’agisse uniquement de l’autorisation d’ordonner le métropolite de Kiev et non de la concession complète de la juridiction. Il n’y a aucune mention de la subordination du métropolite au patriarche de Moscou, mais uniquement de sa reconnaissance en tant que «père spirituel» («ὡς γέροντος καὶ προστάτωτος»).
Les lettres confirmant aussi l’autorisation conférée au synode ou plutôt à l’assemblée clérico-laique de la métropole de Kiev d’élire le métropolite, ce qui était une des conditions de cette concession. Dans certains textes, il est mentionné que les privilèges du métropolite de Kiev doivent être préservés, parmi lesquels on trouve aussi le titre de « métropolite de Kiev et toute la Russie » mentionné une fois.

L’autre condition de la concession était la commémoraison en premier lieu du nom du patriarche œcuménique par le métropolite. Un document indique aussi la raison canonique de cela : « afin de préserver l’honneur du trône œcuménique, et pour qu’il n’y ait pas de négligence ni de privation extrême de ses privilèges, nous avons ordonné que dans cette métropole soit chanté le nom patriarcal du patriarche œcuménique en premier … pour les anciens privilèges du trône œcuménique ». Parmi ces privilèges figure aussi la juridiction du trône œcuménique sur la métropole de Kiev. D’après la tradition liturgique et canonique, un prêtre ou un évêque mentionne le nom de son chef canonique direct uniquement, le prêtre celui de son évêque, l’évêque celui de son métropolite, l’archevêque ou le métropolite celui de son patriarche (voir Пантелеймон Родопулос, мтр. Іосифич і Іеромонах, Мелетій B’, Θεσσαλονίκη, 2008, p. 91-95 ; 99-104). Le métropolite de Kiev doit alors commémorer le patriarche œcuménique en premier, puisque c’est lui qui est son patriarche canonique. En outre, un document parle de futurs contacts des chrétiens d’Ukraine avec la Grande Église du Christ.

Un des documents contient une clause interdisant toute transformation et résistance contre la décision prise. Les références à d’autres documents se trouvent dans les trois premiers textes du mois de mai : « … émission d’une lettre aux [chrétiens] soumis à la métropole … «, « Par lettres sigillées nous avons confirmé synodalement », « … pour que soit émise la lettre dimissoriale », « À ce propos des lettres patriarciales et synodales furent émises, et ont été enregistrées dans le codex de la Grande Église ». Cependant aucun acte synodal datant du mois de mai n’est connu ; en effet tous les textes synodaux sont de juin, sans mention d’un quelconque sceau dans leurs traductions. En outre, la lettre de Denis après son patriarcat ne parle que de « Lettres patriarciales et confirmatives ». Aucun de ces documents n’a été sauvegardé « dans le codex sacré », ou registre du patriarcat.

La durée de cette situation n’est mentionnée que vaguement sans qu’il soit dit que cela ait été fait « pour l’éternité », ou toute autre formule similaire.

**Conclusions**

Le seul texte sauvegardé en grec dit que « le … patriarche de Moscou … actuel et à venir a la permission d’ordonner celui-ci » (« ἔχει ἀδείαν ὁ κατὰ καιροὺς … Πατριάρχης Μοσχοβίας … χειροτονεῖν τοῦτον »). Il rappelle la procédure consistant à « ordonner sur autorisation » (« ἐπ’ ἀδείας χειροτονεῖν »). En outre, il est signalé au sujet des évêques, du clergé et des dirigeants de la métropole de Kiev qu’« ils auront la permission quand il y aura besoin … d’élire celui qu’ils veulent » (« ἔχειν τούτων ἀδείαν ἡνίκα ἐμπίπτῃ χρεία … ἐκλέγειν οὗτοι ὄντινα βούλωνται »). Bien que la traduction russe du même acte, comme aussi les textes parvenus uniquement en traduction, parlent de la liberté d’ordonner et d’élire, il ne s’agit donc que d’autorisation et aucunement d’un droit ou d’une prérogative.

Tous les documents annoncent les trois conditions sous lesquelles a été faite cette concession : 1) élection du métropolite par les évêques, le clergé et les notables avec la permission et l’ordre du hetman 2) la commémoraison conjointe à la fois du patriarche œcuménique et de celui de Moscou.
(le premier à cause de ses privilèges, c'est-à-dire la primauté d'honneur et sa juridiction sur la métropole de Kiev et de toute la Russie, et le second à cause de l'ordination du métropolite par le patriarche de Moscou) 3) la préservation de tous les privilèges du métropolite de Kiev.

Un seul texte prévoit que le métropolite de Kiev sera soumis au tribunal du patriarche de Moscou.

La durée de cette concession n'est pas mentionnée du tout, il est seulement noté: «et les Patriarches après celui-ci» auront cette autorisation, sans que soit ajoutée «tous», ou qu'il soit précisé que cet état est permanent et définitif, comme il est indiqué systématiquement dans les actes patriarcaux.

Apparemment aucun rattachement ou changement de juridiction de la métropole (chose interdite par les canons) n'a été accordé au patriarche de Moscou, mais seulement l'autorisation de procéder à l'ordination du métropolite. Cela n'a été fait que pour des raisons d'ordre pastoral et à cause de la situation politique dans la région. Cette autorisation a été donnée à titre de délégation, comme à un exarque, et pour l'administration seulement. C'est, probablement, pour cette raison que le patriarche Denis, après avoir quitté le siège patriarcal, appelle le patriarche de Moscou «exarque». Le statut canonique de la métropole de Kiev se rapprocherait de celui des diocèses des «nouveaux territoires» (Νέων Χωρῶν) en Grèce (Voir K. Βαβοῦκος, Ἡ νομοκανονικὴ ύπόστασις τῶν μητροπόλεων τῶν Νέων Χωρῶν, Θεσσαλονίκη, 1973, p. 9-11 note 1), à la différence que la métropole de Kiev ne devait pas être intégrée dans le système administratif de l'Église de Russie. Bien que le maintien des droits canoniques du trône œcuménique sur la métropole ne soit pas formulé de manière explicite, les textes ne les abolissent pas.

Aucun des termes de cette concession n'a été respecté par l'Église de Russie : l'élection du métropolite est passée entre les mains du synode de Russie, la commémoraison du patriarche œcuménique a cessé, et les privilèges du métropolite ont été supprimés, et de même la métropole a cessé d'exister comme unité ecclésiastique.

Comme on le décèle dans la lettre de Denis après son éviction du patriarcat, cette concession a été remise en question par le trône œcuménique déjà en 1688 ou plus tôt.

Il faut aussi rappeler que la métropole d'Alep qui fut rattachée en 1757 au trône œcuménique à cause des difficultés d'administration par le patriarche d'Antioche, fut retournée par la suite à son propre patriarche; un des documents sur le sujet stipule: «Le fait de prendre en charge et d'aider par ses propres forces en cas de besoin les autres très saints trônes patriarcaux et apostoliques, notre ... trône ... œcuménique le considère depuis les temps anciens comme tout à fait convenable, mais le fait de s'approprier leurs droits et de l'emporter sur eux en les lésant, cela, non seulement le faire, mais aussi l'écouter n'est pas tolérable. Car le premier est juste et digne de lui-même, l'autre au contraire, est injuste et inconvenable pour la dignité patriarcale» («Τὸ ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι μὲν καὶ έκ τῶν ἐνόντων βοηθεῖν πρὸς τὰς χρείας καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἁγιωτάτοις Πατριαρχικοῖς καὶ Ἀποστολικοῖς Θρόνοις, πάνυ προσήκον ἐκ παλαιοῦ ἣγείται ο καθ’ ἡμᾶς οὔτως ... Οἰκουμενικὸς Θρόνος, ἀφαιρεῖσθαι γε μὴν ἐκέινω τὰ δίκαια καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν ἀδίκοιντα, οὐχ ὅπως πράττειν, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἀκούειν ἀνέχεται. Ἐκεῖνο μὲν γὰρ δίκαιον καὶ ἄξον ἐαυτοῦ, τοῦτο δὲ τουναντίον ἄξιον τε καὶ ἀπρεπὲς τῷ Πατριαρχικῷ ἀξιῶματι». K. Δελικάνη, Τὰ ἐν τοῖς καθεξί, op. cit, p. 217).
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Introduction

Funerary practices for the deposition of the corpse and the remembrance of the dead were significant both for the deceased and for those who survived them. For deceased Christians, mortuary practices saw to the disposition of their physical remains in a manner that was deemed beneficial for the salvation of their soul, while also mediating the installation of the newly dead among the already departed brothers and sisters within the larger, unified body of the Church, where they could benefit from the prayers of the living and, at the same time, intercede to God on their behalf. Not least, mortuary practices ensured for the deceased, whether as individuals or as members of larger familial or other social groupings, a form of continued presence among the quick through memory and commemoration. Burial and memorial rituals performed within specific spatiotemporal contexts, the location and the material culture associated with the tomb, as well as words, inscribed or recited, all served as mnemonic strategies for constructing the identity of the deceased to be perpetuated among the living, according to deceased’s own desires, but also in agreement to the needs and interests of the living keepers of his/her memory. For the living, mortuary practices were a means to deal with the trauma caused by death and to re-negotiate (either to reaffirm or challenge) the social relationships that had been thus disrupted, by referencing shared values, hopes, and beliefs rooted in tradition. Such practices also helped the living to articulate and maintain links with the dead through memory, links that anchored the present in the past and could be employed to make current statements about individual and communal identity and status.

The contributions to the present Round Table discuss a number of issues related to funerary practices and rites in Byzantium and its periphery, as well as the art and the archaeology of the tomb both within the church building and beyond. Within the broader framework outlined above, of special interest is the enquiry into the ways in which rituals, material culture, and art contributed to the creation and preservation of the memory of the deceased, but also of the collective memory of the social group/community to which he/she belonged as an element of communal identity.
Strategies for Commemoration and for the Evocation of Presence in the Burials and Portraits of Monastic Fathers of Late Antique Egypt

The plain language of monastic hagiography masks lessons for the guidance of ascetics and others who seek to live virtuous lives. Much as the written lessons that were crafted from the lives and sayings of desert fathers continue to unfold their meanings for subsequent generations of the devout, who meditate upon them throughout their lives, so, too, did the proliferation of painted portraits during the sixth century in the monasteries of Egypt. Characterizing aspects of these commemorative portraits—poses, clothing, and other attributes—resonate with late antique monastic burials. This project addresses evidence for the intertwining of monastic rituals that accompanied the dying and the preparation of the dead for burial with pictorial representation of fathers among the tabernacles of the saints: they constituted complementary strategies for the deceased fathers’ ongoing commemoration and effective presence within the monastic community. The convergence of textual, archaeological, and pictorial evidence for the monastery of Apa Apollo at Bawit near Hermopolis in Middle Egypt provides a useful focus for this investigation.

The ritualized death of monks and monastic elders

In The Life of Phib, which also contains the outlines of the life of his close colleague, Apa Apollo, are brief accounts of, first, the death and burial of Apa Phib and, later, of a good monk, the young and sweet Zachary (Tim Vivian, “Monks, Middle Egypt, and Metanoia: The Life of Phib by Papohe the Steward (Translation and Introduction),” Journal of Early Christian Studies 7, 4 (1999): 547-571). Upon Phib’s death the angels held a vigil for him, singing and dancing over his body throughout the night, announcing that this place, this mountain, was to be the dwelling place of the righteous, and Apollo was to be the father of these righteous men. The community quickly began to grow and a little church was built over Phib’s burial, where the brothers held the morning synaxis before breaking their fast. Apa Apollo soon learned from conversations with Christ himself that this small church would not accommodate the great throngs who would come to his monastery, so Apollo had a larger church built following Christ’s instructions. On the first anniversary of Phib’s death, Apollo gathered together all the brothers from their abodes for a great synaxis, an agape-feast in honor of Phib. This story may be read as a microcosmic history of the shaping of this semi-coenobitic community during the later fourth century, and of the proliferation of small cemeteries and architectural complexes, each with its own assembly room that might also serve for the celebration of the Eucharist as well as other sacraments and feasts.

The story continues: the next morning after the agape, young Zachary died and his body was taken to the church (which one, small or large, is not clear), where two brothers attended him until the time of his funeral at the sixth hour. The more detailed description of the rituals carried out during Zachary’s funeral are integral to the explanation of the establishment of an annual ritual of
repentance. All were gathered in sight of Zachary’s body when Apollo announced that those who
repented on that day would have their sins forgiven. Not all the monks believed Apollo, however the
deceased Zachary supplied proof. He sat up so that the burial cloths that had been wrapped around
him fell away. Then, he walked around and spoke, affirming Apollo’s words. When he lay down and
went again to his long sleep, the cloths wrapped around him again. This miracle may be read as well
as an interpretive sketch of monastic funeral ritual: monks acted as angels during the funeral vigil
and the entire community gathered for the funeral service where the body was displayed.

This ritual pattern is discernible with minor variations from the earliest monastic hagiographies,
including the Lives of the famed Antony, Pachomius, and Shenoute, from which additional elements
of funerary rituals may be culled. During the vigil, the body was prepared for burial (laid out,
washed, dressed, wrapped) to the accompaniment of psalms and prayers. At some point, the body
was brought to the place of synaxis, where, in the morning, the funeral service began. The recitation
of psalms continued as the body was taken in procession to the place of burial, sometimes called “the
mountain.” The Eucharist was celebrated at the synaxis or burial, and the monk’s soul commended
to God. More elaborate versions of these rituals were performed upon the death of monastic fathers.
In accounts of their passing, the time of death is known in advance (if revealed by prophecy) or
estimated (when based on the signs of advancing illness) so that those closest to the dying father
or even all of the monastic community could be gathered together in time to receive the father’s
final teaching and last wishes, and to assist the father’s passage from this world into the bosom of
the saints who had gone before him (on the development of liturgical rituals, see Elena Velkovska,
21-51). A saintly father was honored on the anniversary of his death in accordance with the entry
in the monastery’s synaxarium.

Of particular importance for considerations of ongoing interactions with absent fathers are
descriptions of the expectant physical acts of the dying and interactions of the dying with those in
attendance. Antony’s disciples kissed him just before, at the moment of passing, he lifted up his feet
as one might do at the arrival of friends (Athanasius of Alexandria, The Life of Antony. The Coptic
Life and the Greek Life, translated by Tim Vivian and Apostolos N. Athanassakis, with Rowan A
Greer, 2003). Pachomius died immediately after signing himself with the sign of the cross; then,
those attending kissed him; Theodore, one of Pachomius’s successors, closed his eyes. Upon the
moment of his own death, Theodore opened his mouth to give up his spirit (Armand Veilleux,
Pachomian Koinonia. The Lives, Rules, and Other Writings of Saint Pachomius and his Disciples
vol. 1, 1983). Each of these vignettes suggests communication between the worlds of the living and the
saintly dead through the medium of the body, although the nature of what is communicated differs:
Antony saw the saints he would join, Pachomius received his disciples’ kisses, Theodore sent his
soul from here to there. The character of the elder and his passing might be expressed not only in
his hagiography and synaxarium entry, but also through the preparation of his body for burial.

Archaeological evidence for the preparation of the monastic dead for burial

Recent publication of the excavators’ unpublished notes and photographs has introduced
information about burials at the monastery (Dominique Bénazeth and Marie-Hélène Rutschowscaya,
Jean Clédat, Le monastère et la nécropole de Baouit, IFAO Caire, Mémoires 111, 1999). The “nécropole
désertique,” located between the wall of the monastery and the desert escarpment contained a
simple type of pit grave that was used for men, women, and children, and a single example of a one-room mud-brick chapel over two subterranean chambers. In the farther underground chamber were found three bodies placed next to each other on the pavement and covered by a single white shroud. A photograph shows the right hand from one of these bodies posed in what the excavators described as a gesture of benediction: the index finger pointing, the thumb holding down the other fingers: those in attendance at the father’s passing may have helped him sustain the gesture; and, the father’s surviving colleagues and disciples would have had much to gain from the perpetuity of such a posed gesture for its indication of continued work on their behalf. The rest of the body, clothing, and shroud were not described in the published notes. The second, larger chamber was identified as serving for the preparation of the bodies before their interment. Another body found in the desert cemetery was enshrouded with bundles protecting the head and feet. A cane or staff was buried with one of the bodies in the “nécropole méridionale.” In “la nécropole sur la montagne” was a small rock-cut tomb with traces of wall paintings representing haloed figures identified by painted inscriptions: here, burials, chapel, and painted portraits were combined.

One striking comparison comes from the excavation of the fourth- to sixth-century settlement at Kom el-Ahmar, in Middle Egypt (Béatrice Huber, “The Textiles of an Early Christian Burial from Kom el-Ahmar/Sharuna, Middle Egypt,” in Caecilia Fluck and Antoine de Moor, eds., Methods of Dating Ancient Textiles from the First Millennium AD from Egypt and Neighboring Countries, 2007, 36-69). A group of late antique burials for a small semi-eremitical community near the town was associated with a complex combining an assembly room, chapel, and larger church, however because the burials include men, women, and children, the cemetery has been identified as serving a secular community. The burial of a man of forty to sixty years of age stands out due in part to preparations corresponding to other monastic burials. A finely woven mat had been placed over the upper body and the head that had been meticulously wrapped in three layers of cloth and criss-crossing tapes, further protected by a padded bundle of several elements: textile scraps, palm fibers, and palm ribs. Additional padding for the head was provided by a sleeveless tunic and other textile fragments. The torso and the textiles that had wrapped the body were so poorly preserved that they fell apart as soon as the mat was removed, yet the excavators were able to determine that the body had been dressed in a fine, decorated tunic and wrapped in layers of shrouds. Like many other better-preserved bodies, this one had been padded in several places and braced by palm ribs. Wrapping, it was determined, took place as rigor mortis set in. The body was laid on his back, posed as if standing upright, with his right arm lengthwise along the body and the left arm crossed over the chest so that the hand rested near the chin. The body had been positioned with the head to the west and feet to the east so that if it were to stand, it would face the east.

Several burial features, including orientation, straightened limbs, and the covering and protection of the head, have been found in monastic and secular burials elsewhere in late antique Egypt. At the Monastery of Epiphanius, the bodies of monks were tied at the feet, hands, and head, to create form (upright?) figures, before they were wrapped in multiple layers of shrouds, then tied with criss-crossing tapes (Herbert E.Winlock, Hugh G. Evelyn White, and Walter E. Crum, The Monastery of Epiphanius at Thebes, 1926). Similar to the burial at Kom el-Ahmar were three well-preserved burials in which the head (and upper body) had been covered by items of personal use apparently selected to correspond to noteworthy aspects of each monk’s virtuous ascetic life: mats, apron and belt, sack and apron.
Hagiography suggests that the careful posing of the corpses at Apollo’s monastery at Bawit and elsewhere reflected the character of the monk at the moment of his death. From the *History of the Monks of Egypt*, an account of the pilgrimage of monks from Palestine to the Desert Fathers of Egypt, come the following two illustrative examples (*The Lives of the Desert Fathers: The Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*, Norman Russell, transl., Benedicta Ward, SLG, intro., Cistercian Studies Series 34, 1981). The first chapter is devoted to the pilgrims’ extended consultation with John of Lycopolis, in Upper Egypt, who taught the pilgrims a number of lessons—about vision and memory, among other topics—and encouraged them to strive continually for virtue by imitating the fathers. After the end of their visit, the pilgrims learned that John had prophesied his own death, then choreographed his passing “in a wonderful manner,” praying on his knees. The posture of his body at the moment of death not only appropriately reflected the power of his life of prayer, but also looked forward to his existence after death. This final act, like all the actions undertaken during his life, prepared his resurrection body. This shaping of the living and the resurrection body finds echoes in, for example, the body of the unnamed monk discovered kneeling in prayer at the beginning of *The History of the Monks of Upper Egypt*, and the account of the *Life of Daniel the Stylite*, in the *chora* of Constantinople, which describes the creaking of his bones as his body was straightened in preparation for burial (Tim Vivian, ed. and transl., *Histories of the Monks of Upper Egypt and The Life of Onuphrius with a Discourse on Saint Onuphrius by Pisentius of Coptos*, Cistercian Studies Series 140, 1993); and *Three Byzantine Saints: Contemporary Biographies of St. Daniel the Stylite, St. Theodore of Sykeon and St. John the Almsgiver*, Elizabeth Dawes, trans., and Norman H. Baynes, intro. and notes, 1948).

*The portraits: characteristic poses and possessions as attributes*

Although memory of an elders’ physical actions and interactions of life and passing were commemorated in his hagiography and *synaxarium* entry, and in the preparation of his body for burial, visual memory of telling poses, indicative gestures, and possessions characteristic of his virtues would fade, if not for his portraits. The texts and archaeological evidence cited above may be compared productively to painted portraits as demonstrated here with representative painted portraits of Apollo from his monastery and from the Monastery of Apa Jeremiah at Saqqara, which employ two main compositional types: Apollo is shown seated with his colleagues Anoup and Phib or standing among other saints (as may be found in, e.g., Dominique Bénazeth, Rutschowscaya, and Clédat (1999) as cited above; Paul van Moorsel and Mathilde Huijbers, “Repertory of the Preserved Wall Paintings from the Monastery of Apa Jeremiah at Saqqara,” *Acta ad Archaeologiam et Artium Pertinentia* 9 (1981): 125-186 and, in the same publication, Marguerite Rassart-Debergh, “La decoration picturale du monastère de Saqqara. Essai de reconstitution,” 9-123).

The extended compositions of both portrait types place Apollo among gatherings of saints, each of whom is distinguished by facial features and identified by painted inscriptions, and shown to be holy and deceased by their round (rather than square) halos. The designated setting was shown, by the majestic images in central niches of Christ enthroned in cosmic glory, to be beyond earthly time and space among the tabernacles of the saints in the court of heaven. Prayers of individual local monks, monastic and secular pilgrims inscribed on the walls ask the fathers, saints, angels, Mary, and Christ to watch over them and pray on their behalf. Prayers written in the voices of monastic elders beseech the saints to watch over them and their spiritual children and to lead them to good ends.
Apollo was represented in his portraits wearing luxurious clothing of ancient style (long tunic and large mantle), establishing both his descent from scriptural figures of the distant past and his spiritual authority. All those portrayed similarly were understood to be precursors to more recent generations of monks and mediators. *The History of the Monks of Egypt* begins with this instructive idea:

*Therefore, if God wills, I shall begin this account with a description of the way of life of the holy and great fathers, and show that even in these times the Savior performs through them what he performed through the prophets and apostles. For the same Lord now and always works all things in all men.* (Prologue, 13).

Both the literary and pictorial portraits emphasize resemblance across testamental eras (as well as the more recent era of the martyrs). In the painted portraits, Apollo—like the other fathers—holds and points to a book (in one instance, however, he stands with arms raised in prayer), facing the viewer and fixing his gaze on him. Groups of similarly dressed and posed figures present chains of mirroring images, articulating an overarching message of community membership that extends back through the generations now gathered together in heaven, watching those on earth. Their postures and gestures can be seen to reflect ongoing acts of communication and mediation. In their use of scriptural exemplars, the painted portraits are like the paradigmatic models for *mimesis* of hagiography (Georgia Frank, *The Memory of the Eyes: Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Antiquity*, 2000; Derek Krueger, “The Old Testament and Monasticism,” in Paul Magdalino and Robert Nelson, eds., *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, 2010, 199-221). Striving monks still saw layered temporalities of fathers, prophets, and apostles in their own time as urgent reminders to *mimesis* and as confirmation that life in the body provided suitable material for the performance of God’s work and for the building of the resurrection body (Thelma K. Thomas, “Mimetic Devotion and Dress in Some Monastic Portraits from the Monastery of Apa Apollo at Bawit,” *Coptica* 11 (2012): 37-79).
Mémoire sociale et modèles de deuil dans le Discours 15 de Grégoire de Nazianze sur les martyrs Maccabées

Le Discours 15 de Grégoire de Nazianze (PG 35, 912-933) est entièrement consacré à l'éloge des héros juifs appelés martyrs Maccabées dans la tradition chrétienne dont la mort est présentée au Deuxième livre des Maccabées. Ce récit relate la mort héroïque d'Eléazar (2 Mac 6, 18-31) suivie de celle de sept fils anonymes et leur mère (2 Mac 7), persécutés sous Antiochus IV Epiphane pour avoir refusé de se soumettre aux sacrifices païens par fidélité à la religion de leurs pères. Ce récit initial a reçu une amplification rhétorique remarquable dans le Quatrième livre des Maccabées, écrit du judaïsme hellénistique principalement consacré à l'éloge de ces personnages, dont Grégoire recommande la lecture au début de son discours. Les livres des Maccabées figurent dans trois des plus importants manuscrits de la Bible grecque, le Sinaïticus, daté du IVe siècle, qui présente le texte de 1 et 4 Mac ainsi que dans l’Alexandrinus et le Basiliano Venetus, tous deux du Ve siècle, qui offrent le texte des quatre livres. Les Maccabées sont cités dès le début de la littérature martyrologique chrétienne comme des exemples achevés de courage et de foi dans l’épreuve du martyre.

Au IVe siècle, le processus d’intégration de ces héros juifs parmi les saints martyrs de l’Eglise est à l’oeuvre. La vénération de leur tombe à Antioche, où a pu être bâtie une synagogue puis une église, a sans doute favorisé le développement de leur culte et la mise en place d’une panégyrie comparable à celles qui furent consacrées aux autres martyrs de l’Eglise. Le Discours 15 de Grégoire de Nazianze est le premier discours panégyrique connu qui leur soit consacré. Prononcé le jour anniversaire de leur fête, le 2 août, il se place en toute vraisemblance l’année 362, sous la persécution de Julien l’Apostat, personnage auquel ferait allusion Grégoire au travers de la dénonciation du persécuteur Antiochus IV Epiphane.

A cette époque, le genre épideictique s’est répandu chez les grands orateurs chrétiens et régit aussi bien les règles de composition des oraisons funèbres de personnes proches, famille ou amis, que celles des panégyriques de martyrs ou de saints. Le panégyrique de martyrs s’apparente de près à l’oraison funèbre dans la mesure où les éloges de martyrs étaient, à l’origine, prononcés le jour anniversaire de leur mort. En effet, le panégyrique se fond à merveille dans le moule de l’éloge funèbre avec lequel il partage tout naturellement le topos de la mort, même s’il puise également aux autres formes du discours épideictique, comme les discours de fêtes où la cité était louée, lors des organisations de jeux par exemple. Le panégyrique de martyr se présente ainsi comme une branche spécifique du genre épideictique, au point de rencontre de l’oraison funèbre et du discours panégyrique profane : il est le discours de la fête donnée à l’occasion de la commémoration de la mort des martyrs, mort considérée comme une victoire digne d’être célébrée par toute la cité.

1. Proximité de l’éloge de martyr et de l’oraison funèbre

La proximité du genre de l’éloge de martyr avec l’oraison funèbre est tout particulièrement palpable dans le Discours 15. Après un exorde assez long sur la légitimité qu’il y a pour l’Eglise
à fêter des martyrs juifs, Grégoire confie le discours aux martyrs eux-mêmes à qui il prête des éthopées. Cette figure de pensée qui consiste pour l'auteur à donner la parole à un autre locuteur à l'intérieur d'un discours oratoire est très représentative du style épidictique, dont elle constitue l'une des particularités les plus remarquables, Grégoire systématisant ici son emploi. Le fait de déléguer aux martyrs eux-mêmes la plus grande partie de la fonction épidictique est lui-même emprunté au modèle que cite Grégoire dans l'exorde, à savoir le Quatrième livre des Maccabées qui insère tout au long de l'éloge des martyrs de nombreux discours attribués au tyran, à Éléazar, aux frères en tant que groupe et à la Mère.

Nous sommes donc face à un seul discours tissé de plusieurs discours, où la polyphonie domine selon des thèmes distribués aux différents protagonistes du martyr. Il s'agit d'un procédé classique où l'orateur confie l'exhortation à un locuteur plus persuasif qu'il ne l'est lui-même, procédé renforcé ici par le rôle central de la parole dans le martyr chrétien, faisant de l'éthopée non plus un artifice rhétorique de plus, mais la reproduction elle-même de la situation vécue par le saint professant sa foi au milieu des tortures, dans un effet dramatique qui renforce le pathétique. Ce moment de rassemblement de la communauté autour des martyrs est donc l'occasion d'une parénèse spécifique, dont nous retiendrons ici deux enjeux. Le premier porte sur l'évocation de la grandeur de l'Histoire juive comme d'un passé devant être approprié par l'auditoire chrétien. Le second avance la nécessité d'abandonner les rituels de deuils antiques et de les renouveler par une attitude de joie et de foi.

2. Les éthopées des frères ou la convocation d'une mémoire collective centrée sur l'exaltation de l'histoire juive

D'embrée, les Maccabées sont présentés comme juifs et devant être loués en tant que tels par l'auditoire, malgré sa réticence. « Mais pourquoi les Maccabées ? Car c'est leur fête aujourd'hui ! Si bien peu de gens les honorent sous prétexte que leur lutte n'a pas eu lieu après le Christ, ils sont pourtant dignes d'être honorés de tous parce que leur endurance s'est exercée pour la défense des institutions de leurs pères », proclame Grégoire en ouverture de son prêche (912, 14). En évoquant ces institutions patriarcales, Grégoire replace d'embrée la mort des martyrs dans leur contexte historique d'origine. Les deux éthopées (920, 8 - 921, 40 et 924, 8-40) que prononcent les frères dans la suite du discours développent l'éloge de l'histoire biblique à laquelle ils appartiennent. Ils se présentent en tant qu'héritiers du peuple juif, dans un tableau de l'histoire juive grandiose, dont ils résument les principaux moments en ces termes : « Pour nous, ô Antiochus et vous tous qui l'entourez, il n'est qu'un seul roi, Dieu, par qui nous sommes nés et vers qui nous retournerons. Il n'est aussi qu'un seul législateur, Moïse, que nous ne trahirons ni n'outragérons, nous le jurons par les dangers que cet homme a bravés pour la vertu et par ses nombreux miracles, fussions-nous menacés par un autre Antiochus, plus terrible que toi. Il n'est qu'une assurance, l'observance des commandements, la conservation intacte de la Loi qui fait notre rempart (...) Nous sommes la race et les disciples de ceux que guidait une colonne de feu et de nuée, pour qui la mer se fendait, le fleuve s'arrêtait, le soleil retenait sa course, le pain pleuvait, les mains levées mettaient en fuite une foule innombrable, en la rejetant par des prières; eux qui triomphaient des bêtes sauvages, eux que le feu ne touchait pas et devant qui les rois se retraitaient pleins d'admiration pour leur noblesse. Rappelle-toi encore une chose : nous sommes les initiés d'Éléazar dont tu connais le courage. »

Les frères consacrent alors un éloge à leur patrie, la ville terrestre de Jérusalem, exaltée comme la ville nourricière, le lieu du Temple, mais également le lieu de l'ensevelissement et de la perpétuation de la mémoire des héros morts pour elle. Les frères apostrophent la ville sainte en
tant que patrie destinée à recevoir leurs corps : « Jérusalem, ensevelis magnifiquement tes morts », déclarent-ils en formant le vœu que leur martyre y sera célèbre et leur tombe montrée en mémorial, le rôle de l'épitaphe comme gardienne du souvenir des morts étant déjà évoqué dans 4 Maccabées.

Cette louange du peuple juif, de son histoire et de sa ville sainte, tout à fait unique dans la patristique grecque de cette époque, est donnée à adopter à l'auditoire en tant que telle. Certes Grégoire cède dans l'exorde à l'argument selon lequel les Maccabées auraient été encore plus courageux s'ils avaient connu le Christ. Mais à la différence de ce que fait Jean Chrysostome dans ses homélies consacrées aux Maccabées (PG 50, 617-622 et 623-626), où le mérite des martyrs est entièrement centré sur la connaissance qu'ils avaient eue avant l'heure du Christ, Grégoire abandonne cet argument aussitôt avancé pour se consacrer à des choix oratoires visant à l'éloge des Maccabées en tant que juifs pieux plutôt qu'en promartysrs chrétiens.

3. Les éthopées de la Mère : la substitution d'un modèle de deuil antique par un modèle de deuil saint

Deux discours sont ensuite attribués à la Mère, un discours d'exhortations à ses fils (925, 22-31) suivi d'un discours d'action de grâces, spécifiquement qualifié d'oraison funèbre (925, 36-929, 7). Grégoire y campe une mère atypique, capable de vouloir la mort de ses fils et de s'en réjouir, dans la lignée des récits-sources de 2 Maccabées et 4 Maccabées. Selon cette logique paradoxaux, on trouve dans ce second discours le contre-pied des paroles de deuil normalement attendues dans la bouche d'une mère. L'attitude conventionnelle antique aurait en effet voulu que la mère retienne ses enfants pour subvenir à sa subsistance. La mère des Maccabées, sans se soucier de son de sa vieillesse, rejette au contraire les gémissements et les lamentations, réservés « aux mères de chair » dont les enfants sont morts sans gloire. « Je n'arracherai pas ma chevelure, je ne déchirerai pas ma tunique, je ne déchirerai pas mes chairs avec mes ongles, je n'entremerai pas un chant funèbre, je n'appellerai pas les pleureuses, je ne m'ennemerai pas dans les ténèbres, afin que l'air pleure aussi avec moi, je n'attendrai pas de consolateurs, je ne placerai pas à mes côtés un pain de deuil, car ces pratiques sont celles des mères sans noblesse, qui sont mères seulement selon la chair, et dont les enfants sont morts sans inspirer de vénérable récit. Mais vous n'êtes pas morts pour moi, ô plus chers des enfants, vous n'avez pas été arrachés, mais vous avez été rassemblés », proclame-t-elle, faisant référence au rituel antique du deuil, commun aux pourtours de la Méditerranée orientale (928, 11-20).

Comme ses fils avant elle, la Mère ne craint qu'une chose, qu'ils ne souffrent pas (916, 23) ou que « les bourreaux se lassent » (925, 11). La peur de l'apostasie ou de l'interruption brutale du martyre par le fait du tyran hantent en effet les martyrs comme l'événement qui leur ôterait la récompense (917, 2-3; 924, 9-11). « La funeste victoire » qu'ils pourraient rencontrer serait « celle de ne pas souffrir », c'est-à-dire d'échapper au martyre (916, 18-19). L'amour de la mère pour ses fils ne la conduit donc pas à espérer leur préservation, mais à souhaiter leur mort. Le discours cumule en des terms hyperboliques exprimant sa joie : « Mais les événements d'à présent sont bénéédiction, joie, gloire, chœurs, gaiété pour ceux qui restent sur cette terre. Car moi, je répands des libations pour vous » (928, 30-32). Chez Chrysostome, elle n'est soulagée qu'une fois l'ensemble de ses enfants morts (PG 50, 622, 29-35).

En prétendant à une mère des paroles de joie face à la mort de ses fils, Grégoire rompt avec la tradition oratoire établie, incarnée par l'éthopée de Niobé pleurant la mort de ses enfants, topos des oraisons funèbres et des exercices de rhétorique tels les Progymnasmata d’Aphtonius ou de Libanios.
L’éthopée habituelle de Niobé décrit le basculement définitif d’une vie heureuse dans un malheur sans retour, là où le discours de la Mère des Maccabées met en avant la promesse d’une bénédiction éternelle dans l’épreuve présente.

L’orateur substitue à la référence païenne implicite de Niobé, reconnaissable par tous car faisant partie du fond mémoriel commun, une citation des Lamentations de Jérémie, faisant référence à un discours funèbre non de pleurs mais de louange (928, 38-42). L’auteur des Lamentations, composées vraisemblablement après la ruine de Jérusalem en 587, s’adresse en effet au genre de la complainte funèbre, tout en conservant une confiance en Dieu inébranlable. C’est pourquoi Grégoire peut prétendre que les paroles du prophète Jérémie s’imposent comme un modèle d’oraison funèbre « ne déplorant pas mais bénissant une fin sainte ». La Mère peut appliquer alors la louange des fils de Jérusalem de Lam. 4, 7 à ses propres fils : « Vous avez brillé plus que neige, vous avez caillé plus blanc que lait, votre troupe est plus étincelante que la pierre de saphir ». L’action de grâces prend la place de la déploration, démontrant l’originalité radicale d’une attitude nouvelle présente dans la Bible, avant même d’être chrétienne. En faisant référence à ce livre, Grégoire propose non seulement une attitude nouvelle face à la mort, mais également un modèle rhétorique issu d’un corpus différent du fond profane. La nouvelle attitude de deuil proposée est ainsi renouvelée jusque dans les paroles qui doivent être prononcées en oraison funèbre.

Au travers de l’éloge des Maccabées, discours de circonstance réservé à la mémoire de la mort des martyrs, Grégoire propose ainsi à la communauté chrétienne à laquelle il s’adresse deux nouveaux modèles à intégrer. D’une part, le judaïsme est présenté à l’auditoire réticent comme une histoire et une religion fondées sur le respect de la Loi louables en tant que telles, sans qu’il soit nécessaire de passer par des interprétations métaphoriques, allégoriques ou typologiques du texte biblique. En fêtant ces martyrs juifs en tant que juifs, Grégoire invite son auditoire chrétien et grec à s’approprier et à célébrer ce passé constitutif d’une autre histoire, celle de l’histoire juive, berceau d’un judaïsme dont découle le christianisme. D’autre part, le modèle de la Mère des Maccabées permet de proposer un nouveau rituel de deuil, basée sur la joie dans l’épreuve de la mort, modèle lui-même déjà présent dans les Lamentations de Jérémie. Par ces deux thèmes, Grégoire propose donc une histoire et des rituels collectifs échappant aux modèles dominants issus du fond gréco-romain pour faire du judaïsme, et de ces héros juifs en particulier, des modèles à part entière à intégrer dans la mémoire sociale.

L’iconographie de la Mère des Maccabées à l’époque médiévale :
un modèle extrême de foi en la résurrection

Les martyrs Maccabées devaient de fait devenir des saints à part entière dans l’Antiquité tardive et le Moyen-Âge, en particulier dans le monde chrétien oriental. La vallée de la Qadisha au Liban présente ainsi un groupe de trois lieux saints rupestres des XIIe-XIIe siècles proches du village d’Hadschit où figurent des peintures murales représentant la Mère des Maccabées avec son septième fils. Il s’agit de la chapelle de Mart Schmouné (nom syriaque de la Mère des Maccabées), du monastère de Sayyidat ad-Darr (« Notre-Dame-du-lait-abondant ») et de Deir es-Salib (le « monastère de la Croix »).

A Mart Shmouné, où les fresques n’existent plus mais sont connues par des photographies d’E. Cruikshank Dodd, la Mère des Maccabées était figurée non loin d’une Anastasis, où était peint en particulier un remarquable portrait d’Eve, dans un contexte de chapelle funéraire. Dans l’ensemble
de la tradition chrétienne, cette mère paradoxale souhaitant ardemment la mort de ses fils sous les tortures les plus atroces était devenue un modèle de foi dans la résurrection, croyance déjà affirmée dans le récit-source de 2 Maccabées. Les frères affirment à plusieurs reprises leur foi dans une résurrection (2 M 7, v. 9, 11, 14, 23, 36), profession de foi que reprend la mère en s'adressant à son dernier fils, avec lequel elle entretient un lien privilégié amplement repris dans la tradition textuelle postérieure : « Je t'en conjure mon enfant, regarde le ciel et la terre et vois tout ce qui est en eux, et sache que Dieu les a faits de rien et que la race des hommes est faite de la même manière. Ne crains pas ce bourreau, mais, te montrant digne de tes frères, accepte la mort, afin que je te retrouve avec eux dans la miséricorde » (2 M 7, 29). Ce lien privilégié avec le septième fils est sans doute à l'origine de l'individuation iconographique que forme ce couple par rapport au reste des frères, constatée dans la Qadisha mais également déjà visible dans des manuscrits médiévaux des Seize discours liturgiques de Grégoire de Nazianze étudiés par G. Galavaris en 1969. La figuration de ces deux personnages en couple autonome se retrouve ainsi dans trois enluminures appartenant respectivement au codex 146, fol. 40v, du Musée historique de Moscou (XIe siècle), au codex Cl6, fol. 29r (XIe siècle) de la Bibliothèque universitaire de Turin et au codex graecus 339 du Sinaï, fol. 381v (XIIe siècle). Sur chacune d'elle, la Mère semble avoir précipité elle-même dans le brasier son enfant figuré au milieu des flammes, par ses mains tendues en avant. La tradition textuelle, cette fois-ci chrysostomienne, aide à comprendre le sens exact de ce geste. Dans l'Homélie 1 sur les Maccabées, Jean Chrysostome a en effet cette image : « Et parce qu'elle craignait cette issue [id est l'apostasie], prenant presque son dernier fils par les mains, elle le précipita dans le chaudron, remplaçant ses mains par les prières et par les conseils contenus dans les discours qu'elle lui adressait » (PG 50, 621, 45-46). La mère a effectivement agi avec son dernier fils comme si elle devenait elle-même le bourreau, par le fait de ses exhortations.

Sans l'espérance de la résurrection, le modèle de la Mère de Maccabées serait tout simplement incompréhensible. Au travers de l'exemple de cette mère au comportement contraire à ce que l'humanité attend, l'antithèse entre le monde terrestre et le monde céleste est portée à son comble. Depuis le récit source de 2 Maccabées jusqu'à l'iconographie médiévale, en passant par la prédication épidictique du IVe siècle, la Mère des Maccabées apparaît comme un modèle particulièrement frappant pour les imaginations, portant en elle une réponse qui n'est pas de ce monde face aux malheurs présents et à la mort, qui ne sauraient avoir le dernier mot.
Female Presence in Funerary Ritual, “Magic,” and Burial Context

Introduction

Although the association between women, funerary ritual and “magic” in a burial context may initially seem peculiar, it should be acknowledged that women, due to their biological role in giving birth to a new human life, may also “be expected to play a symmetrical role at the end of life.” The topics that this Round Table focuses on, from funerary cult and the commemoration of the dead, to the architecture and iconography of burial churches and tombs, as well as the use and deposition of ritual artefacts and accompanying materials, are altogether aspects connected to a large extent with women and the domestic sphere. This contribution aims at identifying female presence in burial context along three strands of funerary ritual behaviour: (a) the mourning of the dead and female devotional practice, (b) the deposition of personal objects carrying protective and apotropaic properties, usually related to health and fertility, and (c) the creation of secret and mysterious katadesmoi or defixiones and the expression of sexual desire through binding curses.

The gendered association of death is usually illustrated within the funerary ritual itself: women as performers of laments represent the domestic sphere, while men, carrying out the actual burial, represent the official or public sphere. The role of women as mothers, wives, midwives, nurses, nuns, and mourners in a male-dominated Byzantine society does not seem to have always left much space for female activity and expression, beyond their love and care for their family, and their concern with fertility and infertility, health, and infant mortality.

Funerary ritual and lamentation

The first strand of funerary ritual behaviour concerns the performance of lamentation, commemoration, and female devotional practices. Mourning women are depicted in sarcophagi, frescoes, and miniature paintings in violent acts of lamentation, such as the tearing of the hair and cloths, beating of the head and chest, clasping their hands over their mouths, veiling their faces, or throwing their arms up, in numerous scenes, from Dido’s death and the Massacre of the Innocents to the Crucifixion, the Entombment, and the Dormition. Women comprised the chief mourners in a suitable grieving ritual for the successful separation of the deceased from the living.

Beyond the depiction of mourning women in religious imagery, gendered funerary ritual practice is, first and foremost, archaeologically evident in burial assemblages. Glass and ceramic vessels, oil lamps, buckles and fibulae, combs, jewellery, and reliquary crosses are listed as the commonest funerary artefacts or “grave goods.” It goes without saying that the use of the term “grave goods” interpreted as funerary offerings does not agree with the Christian context within which one ought to examine such artefacts. “Accompanying materials” may be an alternative term to refer to personal items and ritual objects found in a Christian funerary context.

Glass and ceramic vessels, for instance, signify, the family female members’ burial and post-burial ritual activities, such as the preparation of the body and commemorative ritual meals.
Glass perfume sprinklers of the Early and Late Byzantine periods are part of the burial ritual (for anointing the body with scented oils); they are associated with women and are buried with the dead, as they were no longer deemed appropriate for further use amongst the living. Ceramic objects and containers, such as lamps, jugs, and amphoriskoi of the Early and Middle Byzantine period were an integral part of the funerary ritual, which involved the pouring of olive oil by the priest upon the body in the shape of the cross.

The choice of certain female saints carrying the same names as those of certain female donors testifies to the deliberate correspondence between the two. Moreover, one could argue that certain spaces within a church were reserved for female ritual (Gerstel 1998): the common depiction of female saints associated with the sick and dying, such as Paraskeve, Kyriake, Anna, Anastasia, and Eirene in the narthex, in cemetery churches without nartheces or even arcosolia, not only denotes female devotional practices aimed at curing infertility and sick children, but also stresses the role of women in funerary rituals and commemoration. A similar interpretation has been reached for the presence of the Virgin on the dome of the Parekklesion of the Chora Monastery in Constantinople, being an important female holy figure in funerary cult and the supreme intercessor between God and men, a role that was exceptionally stressed during the ritual of the prothesis in this funerary chapel.

Amulets, health and fertility

Proceeding to the second strand of ritual behaviour, it should be acknowledged that women have generally been seen within the context of sin and sex since Antiquity, a representative example being the Biblical story of Adam and Eve. Christianity, on the other hand, perceived women in a bipolar way: both as “evil,” required to deny their sexuality or retain their virginity in order to enter Paradise, or as “good,” with Virgin Mary being the epitome of piousness and humility. “Good” women were expected to love their husbands and care for their children, being good wives and mothers restricted within the domestic sphere. “Evil” women were perceived as sinful and lustful, the embodiment of sexual trap and temptation.

The vagina, often personified on amulets, should be read as a reference to sexuality, fertility, child birth, and female life-giving powers, as an obverse of death. A variety of grave finds, including rings and amulets, combined engraved symbols and other magical images, such as the Hystera, Chnoubis, and the Holy Rider, as a means of protection, health, and childbearing. The depiction of a face from which radiates a number of serpents, engraved on a variety of amulets (rings, pendants, gems) and dated to the Early and Middle Byzantine periods, has been interpreted as the hystera or womb, often accompanied by spells or invocations addressed to holy figures (e.g. the Virgin), commanding it to keep calm and return to its proper place.

Amulets from burial contexts, referring to demons, to women-related issues, and protection from diseases, bear a variety of apotropaic or magic symbolism which is worth summarising here. The inscribed word for health or Hygeia on rings and belts, and its combination with the Greek letter Θ for Thanatos or death and the magic symbol of the pentalpha, such as the example of the Early Byzantine doctor’s stamp published by Joseph Dölger, is a representative case where Hygeia and the pentalpha seal and control the power of demons and Thanatos. Chnoubis, on the other hand, a serpent-like figure with the head of a lion, frequently engraved in amuletic armbands and gems, has been associated with the area of the stomach and was perceived as a protector of the womb. Another interesting category of amulets commonly found in Early Byzantine burial contexts is that depicting
the so-called “Holy Rider” or “Rider Saint,” a male figure riding a horse and identified as Solomon (sometimes accompanied or replaced by an angel), spearing a serpentine or animal-like female demon, often named “Abyzou” or “Gylou.” It is noteworthy that the demon has an evil feminine form, while Solomon's supernatural powers of healing and driving demons out of men on the one hand, and the choice of hematite (translated as 'bloodstone') for the production of such gems on the other, denotes the amulets ability to stop the flow of blood and their protective power over young children and women in childbirth. The depiction of Christ healing the Haemorrhiosa strengthens the association between hematite gems engraved with the Holy Rider and the female demon, and their protective power against bleeding at childbirth. Another category common amongst grave accompanying material is the so-called tintinnabula, little bells used as apotropaic devices in Byzantine graves (dated at least as late as the sixth-seventh centuries) to protect infants against sickness and frighten off evil spirits, and gradually replaced by pendant crosses against evil intervention.

Curse tablets and women

The third and final strand of female ritual practice concerns the deposition of the so-called katadesmoi or defixiones, rolled up curse- and/or love-tablets, known since Greek and Roman Antiquity and documented in burial contexts as late as the seventh or eighth centuries AD. “Binding down” spells were inscribed on thin sheets of lead, were rolled up, pierced by a nail, and deposited in a grave or a well, invoking chthonic powers to harm individuals or bind sexual desire. Specialists on curse tablets and magic in Antiquity have concluded that there is a gender-based distinction between spells; women, in particular, have been seen as “agents of magic” and are obviously associated with “love spells.”

The largest number of curse tablets of the Early Christian period has been retrieved in urban funerary contexts, from places such as Rome, Athens, and Corinth. Binding tablets are amongst the characteristic defixiones of the fourth century AD, covered with magical and other symbols. A curse tablet from Rome, in the container of Petronius Cornigus depicts a man bound with rope between two snakes and the lower part of another body beneath him, accompanied with an inscribed love curse, mentioning “he whom I love with all my thoughts...” Another tablet depicting Osiris, the demon Seth, and a figure in the coils of a snake calls upon the gods to make Kerdelos suffer a painful and sudden death. A review of curse tablets dating from the Roman period to Late Antiquity reveals that most of them belong to the category of “justice” and “law,” followed by tablets concerned with issues of “love” and “sexual desire.” Written in times of crisis and tension, curse tablets involved the ritual of magic, while placing a curse (in magic secrecy) seemed more preferable than direct confronting.

Conclusion

Summarising, it has become evident through the overview of funerary items and burial rituals that women in Byzantium occupied a liminal, yet powerful, position, one that men could not substitute. Their involvement in the preparation and care of the deceased facilitated their departure in the same way women facilitated the arrival of a new human life as mothers and midwives. Differences, however, in male and female cognitive abilities are slight and cannot explain the diversity of gender roles and identities. Considering that our view about women in Byzantine society relies heavily on male-produced sources of textual and visual evidence from legislators to Church Fathers such as John Chrysostom, archaeological assemblages comprise silent yet objective witnesses to female roles and practices, including the sphere of funerary ritual performance.
Death ritual involved practices of various kinds, with the prime aim to honour and commemorate the dead. The women, confined within the limits of the domestic sphere, invented ways to commemorate or celebrate their leading role as mothers and wives. Through invocations to saintly and chthonic powers, women transformed into mediators between humanity and the supernatural, especially in the contexts of death and “life crises.” Chrysostom speaks of ladies protecting their children by attaching amulets on them and refers to old Christian women who uttered incantations over the sick (in which they invoked the name of God), while archaeology confirms such practices through burial accompanying materials and the iconography and inscriptions on pendants. It can be argued that women found their own devotional paths to achieve fertility, bear healthy children, retain spiritual healing, acquire sexual partners and husbands, express their emotions, lament and commemorate the deceased in his eternal life: all through funerary ritual performances.
Remarques sur l'architecture et l'iconographie des pareclèsia de la région d'Ohrid : XIVᵉ–XVe siècle

Dans la région d'Ohrid, à l'époque tardo-byzantine, sont attestés plusieurs monuments dont le rôle principal était d'abriter le tombeau du fondateur en suivant une tradition byzantine bien connue. La plupart du temps, le fidèle fortuné fonde un monastère pour assurer la commémoration de son nom par les moines et finance la construction et l'embellissement d'un catholicon. Il réserve une place pour son tombeau dans l'église et bénéficie des offices commémoratives en tant que ktitor. Ces catholica-mausolées, comme les églises de Saint-Nicolas Manastir (XIIIe siècle) ou Saint-Georges de Pološko (milieu du XIVe), ont souvent un aménagement liturgique et un décor qui répond à cette double fonction : monastique et funéraire. Parfois, les chapelles annexes d'un monument dont la fonction principale n'est pas funéraire (cathédrale, monastère…) endossent aussi la fonction commémorative. Notre attention sera davantage concentrée sur ce type de chapelles dans les églises d'Ohrid du XIVe et du XVe siècle. Ces annexes assurent la mémoire sociale non seulement individuelle, mais parfois aussi collective des fondateurs.

À Sainte-Sophie, la cathédrale de la ville d'Ohrid, une chapelle a été aménagée au-dessus du narthex en 1347. Commanditée par Jean Oliver, un despote serbe, cette petite chapelle à nef unique avec abside a été entièrement peinte. O y trouve, entre autres, les portraits de la famille d'Oliver accompagnée de l'archevêque d'Ohrid, Nicolas. Jean Oliver est un personnage connu par ailleurs. Il est le commanditaire de l'église de l'Archange Michel du monastère Lesnovo, église qu'il a préparé pour sa dernière demeure. La petite chapelle de Sainte-Sophie n'avait donc pas vocation à abriter son corps, mais plutôt à servir de lieu de commémoration de son nom. Jean Oliver et l'archevêque d'Ohrid avaient des intérêts communs qui ont pu encourager cette donation dans la cathédrale. Toutefois, des raisons religieuses liées à l'entretien de la memoriae de Jean Oliver et de sa famille ont certainement motivé ce choix.

Dans le catholicon de la Vierge Péribleptos d'Ohrid, deux chapelles latérales ont été aménagées au milieu du XIVe siècle au sud-est et au nord-est de l'église principale, selon un modèle proche de celui des Saints-Apôtres de Thessalonique. L'architecture des deux pareclèsia est comparable : nef unique avec une abside à l'est et des niches latérales. Les deux chapelles ont été entièrement peintes par des ktitors différents et celle du nord possède une image symbolique de la Sainte-Trinité sur laquelle nous nous attarderons. La chapelle nord qui est dédiée à Saint-Grégoire-le-Théologien a été commanditée par l'évêque Grégoire de Dèvolis et a été peinte en 1364-65. Au-delà de la fonction commémorative de la chapelle, sa façade occidentale présente un message politique d'entente entre les autorités séculières et religieuses de la ville. Une composition comprenant les portraits des seigneurs locaux (Vuk Branković et Grgrur Branković), le roi régnant (le roi serbe Uroš), saint Grégoire le Théologien, l'archevêque d'Ohrid de l'époque Grégoire II, une figure détruite qui représente vraisemblablement Grégoire l'évêque de Dèvolis, et Jean l'archimandrite du monastère...
Saint-Clément d'Ohrid y est peinte. Ce tableau collectif n'est pas une composition dédicatoire proprement dite. Il s'agit plutôt d'une représentation qui honore un événement historique à savoir celui d'un accord entre les seigneurs locaux et les autorités religieuses. La présence d'autres sujets iconographiques nous aidera dans la détermination des attentes commémoratives de l'évêque Grégoire de Dévolis.

La chapelle sud de l'église de la Vierge Péribleptos a été peut-être préparée pour recevoir le tombeau de l'archevêque d'Ohrid Grégoire II qui, à notre avis, est mort vers 1368/69. Sur la façade occidentale de la chapelle sont peints une Déisis et la Dormition d'un évêque, accompagnées d'un Jugement Dernier. Les travaux de restauration et les recherches archéologiques qui se déroulent actuellement dans l'église de la Vierge Péribleptos pourront confirmer ou contredire cette hypothèse.

Dans l'église dédiée à saints Constantin et Hélène (fin du XIVe siècle), commanditée par l'hieromoine Parthenios, a été également construit un parecclésion accolé à la façade méridionale. La chapelle a été mise sous le vocable de saint Paraskévi, la protectrice des morts et son cycle se développe sur la façade occidentale. Le programme hagiographique de l'intérieur de la chapelle mérite quelques observations car il reflète sa fonction commémorative.

D'autres chapelles annexes des monuments d'Ohrid, possédant une architecture différente de celles analysées précédemment ont aussi eu une vocation commémorative. Il s'agit par exemple du parecclésion de Saint-Nicolas Bolnicki (XVe siècle). La chapelle possède une nef longitudinale monopente se terminant par une abside. Elle longe le mur méridional de l'église et est dédiée aux Saints-Apôtres. Peinte en 1476, elle possède un décor singulier : saints Pierre et Paul, en tant que patrons de la chapelle, supplient le Christ « donneur de vie » dans une sorte de Déisis. La présence de l'Anastasis sur le mur oriental de la chapelle révèle aussi sa fonction funéraire.

L'analyse de l'architecture et du décor de quelques chapelles annexes des monuments d'Ohrid des XIVe-XVe siècles nous apportera des informations concernant les fonctions commémoratives de ces chapelles. Certains points architecturaux ou iconographiques demeurent communs pour ces parecclésia, mais nous avons surtout noté une grande variété de sujets qui ornent ces espaces. Les préoccupations personnelles, politiques ou spirituelles du ktitor jouent un rôle décisif dans l'embellissement de ces espaces.
Memory and Worship:
Commemorative Settings and Decoration in Medieval Armenia

A series of recent studies show an increasing interest for the funerary practices in Medieval Armenia. Travelers, historians, and archaeologists have been recording remains from tombs considered to belong to kings and princes. Despite the dearth of archaeological evidence, the confrontation between sources, topography, and architecture allows to outline some patterns of burial and commemoration and to address issues of continuity and change, of memory and identity. Given the importance of the burial ad patres, stressed systematically in historiography, the paper will investigate the location of princely and royal tombs, their architectural context and insertion in land- or cityscapes. The focus of attention will be the kingdom of Cilicia from which records attest the importance of urban and suburban or rural aristocratic cemeteries. Princely and royal burials alongside with graves of high clergymen have been an efficient means for shaping the country on a strand of memory exemplified by monasteries as places of worship and power. The monastery as institution and physical presence appears to be not only the adequate content for burial and place of commemoration but also to convey, through carefully established rituals, the memory of individuals and groups more effectively than the graves themselves.

The case of Cilicia testifies to changes but also reveals the consistency of the primacy of family monastic possessions as privileged places for burials. The distribution of the highest ranked burials between at least two monasteries and an urban church may be interestingly compared to a similar situation observed in earlier Armenian kingships. Comparison with thirteenth- and fourteenth-century monastic places of memory in Greater Armenia confirms that accumulation of graves and continuity around princely monastic churches created affiliations beyond lineage, conveying consciousness of community across time.
A Humble Servant of God?
Strategies of Memory-Making and Remembrance in Bulgarian Lands

Death played a key role in the every-day life of medieval men. Whether caused by the hand of another, by disease, birth or age, death was inevitable and omnipresent, but not to be feared. This is why it became an object of strict regulation by the Church. The latter encouraged Christians to prepare their parting from the earthly world both morally and materially by making donations and building tombs. Moreover, death served as a constituting element of society through memory and commemoration. Providing the deceased with a last chance to modify his public image, it turned into an important tool for ideological and political exploitation. The paper will explore the complexity of the topic by focusing on aristocratic and imperial burials, funerary rituals and remembrance in Bulgarian lands from the centuries before the founding of the Second Bulgarian Tsardom until the first century of the Ottoman rule (11th-15th c.). Even though only a small part of the funerary settings survives, important observations can be made by comparing visual, textual and archaeological sources in order to understand how the rulers and the nobility wished to be remembered. Special attention will be paid to the ways by which the family members and contemporaries of the deceased participated in the creation of his memory. What aims did they pursue by doing so, if any? Finally, how did the dead continue to be remembered later on in a changed historical context?
Épigraphie funéraire dans la vallée d'Ihlara (Peristremma) en Cappadoce

Située au nord-est de la montagne Hasan Dağ, la vallée d'Ihlara abrite un nombre important d’églises médiévales rupestres, connues essentiellement par leur décor peint où l’image de la croix est étroitement liée à des cycles christologiques et à des scènes élaborées du Jugement dernier. Parmi ces églises, celle connue sous le vocable d’Eğri Taş kilisesi, dédiée à la Théotokos, d’après la dédicace peinte à proximité du bèma, datée entre 921 et 944, surplombe un complexe de salles funéraires avec des tombes creusées au sol et aux parois. Ces espaces, destinés à une inhumation dense des défunts, constituent de la sorte une nécropole importante dont les tombes visibles dépassent la cinquantaine, bien qu’il soit difficile, à défaut de fouilles, de préciser le nombre exact des sépultures dans les lieux. Plusieurs de ces tombes sont surmontées d’épitaphes peintes sur les parois, associées à l’image de la croix, évoquant ainsi les stèles funéraires. D’après des critères essentiellement paléographiques, certaines de ces inscriptions peuvent remonter à l’époque paléochrétienne, d’autres sont attribuables aux IXᵉ-Xᵉ siècles. Dans leur majorité, les épitaphes médiévales ne correspondent pas à un modèle répétitif du genre est décédé ἐτελειώθη ou ci-git ἐνθάδε κεῖται. La diversité des formules utilisées semble être liée à un choix parmi des textes préalablement conçus à des fins commémoratifs qui circulaient d’une région à l’autre. Cela est mieux illustré par la diffusion d’inscriptions mentionnant les qualités morales des défunts ou faisant appel à la force salvatrice de la croix, et notamment par l’utilisation des épitaphes gnomiques (memento mori), conservées à Eğri Taş kilisesi, mais aussi dans d’autres églises en Cappadoce et ailleurs.
Tombes royales en Serbie médiévale : culture visuelle et mémoire collective

Entre la fin du XIIIᵉ et le milieu du XIVᵉ siècle, sous l’impulsion de son élite princière, la Serbie a tiré parti de sa situation géographique entre l’Adriatique et Constantinople pour forger sa propre identité politique et religieuse au sein du monde byzantin et s’ériger en grande puissance dans les Balkans. La dynastie némanide, du nom de son saint fondateur Siméon-Nemanja, a matérialisé cet essor à travers la construction de nombreux édifices religieux qui maillent l’ensemble du territoire.

Certains d’entre eux bénéficient toutefois d’un statut particulier car ils sont conçus, dès l’origine, comme de futurs mausolées royaux, selon le modèle initié au monastère de Studenica par le père de la lignée. Abrivant les tombes des monarques successifs, presque tous canonisés après leur mort, ces édifices structurent la mise en place d’un culte dynastique qui fonde toute l’idéologie politique et religieuse de la Serbie au cours de cette période.

L’emplacement géographique et le modèle architectural des mausolées, l’agencement spatial et architectonique des sépultures et les effigies des fondateurs qui les accompagnent témoignent, par leur caractère répétitif, de la volonté des Némanides de s’inscrire dans la continuité de leur saint ancêtre. Ils offrent, dans le même temps, les éléments d’une culture visuelle, propice, semble-t-il, à l’édification d’une identité et d’une mémoire collectives.

Cet exposé se propose, en conséquence, d’examiner la conception de l’espace funéraire dans les fondations respectives des Némanides, en lien avec les pratiques cultuelles et le culte des reliques amenées à s’y dérouler, et de s’interroger sur les incidences éventuelles de certains marqueurs visuels sur la construction d’une mémoire sociale.
Formulas in Funerary Byzantine Graffiti from Different Parts of the Byzantine Empire

This report discusses formulas and traditional phrases from funerary Byzantine graffiti in Constantinople, Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, Bulgaria and elsewhere.

What do the classical structure of the Byzantine funerary inscription and its variations look like? First of all, the composition of the inscription depends on its “nucleus” and, according to its type, we can prognosticate which elements will be used. For example, we have the invocation, the prayer, or the characteristic regional malediction for the person who wants to damage the tomb or other burial place. The type of “nucleus” also determines whether there will be a date and a detailed description of the deceased included, besides the traditional – for a Christian context – phrases «τοῦ δούλου τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ» (the slave of God) and «πιστός/ πιστή» (faithful) or «πιστός/ πιστή ἐν Χριστῷ» (faithful in Christ).

We can distinguish four common types of formulas, which make up the «nucleus» of the inscription:

1. “Tomb/burial place of so-and-so.”
2. “The monument (or other synonyms of the monument) was built/raised in memory of the deceased,” with variants from the relatives, the deceased or the deceased with his/her family, while alive
3. “Here lies so-and-so.”
4. “So-and-so died,” in different variations.

Beginning with the first formula, in Asia Minor, for example, we can find references to the following types of funerary monuments and names of burial places: «σωματοθήκη/ σωματοθήκη/ σωματοθήκη/ σωματοθήκη» (366 inscriptions, 5th-6th c. AD); «θήκη/ θήκη/ θήκη/ θήκη» (198 inscriptions, no date); «τίτλον/ τίθλον/ τεῖτλον» (inscriptions, 4th c. AD); «ήρων/ ήρωεν/ ήρώων» (37 inscriptions, 3rd-7th c. AD); «στήλη/ ιστήλην / ἐστί(λην)» (32 inscriptions, 3rd-5th c. AD); μνημεών/ μνημείων (29 inscriptions, 2nd-6th c. AD); «τύμβον/ τύμβον» (27 inscriptions, 3rd-14th c. AD); «νή/ νός» (23 inscriptions, 3rd-6th c. AD); «τάφος» (21 inscriptions, 3rd-9th c. AD). Also, in this region a number of euphemisms for the burial place were used, e.g.: «τόπος» (14 inscriptions, 5th-6th c. AD), and its variants «τόπων/ τόπων/ τόπων»; and «θέσις» (26 inscriptions, 4th-5th c. AD, the Pontus variant). More rare variants are: «παραστατικόν» (15 inscriptions); «σήμα» (14 inscriptions, 3rd-5th c. AD); «ἐνορίον» (3 inscriptions); «μνημόσυνον» (2 inscriptions).

The most popular variant of the first formula is the usage of any of the monument names (besides στήλην and τίτλον) with the name of the deceased in the genitive case, while sometimes the authors of the inscriptions also add the pronoun «αὐτοῦ» in the relevant genus and the verb «ἐστίν». For «τάφος»,
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there is a variant «εἰμί» + genitive case, when the tomb speaks itself. For all the monument types, the second most frequent variant is the usage with the verb «διαφέρων», + dative case, or the participle form of this verb, «διαφέρουσα», + dative case, or, occasionally, genitive case. Combinations with the formulas of the other “nuclear” types, for example «ἐνθα κήτε», are also possible.

In Constantinople, we can see only 1) «τάφος», which is used in the official funerary inscriptions or in the texts written in verse; 2) «τύμβος» (14th c. AD); 3) «μνημήν»; and, 4) the combination of two above-mentioned types: «[θηκή διάφερουσα] + «μεμόριον(_ _)» (no date?). In Athens, very common is the term «κοιμητήριον», with different spelling variants.

The second type of “nucleus” formulas has its analogue in antique honorary decrees and dedicatory inscriptions, and usually includes the verb «ἀνέστησα/ ἀνέσθησα» + dative case + «τίτλον» or «στήλην» + «μνήμης/ μνής/ μνείας ἐνεκεν / χάριν». Sometimes the verb is omitted, or replaced by another synonymic verb, such as «κατεσκευάσατο», «ἔστησαν», «ἔτευξεν» or «ἐποίησεν». One can also encounter different combinations with other formulas, such as «ἐνθὰ κ] ατά[κ]τε» or «ἐνθάδε γῇ καλύπτι».

The third type of the “nucleus” formulas «ἐνθάδε κείμε/ κίμε/ κατάκιτε» (here lies) is combined with the name of the dead person in the nominative case and with the profession and certain formulas with specific characteristics of the deceased (see below). A more late variant of this formula is «[ἐνθ] ἀδε ἀνα[πα][ύτε]» (9th c.).

In Constantinople, for example, this third “nucleus” formula type is very often used and we can see it in such variations as «[ἐνθ]βα κίνται / ἐνταῦθα κείται / ἐνθάδε κατάκιται / κατ<ά>κιτε / κεῖται / κατάκειται / κατάκειτε» (A.D. 559, A.D. 575-600?, 5th-6th c., 6th c., 14th c.). Sometimes this “nucleus” formula is repeated twice in different lines of the text of the inscription. Usually in many graffiti there is nothing more than the name of the dead person, as for example, «ἐνθάδε κατάκιτε Ἐμπαύνις» (6th c., SEG 28.569, DOP 32:3,1.1).

As mentioned above, this formula can be combined with specific characteristics of the dead person. Let us look at some formulas including such characteristics in more detail:

1) Phrases with the noun «μνήμη» (memory). The traditional funerary Christian characteristic of the dead person is «ὁ/ ή τῆς μακαρίας [μνήμης]», used on its own or with «διαφέρων», in proper forms. This formula may also be combined with familial relationship names, such as son, wife etc., or with a toponymic.

2) The adjective «πιστὸς», as the core for two characteristic formulas: «πιστὸς δούλος τοῦ θεοῦ» (faithful servant of God) and «πιστὸς ἐν Χριστῷ» / «ἐν Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ πιστὸς» (faithful in Christ / faithful in Christ the Lord). As in the previous case, familial relationships and the place of origin may be specified. More often, however, we can read in inscriptions only «πιστὸς / πιστὴ» without any continuation.

3) The phrase «δούλη τοῦ θεοῦ» (servant of God). In Constantinople this phrase was not used for men, and it appears without other formulas and characteristics.

4) A specification of the position of the deceased within the Christian community, for example, with an adjective such as «νεοφώτιστος» (newly baptized).
The fourth type of the “nucleus” formulas is characterized by the presence of the date of death and the usage of the verb «ἐτελειώθη/ ἐτελιώθη/ τελειωθεῖσαι», as characteristic of the deceased, or with a specification of his/her profession or age. In Athens, a more extensive variant is very often encountered: «ἐτελιώθη (η) ἐν Κ(υρί)ῳ» (Parthenon, A.D. 863).

There are other variants of the fourth formula, such as «ἀπεγενέθη» + date (5th-6th c.), or, a late variant from Constantinople «ἐκοιμήθη» (12th cent, 1408-1483.). All of them may be combined with «δούλη τοῦ [θ(εο)ῦ».

The third and the fourth types of the “nucleus” formulas can often be combined with each other or with other funerary formulas: «ἐνθάδε κατάκειται / κατακιμί / ἔλαβα κατάκητε» + «ἐτε[λ(ι)ωθή] / ἐτελεύτησεν/ τελευ[τ]ᾶ / τελιωθεῖσα / ἐτελειὼθη» + date (5th-6th c., 6th c.). In this case the following formulas are used in the remaining structure of the inscription:

1) The phrase «τῆς [μακ]αρίας μνήμης» with the profession or rang, if the deceased is a man, and the familial relationship + profession/rang of a male relative, if the deceased is a woman. A rarer variant of the formula is «ὁ τῆς εὐλαβῶς μνήμης». There are a lot of inscriptions in which the “nucleus” formula is «μνήμη» + genitive case (5th-6th cent. AD). In this formula, the noun «μνήμη» is simultaneously a synonym of the «μνημόσυνον» as one of the variant names of the burial place, thus transforming the characteristic traditional formula.

2) The combination of the previous formula with the traditional epithet «πιστὸς» has two variations: a reference to familial relationship or to the profession/rang of the deceased.

3) The adjective «πιστὸς» may also be combined with both these alternatives, as well as, in some cases with «δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ».

4) The traditional Christian phrase «δοῦλος τοῦ θεοῦ».

In some inscriptions we encounter a combination of the “nucleus” formulas: «ἐνθάδε κατάκειται» + «ἐκοιμήθη» + date with the characteristic «πιστὸς».

The most common descriptive variant of the funerary formulas in Asia Minor is «τοῦ Κυρίου ἡ γῆ κέ το πλήρωμα/ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς»+ genitive case. We also come across other versions of this formulas in this region. In Constantinople, instead, a formula of praying is used: «δ(έησι)ς τοῦ δούλου [τοῦ] θ(εο)ῦ» (A.D. 1300?).

The formulas which we can see in the remaining parts of the inscription-structure have the following functions: the laudation of the deceased, the malediction for the probable tomb violator, the prayer, the characteristics of the dead person etc. Some of these formulas we reviewed earlier, others will be presented in the report.

We have a lot of inscriptions which we can identify as funerary in spite of the fact that all the formulas are omitted or are implied. They can be very brief and include only the names in the proper case or a reference to familial relationships and/or profession. Rarely, this type of inscription can be detailed, and includes in its structure not only the names, professions and familial relationships, but also specific characteristics, such as the widespread formula in Asia Minor «Χρηστιανοὶ Χρηστιανῷ», with the orthographic variant «Χρησιανοὶ Χρησιανῷ». In Constantinople, for example, we can
find such inscriptions with omissions in the following variations: 1) genitive case of the deceased’s name; 2) genitive case + profession; 3) genitive case + part of the characteristic formula «ἐν Χ(ρίστ) ἤ»; 4) dative case.

There are about 250 different funerary formulas both in the “nucleus” and in other parts of the structure. In the report we will represent the full classification of formulas along with the analysis of some rare and interesting cases from each region.
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The main aim of this round table is to foster interest and research into the environmental history of Byzantium. The three elements included in the title of the round table make it possible to accommodate various perspectives – those of philology, history, archaeology and environmental science – on the links between food production and consumption, modes of environment exploitation (including the question of its sustainability), and the changes in the landscape caused by anthropogenic and natural causes, including climate change. We also hope that the choice of these three particular elements for the subject of the session will make it possible to study with the different sources and methodologies the very same process, in which a society establishes its particular *modus vivendi* with the environment, adapted to its own needs, cultural heritage and local natural conditions; the result of this process being the creation of a specific cultural-natural landscape. In addition, this round table will provide an opportunity to reflect on the relationship between the differing methodologies derived from textual, material and scientific approaches to past societies. Whereas food and landscape seem to be points of departure for text-based research (but not exclusively, as it also accommodates archaeozoological research), environment and landscape are notions which have a long research tradition in both archaeology and sciences dealing with the history of vegetation, land-use and settlement, together with more recent concerns about climate history.
Landscape Archaeology

Landsdapes provide a central concern for many disciplines ranging from cultural geographers and art historians to historical ecologists and landscape managers. Inevitably the best way to understand them is hotly debated with a wide spectrum of interpretations and theoretical and methodological approaches. Landscape archaeology (at least in its predominantly Anglophone iteration) presents a split between economic/functional and social/symbolic approaches, a theme recently taken up by Matthew Johnson in his *Ideas of Landscape* (2007). Such divisions can also be traced in related disciplines including history and geography. Scholars and surveyors have created detailed and accurate records of ancient remains, but have often struggled to link them with past social processes or to appreciate that landscapes were not just simple reflections of economic and technological trends. Steeped in a different tradition are post-modernists including many cultural geographers, post-processual archaeologists, and theoretically-minded historians. They have stressed that landscapes are not static but always contested, always changing, constantly negotiated and culturally constituted.

Archaeological studies in the post-processual tradition have attempted to employ explicitly phenomenological approaches to provide viewpoints on past landscapes and such an approach is well placed to develop rich perspectives on landscapes because it has continued to engage with material culture and with landscapes as the contexts for social life. Rather than seeing landscapes as neutral canvasses which only exist and become active when the perceivers gaze is cast upon them and for many archaeologists there should be no division between ‘real’ or ‘physical’ landscapes and people’s ‘perceived’. Along with the importance of landscape and material culture as context, archaeologists’ appreciation of the time-depth present in the archaeological record has led many to share the Annaliste historians’ concern for following trajectories of change over the long term. Through this historicity, archaeology can provide particular insights into the meanings of landscape that are relevant not only to understanding the past, but also the present and future.

An unfortunate result of the widening divergence between scholars working in empirical and post-modern traditions is that each side seems to have forgotten that anything much might be gained.
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from reading each others’ work. But one of the main lessons of archaeological theory is surely that
different people in the past or present see the same thing in diverse ways thanks to their varying
perspectives. In our view, integrative landscape archaeologies hold out the possibility of transforming
mutual incomprehension into deeper, better-informed awareness of past and present landscapes by
bringing together many viewpoints in unified frameworks. Our thinking in this is influenced by recent
developments in international policy, in particular the signing and ratification by 33 countries of the
European Landscape Convention (ELC). The ELC states explicitly that landscape is:

‘…an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and
interaction of natural and/or human factors.’ (COUNCIL OF EUROPE ELC Article 1)

This definition is much broader than others used to inform heritage management, such as the
UNESCO criteria for recognizing outstanding cultural landscapes. Rather than defining particular
places as ‘outstanding’, the ELC recognises that landscape is ubiquitous and that all landscape has some
value as perceived by people. In future, it may be possible to develop frameworks that bring together not
only social and economic approaches, but also those from a whole range of other disciplines, professions
and perspectives. Using GIS-based techniques such as Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC)
which we have applied for our pilot studies of Silivri and Naxos, we aim to map, analyse, compare and
contrast the perceptions of a wide range of people working with the landscapes of the past, present and
future. This will surely help us to open up debates on the past and future of our landscapes.

Archaeological field survey over the past thirty years has transformed our understanding of
many Mediterranean landscapes. Until recently there has been tendency to focus on classical and
earlier periods while medieval and post-medieval landscapes (Byzantine, Venetian, Ottoman,
modern) are less well understood, although it is worthy to note Timothy Gregory’s multi-faceted
approach to the Byzantine real and imagined landscapes of Kythera. As historical archaeologists,
Sam Turner and I are particularly interested in how the landscape has developed, and how it was
organised at different times in the past. In Britain, HLC is widely appreciated as a useful way to
model past landscapes and how they changed over time to take their current forms. The aim of our
research has been to investigate whether similar methods might be used in Mediterranean contexts.
In future, our maps – which represent our perceptions of historic landscape character – could form
one layer amongst many in Geographical Information Systems (GIS) used to facilitate debate on the
value of these landscapes and how they should be managed.
Vegetation Patterns and Anthropogenic Landscapes of Byzantium

Byzantium, or the Eastern Roman Empire, existed for almost a millennium and spread across a number of regions with different natural characteristics (in terms of both geology and climate). It is not surprising, therefore, that the societies which were part of the late antique and medieval Roman world created a large variety of landscapes which reflected both the ways in which these societies were able to respond to the local environmental conditions, and the economic as well as cultural needs of these different communities. At the same time, however, these local and regional societies were part of the same Byzantine socio-economic (and socio-ecological) system. This resulted in a substantial degree of similarity in agricultural technologies on the one hand, and the socio-ecological models that were put in place in order to transform and maintain specific productive landscapes on the other. The anthropogenic environments created by Byzantine communities had to meet at the same time the local, regional and the empire-wide resource-generation needs. The processes which led to the creation of particular local and regional landscapes were thus determined by interests of a number of different social actors, from peasant families and local communities to remote aristocratic landowners and the imperial government itself.

The aim of this paper is to provide a brief overview of the different landscape types that existed in the Eastern Roman world from Late Antiquity until the end of the Middle Ages. In order to be able to deal in a single paper with the entire millennium of Byzantine history, this presentation will be based on the palynological data. On one hand, they are available for most of the regions of the Byzantine world; on the other, they offer valuable information for the entire thousand years that is being analysed here. This means that the history of landscape will be approached through the history of vegetation, which has both advantages and disadvantages. While the main advantage is the availability of the data itself, and the direct connection between local/regional vegetation structure and human activity, this approach is limited by the fact that not all components of the landscape and not all types of agricultural activity are recorded in this type of data. Gardening, crucial for the supply of vegetables and other staples that were consumed on a daily basis, is completely beyond the grasp of the pollen data. The same, unfortunately, applies to fruit cultivation – fortunately, except for a few species that were crucial for the medieval Mediterranean diet, such as chestnut, olive, walnut, hazel, and vine. Moreover, plants do not tell us a lot about the animals – while we are able to see pastures, that is open yet uncultivated landscapes with vegetation characteristic for more or less intensively grazed areas, we have hardly any idea of the species of the animals for which these pastures were actually created.

Seen from the perspective of vegetation history, the Byzantine millennium in the eastern parts of the Mediterranean is just another stage in the long history of man’s contribution to the creation of the Mediterranean landscapes; this long process started already at the beginning of the Holocene some ten thousand years ago, if not earlier. The deep history of the Mediterranean landscapes can be understood as a series of cycles that were seeing increase and then decrease in
human impact on the environment. Gradually, with the growing political and economic integration of the Mediterranean world, these cycles, which initially had their peculiar regional rhythm, became more or less synchronous across the entire Mediterranean. The socio-environmental integration was already very well visible in the first centuries of the Roman Empire, and thus the Byzantine environmental history begins already at the time when the Mediterranean environment had been profoundly (re-)shaped by human activity. The Byzantines, or more broadly the inhabitants of the Eastern Roman Empire, were already living in a deeply anthropogenic world, which makes their experience of nature surprisingly close to our own in the 21st century.

The Byzantine history encompasses two periods of intensification and a longer period of decrease in human impact on the Mediterranean landscape. While it was during the periods of increasing impact that we most clearly see the ways in which the Eastern Roman societies of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages transformed their landscapes, the early medieval interlude with its retracting anthropogenic pressure also remains of particular interest. In this period, there emerged new landscapes that resulted from the interplay of (secondary) ecological succession and the change in productive and cultural priorities of the societies that were at that time inhabiting the Eastern Mediterranean.

Fig. 1. Location of the key regions with clusters of pollen sites (from Izdebski et al. in *Jahrbuch Der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 2015). Additional data of good quality is also available from single sites in the following regions: Western Anatolia (Lake Bafa), Cappadocia (Lake Nar), Southern Italy (Lago di Pergusa, Alimini Lakes) Palestine (Dead Sea and a number of sites in the Galilee) and Transcaucasia (Lake Van and Lake Almalou [near Urmiah]).
Fig. 2. Cycles of intensification and decline in cereal pollen in four selected regions of the Byzantine world (based on Izdebski et al. in *Jahrbuch Der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 2015). These results should be interpreted as reflecting primarily the changes in the spatial extent of cereal cultivation.

Fig. 3. Cycles of intensification and decline in vine pollen in three selected regions of the Byzantine world (based on Izdebski et al. in *Jahrbuch Der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 2015). These results should be interpreted as reflecting primarily the changes in the spatial extent of vine cultivation.
Fig. 4. Changes in pine pollen: cycles of forest/scrubland retraction and secondary ecological succession onto abandoned fields and pastures in four selected regions of the Byzantine world (based on Izdebski et al. in *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 2015).

A quick look at the three diagrams presented above makes it clear that whereas all three phases (intensification-retraction-intensification) are visible in all of the regions, the chronologies of their development were different and we can only speak of a limited degree of synchronicity in the environmental history of Byzantium. It seems that in the case of the late antique increase in human impact we could identify both regions that underwent this phase relatively early (4th-5th c., such as Macedonia and South-Western Anatolia), as well as regions where the effects of the human pressure on the landscape started becoming visible only later, from the 5th c. onwards. Moreover, the diagrams also suggest that scale of the agricultural expansion differed from one region to another; the significant growth in vine or cereal pollen that we see in Central Greece, Macedonia (cereals only) and Eastern Bithynia, founds no parallel in South-Western Anatolia. Also, when we look at the ending dates, the agricultural landscapes of Late Antiquity seems to have persisted until relatively late in Central Greece and Eastern Bithynia, while in Macedonia, for instance, they started to disappear already in the 5th c. When if we considered regions beyond the diagrams and the map presented in this summary, an extreme cases of the late antique landscapes maintained well into the early Middle Ages is offered by Central Sicily, with the site of Lago di Pergusa, where the large-scale cereal cultivation that dominated the landscape in the 4th-5th c. continued until the 8th c. (when other regions of South Italy, such as Apulia, were already beginning to see a recover from more than a century of retracting human impact). If we looked further East, on the other hand, the inland sites in the Levant also offer evidence for the persistence of the late antique agricultural landscapes beyond the middle of the 7th c. In this context, the Middle Byzantine period compares interestingly to the late antique trajectories. In the high Middle Ages, each region experienced the increasing human
impact in different periods. If we put the starting dates for each region on the map, we would see how the landscapes of the Balkans and Anatolia were transformed starting with the regions located close to the Aegean in the south of Greece and Anatolia, then moving inlands, both northwards and eastwards (in the case of Anatolia). A closer analysis of the ending dates shows close temporal correlations with major historical "events", such as the coming of the Turks in Anatolia; it is possible to find this link also in the case of the late antique intensification cycle, as the ending dates often correspond to the collapse of the Roman political control in the region.

While it is possible to study the different landscape types on the regional level, for instance by tracing the changes in the balance of cultivated land and post-anthropogenic woodlands (cf. the fluctuations in pine pollen on Fig. 4), analysing the pollen data from each site individually makes it possible to put a specific landscape in the context of the region's political, ethnic and cultural history. Interestingly, the periods of increasing human impact usually resulted in the creation of relatively uniform landscapes across many regions, with a visible focus on the same set of cultivars, limited to some extent by the local environmental factors, such as climate. A decrease in human impact usually led to disintegration of such homogeneous productive landscapes, and the emergence of patchworks of landscapes that were dominated by successional vegetation (first of all, and in particular in Anatolia, pine scrublands and woodlands, but as the time passed the composition of such woodlands might have become more varied) and old as well as new forms of agricultural activity. In some sense, the phase of decrease could be seen as a period of innovation, with new types of productive landscapes and socio-ecological models emerging as a result of population movements or in response to changing local political conditions and a smaller degree of integration with the wider markets, or changes in the state pressure. It was during this period, for example, that we see the emergence of the open landscapes, clearly associated with pastoral activities, in the mountain ranges of the central Balkans.
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Some Thoughts on Climate Change, Local Environment and Grain Production in Byzantine Northern Anatolia

Since Anatolia was for several centuries the heart of the medieval eastern Roman empire, understanding how its climate impacted on the political, social and cultural history of the eastern Roman world would seem to be an important consideration. But only recently have historians begun to think about this seriously and to take into account the integration of high-resolution archaeological, textual and environmental data with longer-term low-resolution palaeo-environmental data, which can afford greater precision in identifying some of the causal relationships underlying societal change. In fact, the Anatolian case challenges a number of assumptions about the impact of climatic factors on socio-political organization and medium-term historical evolution. In particular, the study raises the question of how the environmental conditions of the later seventh and eighth centuries CE impacted upon the ways in which the eastern Roman Empire was able to weather the storm of the initial Arab-Islamic raids and invasions of the period ca. 650-740, how it was able to expand again in the tenth century and, following this recovery, what was the real environmental impact of the arrival of Turkish nomads? When looked at holistically, the palaeoenvironmental, archaeological and historical data reflect a complex interaction of anthropogenic and natural factors that throw significant light on the history of the empire and its neighbors.

The climatic regime prevailing across western Eurasia from the third-second century BCE into the late second century CE was relatively stable, warm and moist, in general conducive to intensive agriculture. Often referred to as the 'Roman Warm Period', it was characterised by conditions that minimised much of the usual risk and decadal variability associated with Mediterranean climate, and has been associated by many historians with the growth and consolidation of Roman military and political power and economic expansion; by the same token such conditions were also particularly favorable to the expansion of agriculture and population in central and northern Europe. This favorable climatic regime gave way from round about 200 CE to a far less settled regime, with a considerable degree of fluctuation between cold and dry, and warm and wet. In Anatolia regional variation appears to have been fairly marked; the southern Levant remained wetter until the early sixth century, when a phase of drier weather sets in; by the first half of the sixth century central Europe had become colder and drier.

But there were significant variations from region to region. Palaeoclimatic data indicate a somewhat wetter climate in much of Anatolia during the sixth and up to the middle of the eighth century, stretching in some areas into the ninth century. The point at which this phase ends varied according to whether we look at the data from the south west, the Aegean, the centre or the north. While it is important to be aware of the limited nature of the data, the evidence gives a reasonably good idea of the variations in the pace and nature of climate change, more particularly from humid to arid and from warm to cold, across Anatolia. The written evidence for the period hints at the
instability that such conditions promoted, with a comparatively greater number of severe winters and apparently unusually severe frosts and snows across the later sixth and into the eighth century in the Levant and some parts of Asia Minor, interspersed by occasional droughts and aridity-related events, as this tabulation is intended to illustrate.

This picture of the climate does not coincide with changes in land-use derived from pollen data, however. These suggest some marked regional and sub-regional variations in the vegetation that clothed the landscape, and this evidence together with archaeological data shows that the exploitable arable and pastoral land across Anatolia was (with variations according to local conditions), relatively intensively exploited into the sixth and seventh centuries. But the same data shows that beginning in the middle of the fifth century and peaking by the middle and later seventh century, this regime receded. The established pattern is gradually replaced at different rates according to area, in some cases by natural vegetation or, more usually, by a more limited range of crops. Cereal production and livestock raising now come to dominate, the cultivation of vines and olives recedes dramatically from many areas, and there is a considerable reduction in the presence of pollens from fruit trees of all types.

There seems to have evolved across much of Anatolia a simplified agro-pastoral regime, as well as a reduced level of activity. The onset of this simplification in the pattern of agrarian exploitation does not fit neatly with changes in climatic conditions. In some areas changes in what farmers grew may be paralleled by climatic shifts, in others there is no such parallel. We need to look for other causes underlying the changes and explaining also the continuities, and in this short paper I will suggest some alternative interpretations.
Climate, Ecology and Power in the Armenian Highlands, 7th-11th Century

The realm of Greater Armenia (Mec Hayk) was periphery to both the Roman and Persian respectively Arab Empire, but in the centre of struggles between the Great powers since the first century BCE. The Armenian highlands are characterised by a fragmentation of landscape by various mountain ranges and larger alluvial plains around rivers and lakes, which were of central economic importance, but also often show a delicate ecological balance with regard to temperatures, precipitation and evaporation [6; 24; 26]. These topographical parameters also fostered a fragmentation of political power among a number of aristocratic houses competing for power and prestige, which could also be enhanced by ties of patronage to an exterior superior imperial power. Especially this internal framework of political power allowed Byzantium, Persia or later the Caliphate to exert their influence within Armenia or even to divide it into spheres of interest. Yet it did not only restrict the chances of collective action of the Armenian aristocracy, but also the stability of foreign domination; just as the Armenian kings (up to 428 CE), also the representatives installed by the imperial overlords were not able to enforce universal allegiance to the suzerain. The “decentralized character” of power equally permitted the adaptation to the separation between various rulers and spheres of interest of the neighbouring empires and the existence of multiple layers of authority and loyalty [19; 20].

One central region of historical Armenia is the area around Lake Van (at an altitude of 1719 m above sea level); while one of the largest water bodies in the entire Near East (with 3740 km²), its alkaline water (pH-value of 9.8) makes it unsuitable for any agricultural use. Various mountain ranges fragment its environs in a series of smaller plains, which amount to only 15 % of the area around the Lake. One of the largest of these to the east of the Lake around the ancient and modern city of Van is characterised by a tenuous balance of precipitation, evaporation and temperature. From an early period onwards, when the Lake Van area became the core region of the Kingdom of Urartu between the 9th and 7th cent. BCE, larger installations of artificial irrigation were built in order to exploit the full agricultural potential of the area, such as the still visible, 54 km long Semiramis- or Menua-Canal which was also (re-)used in the medieval and modern period. Until before World War I, these installations irrigated the so-called (today abandoned) Garden City to the East of the ancient and medieval fortress of Van with up to 35,000 inhabitants [6; 13; 16; 35].

Due to its specific ecology, Lake Van also constitutes one of the most important archives of paleo-climatic and paleo-environmental conditions in the Near East, which has been used for various studies – the latest PaleoVan-project ranging back to 500,000 years BP. On the basis of the concentrations of pollen, charcoal and isotopes, reconstructions of past conditions of temperature and precipitation as well as of land cover and human impact were created, especially for the ancient period, where palynological data indicates the increase of cultivation in the time of emergence of the Kingdom of Urartu, but also during the 1st century BCE in the period of Armenian predominance in the region under King Tigran the Great [12; 33].
In addition, these “archives of nature” can be combined with “archives of society”, as the Swiss pioneer of climate history Christian Pfister has called them, such as written and archaeological/monumental evidence [18]. For Byzantine studies, most important in this regard is the pioneering work of Ioannis Telelis, who in two massive volumes in 2004 not only provided the first systematic survey of meteorological information in Byzantine and other sources for the medieval Eastern Mediterranean, but in several articles has outlined the methodological basis for a combination of the archives of society and of nature [27; 28]. The findings of Telelis were also used by Michael McCormick and his team for their “Geodatabase of Historical Evidence on Roman and Post-Roman Climate” (covering the period 100 BCE-800 CE), by John Haldon et alii for an article on the “Climate and Environment of Byzantine Anatolia” and by Elena Xoplaki et alii in their study on “The Medieval Climate Anomaly and Byzantium”; yet also these more recent studies do not provide additional data for the Armenian highlands beyond the findings of Telelis [5; 14; 34]. Thus, I have systematically surveyed the classical Armenian historiography especially for the period from the 5th to the 11th century CE for meteorological and other extreme events. So far, I was able to identify 53 years with such phenomena between 500 and 1150 CE and to verify these by comparisons with other sources from neighbouring regions respectively proxy-data; of these 53 events, 36 were not included in the catalogue of Telelis.

Similarly as for the Byzantine-Arab borderland, where recent studies especially on the basis of palynological evidence have highlighted a decline of land cultivation in areas around proxy sites (such as the Nar Gölü in Cappadocia) from the late 7th century onwards with can be connected to the effects of Arab raids and changes in the survival strategies of local population [1; 5; 8], by using our data, we can identify the turn from the 7th to the 8th and the 8th century as a period of a decline of human activity around Lake Van both in terms of agriculture and building activity [29; 30] (see fig. 1 and 3). This accords with our information on the impact of frequent rebellions against Arab rule and the reduction of the number of noble houses in Armenia in general, but also converges with a change of climatic conditions around Lake Van towards more humid, but also cooler conditions (see fig. 2); for the year 698, for instance, the chronicler Samuel of Ani even reports that the lake was entirely frozen up (for which very low temperatures were necessary due to the salinity of its water) [23; 27, nr. 240]. The destruction of Armenian aristocratic rule in various areas allowed for the emergence of new Muslim centres of power, also in core areas such as the Araxes valley or around Lake Van. But also various noble houses of Armenia, depending on their strategic position and their policies of confrontation or cooperation with Arab power, were able to profit from the disappearance of former competitors and to enlarge their dominions into new focal points of princedoms. Again, the Lake Van area, in the medieval Armenian geography the region of Vaspurakan, is an illustrative case. While in the 4th century, not less than 14 different noble houses ruled over portions of the province, especially from the 7th century onwards the vicissitudes of warfare contributed to a disappearance of most of them. From their relative peripheral (and thus better protected) ancient domain around modern-day Başkale (medieval Hadamakert in the Armenian district of Albag), the distinguished, but not too powerful noble house of Arcruni benefited from this process and expanded its territories especially in the 8th to 9th centuries towards the more fertile plains around Lake Van and towards the Araxes. The Arcruni princedom at the beginning of the 10th century (in 908) with Muslim consent would even rise to royalty in competition with the earlier established Armenian Kingdom of the Bagratuni in the north. Its establishment was accompanied by a process of increasing land
development and building activity, as environmental, monumental and historiographic evidence confirm and as is paralleled by similar developments in Cappadocia and the Byzantine frontier lands, where the end of continuous Arab raids and improving climatic conditions both fostered a re-expansion of land cultivation [22] (see fig. 1 and 3). Focal points of Armenian monumental building in that period can be found to the East and South of Lake Van, while at the northern and western shores the Arcruni had to share control with a number of Muslim Emirates. The most important monument of this period and also part of the UNESCO-world cultural heritage is the Church of the Holy Cross on the island of Altamar in Lake Van, erected under King Gagik Arcruni (904/908-ca. 943) and in its frieze both praising the king’s power and ancestry and the abundance of nature [10].

The period of wealth clearly ended in the 11th century, as a dramatic decrease of the number of monumental buildings and the concentration of charcoal in the sediments of Lake Van (as a proxy for human activity) indicates (see fig. 1 and 3); oxygen isotope data also hints at a significant change towards more arid conditions (see fig. 2). Furthermore, a combination of increasing threat from Turkmen nomadic groups, who defeated the army of the Arcruni in 1017, diplomatic pressure from Byzantium and internal precariousness of his position motivated King Yovhannes-Senekerim in 1022/1023 to hand over his kingdom to Emperor Basil II in return for new domains in Cappadocia, into which now an exodus of reportedly 14,000 families took place; this would have been a considerable reduction of the demographic potential (of maybe up to 250,000 people [35, p. 15-19]) of the Lake Van area (and in accord with our proxy data) [4, p. 137-141; 6, p. 28-30; 25; 31, p. 307-308; 32, p. 370-371]. Vaspurakan became a military province (a Katepanate) of the Byzantine Empire, which, however, was also not able to defend the region against the increasing Seljuk advance especially from the 1040s onwards [11, p. 145-177; 25]. Any collapse of defences here would open up the core regions of Byzantine Anatolia to invaders, as it did for the Seljuks, who advanced mainly through a corridor north of Lake Van and through the valley of the Araxes-river. T’ovma Arcruni continuatus reports: “When news of the kings’ [Senek’erim of Vaspurakan and Gagik II Bagratuni of Ani] departure from Armenia and the Roman control [of that country] reached the camp of the impious, bloodthirsty, ferocious race of Elim, then the ruler of the Elimites [= the Seljuks], who was called Sultan Tullup [Tögrîl], launched a cavalry attack like an eagle swooping on flocks of birds. Reaching the metropolis of Ani, he besieged it; having captured it, he put [the inhabitants] to the sword.” The Seljuk conquest of Ani actually took place in 1064, that is after the death of Sultan Tögrîl (in 1063), but the causal chain of events indicated by the author becomes clear [31, p. 308; 32, p. 371]. At the same time, the region was very much suitable for the nomadic lifestyle of core elements of the Seljuk retinue, as A. C. S. Peacock has demonstrated. Accordingly, Emperor Romanos IV Diogenes tried to get hold of the cities of Manzikert and Akhlat to the north of Lake Van in order to regain control over this corridor in summer 1071 [11, p. 145-177; 15; 17].

The Vaspurakan data thus seems to confirm the scenario of a climate-induced “Collapse of the Eastern Mediterranean” recently developed by Ronnie Ellenblum; according to his interpretation (and earlier work of Richard Bulliet) a change towards more arid and colder conditions in large areas of the Near East and Central Asia contributed to the destabilisation of regimes in the core agricultural regions and an increasing mobility of nomad groups from the Steppe which brought about the breakdown of polities, the advance of the Seljuks and finally also favoured the success of the First Crusade [2; 3]. In a recent paper, I tried to evaluate this scenario on the basis of a large number of proxy evidence for
climatic and agricultural conditions across the Near East (with a focus on Byzantium). It becomes evident that despite a general “cold trend”, we detect pronounced differences in the climatic and agricultural trajectories for different regions of the Near East and especially also within the Byzantine Empire in the 11th century. Besides other sources, pollen data indicates a continued agro-economic growth in Anatolia and Greece in most regions. Therefore, we cannot accept a scenario of general climate-caused “collapse” of Byzantium, but may assume a contribution of environmental factors to also otherwise crisis prone socio-political and military conditions [21; cf. also 9 and 34]. For Armenia, of course, the impacts of this crisis were long lasting and dramatic.

To contribute to this debate with new data and new concepts on the interplay of environment and human societies is also one aim of my study on Vaspurakan which is part of the larger project “Digitising Patterns of Power (DPP) - Peripheral Mountains in the Medieval World” which is funded at the Division for Byzantine Research/Institute for Medieval Research of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (PI: Mihailo Popović; http://dpp.oeaw.ac.at/). By a comparison of four regions (the Eastern Alps, the Moravia-Thaya regions at the Austrian-Czech border, historical Macedonia and Southern Armenia), an even more general analysis of these entanglements between nature and men in the medieval period is intended.
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Fig. 1: Number of larger building projects in the Lake Van region and charcoal index for core samples from sediments in Lake Van (Turkey) as proxy for human activity, 6th–15th cent. AD [from: 21; data: 29 resp. 33]

Fig. 2: Oxygen isotopes index for core samples from sediments in Lake Van (Turkey), 450–1450 AD [from 21; data: 33]
Fig. 3: Locations of larger building projects in the Lake Van region in four periods, 6th–12th cent. AD [maps: Johannes Preiser-Kapeller, 2015; data: 29]
Introduction

This communication aims to contribute to our question by presenting the results of recent archaeological inquiries that shed light on the transformations of the agrarian landscape in Southern Apulia, during the Middle Ages and particularly before the Norman conquest of Southern Italy.

Reference will be made to the excavations and archaeobotanical analysis led by the University of Salento (Lecce – Italy) in the hinterland of Otranto and Lecce during the last 25 years, as well as to the inquiries which I carried out east of Taranto. Here I led surveys and excavations in an area of about 400 km², around the towns of Manduria and Oria.

By way of an overall review, I should like to try to define some features of one or more agrarian systems, depending on trade flows and political and cultural tropisms, between the Late Antiquity and the Norman conquest.
1. A synchronic spatial view of the archaeological record

For several decades, geographers and archaeologists of Apulia region underlined the unequivocal correlation between the substratum and the settlement location: indeed, all the identified settlements, in all different prehistoric and historic periods, seem to be located on the same rock formations (Mørch, 1987). Particularly, that has been verified since 25-years by the archaeological inquiries led by Paul Arthur, Professor of Medieval Archaeology at the University of Lecce and his teams, which I was a part of.

The existence of a reliable pottery and charcoal database south of Lecce was very useful in order to compare my own evidence east of Taranto which I propose to set out in some detail. Here, the area south of Oria and around Manduria is, on one hand, representative of the main regional landscape features and, on the other hand, it was at the junction of different spatial identities of Medieval Apulia. So, I wanted to see if the supposed invariant distribution of the human land-use could adapt itself to economic, cultural and political evolutions.

This sector includes four sedimentary rock formations: a) hard Cretaceous limestone (Calcari di Altamura); b) soft Plio-Pleistocene limestone (Calcareniti di Gravina); c) Plio-Pleistocene predominantly clay soft limestone; d) Pleistocene sand, clay and loamy terraced deposits (Depositi Marini Terrazzati).

As a matter of fact, almost all the inventoried settlements are located on the terraced deposits and on the soft limestone. This strict correlation is verified on hundreds of cases across the region and seems to be justified by the presence of moderately deep, fertile soils, limestone quarries, a suitable substratum for building and water availability. These cultivated fields were cleared of their stones, which were then used to construct drystone fences enclosing olive-tree fields, vineyards or orchards. This dense patchwork of walls criss-crosses the entire landscape.

Calcari di Altamura are a very compact rock formation and the parental material of poor red soils. Furthermore, their impermeability and the typical karst phenomena prevent the surface aquifer, while the water table is often 100 m below ground. These features explain the present and recent soil use in these areas: spontaneous vegetation and extensive grazing; oil olive trees and fig trees; extensive cultivation of cereals. Moreover, the land divisions are here marked by rare but very big and long drystone walls, materializing huge estates or administrative boundaries. The exceptional location of a settlement on these soils is generally justified from a high-altitude perspective, which makes them excellent checkpoints.

Finally, the clay soft limestone formations occupy natural depressions which add to their marked impermeability. So, they are easily flooded zones. Secondly, you can’t find here quarry stone and a stable basis for buildings and roads. Also the low density of place names and the absence of field walls give a general impression of a non-built landscape (Napolitano, Stranieri, 2010; Stranieri, 2015).

2. A diachronic and global analysis of the medieval landscape

During the last four centuries of Antiquity, we observe a sharp decline in the number of settlements, with the same location and distribution that in the past. 19 settlements out of 37 are still occupied after the end of the 3rd c. The occupation of 14 of them in the 6th c. is attested only by African red slip ware D artefacts and some type of Late Roman amphorae.
In the following three centuries, only 5 settlements are attested from a little evidence: we don’t know if we assist to their “loss” or to their “archaeological invisibility”. Anyway, we can affirm that all of them existed in the previous phase. They can be considered as the sign of the continuation of the ancient settlement pattern, probably accompanied by any new dispersed settlement which forms we are unable to recognize.

Thereafter, a new dense settlement pattern emerges from our investigations from the 9th c. onwards as a result of the appearance of new diagnostic classes of locally produced and imported pottery. First, 4 of the 5 previous sites survive until the end of the Middle Ages. Above all, a lot of new settlements are progressively attested: they form a new settlement pattern, different from the ancient one. Such an evolution is in accord with the one highlighted by Paul Arthur south of Lecce, above a largest database (ARTHUR, 2012a; Id., 2012b).

Furthermore, we need to question the transformations of the entire human landscape and to build an historical approach to that. This requires rethinking our traditional “settlement-centred” approach to the historical landscape, in favour of a global vision of land-use by communities. East of Taranto, in a vast sector of hard limestone soils with no information about medieval settlement, I investigated a very large drystone wall, locally called paretone di Sava. Its dimensions and structure are impressive on the hard limestone (about 700 m long) while on the soft limestone soils it appears as a linear accumulation of the clearing result (about 1500 m long). Then, this big wall is interrupted when the land division it marks runs through the clay soils. This observation let us to qualify such a wall as the result of stone clearing in the aim to cultivate very poor soils. At the same time, it’s a marker of land division in the same areas. Then, some excavations let us to establish its construction from the end of 7th to the last quarter of the 9th c., on the basis of both pottery and charcoal analysis data (STRANIERI et al., 2009; GRASSO et al., 2012). So, in this very obscure phase of the Early Middle Ages, when a very little evidence for settlement exist in this sector, we observe the construction of an important land division.

Moreover, through analysis of hundreds of charcoals it was possible to insert the paretone within the surrounding landscape and its changes. The layers of paleosol, containing 7th c. pottery and 5th to 6th c. charcoals, produced a diagram which reveals a degraded scrubland dominated by Rhamnus (buckthorns), Myrtus communis (myrtle), Olea europea L. sylvestris (Mill) (wild olive tree), Smilax aspera (sarsaparilla), Quercus ilex (holm oak), Pistacia lentiscus (mastic tree) with overwhelming presence of heather (Erica sp.). This plant clearly indicates frequent fires and overgrazing from sheep and goats. Indeed, those animals detest heather, so they eat everything except that.

Instead, the spectrum from the first layers of the paretone shows a predominance of the holm oak. So, during an unknown space of time, the environs and the paleosol of the paretone – whose stones and soil were used in aim to build it – was colonised by the Mediterranean forest, which replaced the scrubland.

Then, the layers accumulated onto the west side of the wall after its construction show a spectrum which is largely dominated by olive oil trees: such dominance indicates a landscape of olive groves, where the agricultural work eliminated all possible concurrent species. Finally, the more recent layers of the infill and of the facing walls – which was remodelled in any successive moments – show a widest taxonomic variety: in addition to olive oil trees we have now several fruit trees which evoke a more various and open agrarian landscape. That is also compatible with the presence of cereals, which are attested by written sources.
3. An historical approach to territory, networks and exchanges

So, this sector of hard limestone substratum and very poor red soils appears, in Late Antiquity, as a vast scrubland overgrazed by sheep and goats. These activities are probably led by inhabitants of the two nearest settlements, located about 1 km north and south of our excavations. If the collection of artefacts in field survey attested them until the end of the 6th c., it’s now possible to suggest their activity in the 7th c. and even in the 8th c. These little centres are both located along two roads east-west oriented which belong to two different orthogonal land division blocks. These grids are oriented in the same way that those studied in the eastern periphery of Taranto, dating from the 2nd c. BCE. Hence, in this period, this pastureland appears to be linked to the supply of Taranto, the big city located 30 km away. On the contrary, this area doesn’t seem to have strict connections with Brindisi, which influence extend itself north of Oria.

During the following period, which duration is uncertain (any decades until two centuries), we assist to the abandonment of this poor agricultural land. At the same time, the two nearest settlements are “invisibles”. Then, in this uncultivated landscape, the paretone is built before the end of the 9th c., probably in the context of an agricultural recovery corresponding to the implantation of large olive groves. This large drystone wall could play a role in identifying and protecting an agrarian estate. It insists on the ancient orthogonal land division system.

Simultaneously, the opening of a new road links this sector to Oria. In fact, the remains of land division system generated by this road cut the previous roman frames and were recovered by the new land division pattern of the road relying three towns founded in the 14th c. (Francavilla Fontana, Sava, Maruggio). We know that Oria replaced Brindisi as the bishop residence in an unknown moment, before the half of the 9th c., at the same time it became a strategic pole of the Longobardian Apulia, before becoming a pole of the Byzantine administration after the entire region reintegrated the Empire, at the end of the 9th c.

At the same time, a lot of new villages emerge from documentation, on the fertile soft limestone soils south of Oria as elsewhere in the region. We can suggest that this phenomenon is justified from a new external demand for agricultural products, which reintegrated Southern Apulia to a largest economic space. This is confirmed by the come back of imported fine pottery and byzantine coins. In addition, the recent excavations led at Oria let us discovery clear indications of agrarian-based wealth, as a lot of equipments to roast and stock cereals and oil mills (COCCHIARO et al., 2015). So, since probably the 9th c., even the arid and rocky soils located west and south of Sava were cleared, planted by olive oil trees and annexed to the economic space of Oria.

Hence, all the land-use, settlement pattern and space organization indicators suggest that at the end of the 9th c., at the latest, the Oria basin was massively exploited for the olive growing. That corresponds to the abundant results coming from the archaeological inquiries south of Lecce. Indeed, a similar land-use scenario is attested by the excavations led by Paul Arthur and Girolamo Fiorentino on the sites of different deserted medieval villages (Alimini lakes, immediately north of Otranto, Apigliano, Supersano, etc.), where the massive destination of the land to olive cultivation is attested from the 8th c. (ARTHUR et al., 2012; DI RITA, MAGRI, 2009). At the same time, different forms of amphorae for bulk transport were produced by pottery kilns which were excavated at Otranto (ARTHUR et al., 1992; LEO IMPERIALE, 2004; Id., 2014).
These results about the Apulian agrarian landscape during the last two thousand years let us define a correlation between indicators of extensive olive cultivation – comprising the least fertile type of soil –, archaeological markers of movement of goods between the two sides of the Adriatic Sea and periods during which Byzantine rule in the entire or a part of the region is attested by sources. Therefore, a credible scenario is taking shape whereby the massive exploitation of vast sectors of Apulia to the olive production would be justified by its reintegration in the large Adriatic and East Mediterranean trade networks, as a result of the military successes of the Empire under the Macedonian emperors of the late 9th c. On the one hand, numerous indicators show the increasing import of luxury artefacts from Constantinople and Balkan regions, from the 9th c. On the other hand, the export of the surplus oil production seem to become the main source of wealth for regional communities and elites (LEO IMPERIALE, 2015; ARTHUR, 2012c).

However, it is not just a question of integration in a large economic space, because the same region was very differently and variously exploited over the whole Roman period, as written sources and archaeology show very well. So, a massively olive production – certainly encouraged by nature of soils and climate – seem to be a specific and original choice and probably a determining marker of the Middle Byzantine Empire, with consequences which are still visible in the south-eastern part of Italy.
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Water in Byzantium

Joseph Tainter observed that states and societies faced with adversity and chaos “may simplify so that they are less costly, or people may otherwise reduce consumption. This was the strategy of the Byzantine Empire when it lost its wealthiest provinces in the seventh century A.D. and responded with what may be history’s only example of a large, complex society systematically simplifying” (Tainter 2000 and Tainter 2006: 72). We can point to tarnish and wear on the Roman state and her infrastructure well before the seventh century’s losses, but the essence of Tainter’s conclusion remains intact, and even runs parallel to the arguments of John Haldon’s most recent book, *The empire that would not die* (2016). The ‘simpler’ Byzantine society that emerged after the seventh century was, arguably, more ideologically and religiously complex than its predecessor, but undeniably critical for Byzantium’s survival was its ability to simplify the extraction and management of its resources, including water. While historians and archaeologists have tended to over-emphasize the functional continuity or collapse of aqueducts – aqueducts were either simply maintained or abandoned – an assessment of the fragility or resilience of these systems is arguably more meaningful. In my brief discussion of water, I will outline the heavy burdens and vulnerabilities imposed by imperial Roman aqueduct systems before charting the paths by which the Late Roman state gradually disinvested both practically and ideologically from aqueducts.

The imperial legacy of Rome created heavy hydraulic burdens for urban water supply in the Eastern empire. We can characterize these burdens as follows:

First, aqueducts quickly proliferated by the hundreds across the Roman world in the first and second centuries CE. This proliferation should be correlated to techno-ideological developments in the Roman world-view and the organization of cities. Aqueducts naturalized a city’s ownership of distant, hinterland spring sources by linking springs to the heart of cities where they supplied fountains and baths which – as a coherent and centralized system for urban water supply and consumption – were quickly subsumed into state ideologies and popular conceptions concerning the proper accoutrements of urban life. For instance Menander the Rhetor, in the early fourth century, tells us that when provincial governors visited cities, their *epibaterion* or speech of arrival lavished praise on aqueducts, which had become quintessential elements in the architectural ‘tool-kit’ of Roman urbanism, alongside walls and temples (or later, churches) (Menander Rhetor, *Treatise II* 386.22–30). By concealing the social and technical processes that contributed to urban water supplies, as water trickled over tens of kilometers from springs into fountains, aqueducts produced the miracle or *thauma* of water appearing where it did not naturally belong in otherwise-dry cities or atop mountain sanctuaries of the gods (Kaika 2005: 100-5 and Richard 2012). This technological development, de-linking the consumption of water from its spring sources, was a critical step towards what Marx called the ‘fetishization of commodities,’ excepting the important fact that money was never involved: Roman water was provided *gratis* to the public via fountains, with private supplies to houses provided from the water mains on the basis of office and rank (*CJ* 11.42/43.7 = *Bas*. 58.19.7).
Second, to speak of financial and technical burdens, the construction and maintenance of urban water systems entailed immense investments for cities and the state which were endangered by war, natural disasters, and negligence. The costs and vulnerabilities of aqueduct systems were direct functions of their length, their visibility as regards arcaded bridges, and their technical sophistication insofar as aqueduct systems could include not only simple cut-and-cover channels along a gradient, but also dams or inverted siphons prone to malfunction. The logistics and outlays required by the simple five-kilometer gravity aqueduct at Cappadocian Tyana were thus quite different than the technically complex twenty-kilometer inverted-siphon aqueduct at Pamphylian Aspendos, though the end result was the same: flowing water for fountains and baths at the line’s terminus. Aqueducts were the most expensive projects undertaken by the Roman state and her cities, achieved through a variety of funding mechanisms that included direct imperial support (SEG 34.1122), an array of bureaucratic approaches to cost management that included civic subscriptions (SEG 28.1218) and private appeals to imperial authorities for subventions of cost (SEG 57.1673), as well as quite sizable private donations (3 million denarii for the Aspendos aqueduct, IGRP III.804). Apart from indications of cost provided by inscriptions, significant work on the logistics or energetics of this architecture has also been accomplished in recent decades: such work aims to reverse-engineer standing architecture to assess the human costs of labor required for construction. A group of German engineers completed such an investigation for construction of the Side aqueduct, and concluded that roughly 500 persons working full-time, 365 days a year for three years would have been required to bring the aqueduct into operation (Engels et al. 1983). The thirty kilometer length and low-grade sophistication of the Side aqueduct places the labor investments for its construction on the lower end of the spectrum of possibility: by comparison, the long-distance channels carrying water to Constantinople from Vize total more than 551 kilometers in length (Crow 2008 and for outlays on this system’s repair, Theophanes AM 6258).

Third, aqueducts promoted a particular hierarchy of water potability which understood spring water to be the best of all things. After disagreements about the comparative value of different water sources during the Classical and Hellenistic periods – compare Plato’s love of springs (Critias 110-112) with Hippocrates’ suggestion that fresh rainwater was best for consumption, with the caveat that it spoiled quickly (Airs, Waters, Places 7-9) – by the Roman period authorities like Pliny the Elder (Natural History 31) and Athenaeus (Deipnosophistae II.35A-47E) found consensus when they argued for the priority of spring water consumption, a habit enabled by aqueducts. Springs, collected at their source before confluence with larger stream and river systems, were the universally preferred source for aqueducts: surface water from rivers or lakes was only rarely employed (Hodge 2002: 69). Water from cisterns and wells became the target of aspersions scattered widely throughout Roman and Late Antique literature, especially after the first and second century’s proliferation of aqueducts across the empire. These aspersions and preferences for spring water find their archaeological corollary in the in-filling or abandonment of urban wells and cisterns, contemporary with or soon after aqueduct construction in the empire’s cities (for instance at Caesarea Maritima, Lenzen 1983: 22-30). Such actions created over-dependence on aqueduct systems, leaving cities with inadequate backup supplies. By Late Antiquity, unrest and violence created by water shortages and breakdowns in aqueduct systems arguably became a common-enough feature of urban life (e.g. Mayerson 1986 for Caesarea Maritima). Yet the state had little interest in promoting water supply from wells or cisterns, which were perceived to be unbecoming for a city of rank, and cause for construction of
a spring-fed aqueduct: this sentiment is conveyed at so late a date as the early sixth century, in a
panegyric for the emperor Anastasius (Chauvot 1986: 18-19 and 43-44). Conceptions of imperial
health and prosperity were consistently bound up with the imagery of springs and endless bounties
of running spring water (e.g. Corippus, In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris Libri IV: 1.15-51).

The later sixth century represents a critical tipping point of growing awareness, visible in literary
sources and the archaeological evidence, of the weaknesses and vulnerabilities of overdependence
on urban aqueduct systems. The work entitled Ktismata, De Aedificis, or Buildings by Procopius
of Caesarea -- written during the latter years of the emperor Justinian's reign -- is an especially
clear witness to an evolving imperial Roman relationship between water, nature, and the built
environment mediated by infrastructure like aqueducts (Pickett 2016).

Procopius does not merely mimic inherited literary topos that praise emperors and cities for
its springs, aqueducts, fountains, and baths (contra Cameron 1985, 86 and 111). Rather, Procopius
manages to describe changing ideologies and practices of water management with conservative
language and concepts; and to expand the range of water management projects with which
emperors were traditionally associated. To judge from his comments in the Secret History (26),
these developments may have been distasteful to the author. Indeed, the descriptions of water in
the first book of the Buildings, which describes Constantinople, are deeply incongruous with regard
to their historical precedents. First: Constantinople's aqueducts are not the object of Procopius's
praise, though these were standard elements in the praise of cities: rather they are only mentioned
because they are susceptible to seasonal shortages (Buildings 1.11.10-11). Second: Justinian offered
his patronage to a church built at the Zoodochos Pege, which was without precedent for a basileus
(1.3.1-10). Third: Justinian's patronage of construction at the Basilica Cistern (1.11.12-15) is
completely anomalous and without historical precedent, because: a) cisterns previously were within
the purview of middling elite and episcopal activities, not emperors, and b) Procopius explicitly
identifies the economization or conservation of water, rather than the production of its abundance,
as the project's goal. These introductory remarks are an effective billboard which advertises the
extent to which water permeates the Buildings in incongruous and unexpected ways.

Throughout the remainder of the Buildings, Procopius points to changes in the Roman habitus
of water supply and consumption at the very highest levels of state: limiting our remarks here to
aqueducts, we might draw attention to concerns for the sources of aqueducts, their defensibility,
and the relationship of the church to urban aqueduct systems. First: Justinian is described as
considerably more permissive than his predecessors as regards the sources of aqueducts and urban
water supplies. Where so-recent an emperor as Anastasius was allegedly aggrieved by the thought
of rain- and ground-water as primary sources of drinking water in cities, Justinian patronized
their construction enthusiastically (2.10.14, 4.8.18, etc.) and arguably elevated their status in the
traditional Roman hierarchy of drinking water sources by installing ornate, monumentalized wells
and cisterns at Hagia Sophia (Patria 4.22 and 4.26). Döring's (2012) recent study of remains from
the Iron Gate dam at Syrian Antioch, described by Procopius (Buildings 2.11.15-20), has indicated
that this project – in one of the chief cities of the empire – entailed a change in supply sources of
Antioch's water, replacing a spring-fed source with torrential rain water collected behind the dam.
Similarly, at Mesopotamian Dara, Procopius describes how channelized river water became a viable
alternative to a spring-fed aqueduct (2.2.24-5). Second: throughout the Buildings (e.g. 2.11.2-7) and
the Wars (e.g. 4.1.1, 5.10.1f, 6.9.1f), Procopius expresses concern for the defensive vulnerability
of aqueducts. Where the striding arches of imperial Roman aqueducts had advertised the path of water entering cities, Procopius’s concern for the visibility and security of urban water supplies is mirrored by the widespread Late Antique practice of replacing highly-visible and -vulnerable bridge and tunnel systems with buried pipelines, for reasons of security and technical simplicity or ease of repair. Third: Procopius alludes to a developing relationship between water infrastructure and the church (e.g. Buildings 2.3.24, 5.9.36). The responsibility of bishops and local elites for infrastructure like aqueducts and walls was newly enshrined by Justinianic legislation (CIC Nov 149.2 = Bas. 6.3.44.14), but such recognition only formalized a reality which had existed in some cities for more than two centuries. Indeed, a careful comparative assessment of the archaeology of the Eastern empire’s fifty-six archbishoprics, included in this round-table session’s presentation, demonstrates the great and occasionally innovative range of scenarios by which episcopal complexes were or were not anchored into municipal water supply schemes after the fourth century, often in competition with other local elites (e.g. for Ephesus, see Pickett 2016). The involvement of these actors contributed to the long-term up-ending of imperial Roman standards for patterns of supply and consumption alike. In this sense, the freer hand of bishops’ and local elites’ efforts at water management after the fourth century anticipated comparable developments which appear much later in Procopius.

The Justinian of Procopius’s account is depicted as an arbiter of water conservation practices unheard of at the level of imperial patronage, with indiscriminant tastes for water not only from springs but also from rain or wells. These were no mere rhetorical inventions of Procopius, but arguably reflected real changes of priority at the imperial level. Such changes elevated the status of ground- and rain-water sources in the Late Roman imagination, and thereby responded to inherent weaknesses and vulnerabilities of imperial Roman dependency on urban aqueduct systems with a broadened palette of acceptable options for supply, a developed sense for water conservation strategies, and a pragmatism that made settlement abandonment or infrastructure withdrawal feasible options for survival. Justinian’s imperial innovations persevered, or at least became commonly accepted, because his successors are connected not only to aqueducts, but also to alternative sources of water from reservoirs, cisterns, and wells (e.g. Chronicon Paschale ann. 609 and Vita Basilii 92.14-23). Such developments represent the culmination of several centuries of bottom-up water management evolution, now promulgated from the top-down by the imperial authority.

Roman aqueducts, despite their status as technological marvels, were deeply vulnerable systems for the supply of cities. Late Antique tendencies towards simplification, conservation, and broadened palettes of water potability, as outlined by Procopius in the Buildings, find wide archaeological and literary corollaries after the fourth century (Izdebski et al. 2015: 201-4). In this sense, Justinian was no real innovator, but merely a late accepter who redefined the role of emperor and empire in expectations for urban water management. Taken together, the range of evidence promotes the perspective that, though many of the empire’s aqueducts had been felled by sudden catastrophe, disrepair, or gradual abandonment – if not by Justinian’s time then certainly by the seventh century’s introduction of the thematic system – the empire had already begun to abandon the aqueduct as a conceptual prerequisite for cities, and thereby taken important steps towards a more simplified, resilient conception of urban water supply which would facilitate its survival well into the next millennium.
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Fig. 1. The Eastern empire’s aqueducts: archaeological remains (in blue) and as attested by inscription (in green).
Grasping Byzantine Waterways in the Southern Balkans on the Basis of Medieval Textual Evidence, Early Modern Cartography and Contemporary Surveying

Scholarly publications on the waterways and their navigability in the historical region of Macedonia are quite scarce. Although fruitful syntheses of sources and their interpretation exist in some cases – like those written by Ivan Duridanov, Elisaveta Todorova or Siniša Mišić, numerous questions remain unanswered.

The main rivers in the region, for example the Vardar / Axios or the Struma / Strymon, can be encountered in various sources and contexts on a regular basis. In the literary work entitled “Timarion”, which is a satire dating to the first half of the 12th century, the river Vardar / Axios is described as follows: “[…] we went to the Axios River to hunt. This is the biggest river in Macedonia. Originating in the Bulgarian mountains, it flows first in small and separate streams, then contracting into a single basin for its descent, “bravely and well” as Homer would say, it runs down towards old Macedonia and Pella and empties itself immediately at the nearest shore.” [Timarion (Baldwin), p. 43]

This river was called Axios in Antiquity and in medieval times amongst educated Greek and Byzantine authors. The hydronym Axios derives most probably from the Iranian word “axšaēna” meaning “dark, black”. A medieval variant is the hydronym Bardarios (Βαρδάριος). In Old Serbian the river is attested as Velika (sc. rěka), i.e. “huge river” [APantel. 167 (Nr. 4); Životi Kral. 44; Danilo II. 90].

For example, in king Milutin’s charters for the monastery of Saint George in the vicinity of Skopje from the year 1300 the following source-based evidence can be found: ṣдь велике рѣ̀ке [Gramoti na manastirot Sv. Georgi-Gorg Skopski 216]; ṣб ону страну велике рѣ̀ке (HM SDS 132, Zeile 26); ѹ великоу рѣ̀коу (HM SDS 132, line 146-147); низь великау рѣ̀коу (HM SDS 132, line 147).

The river Vardar / Axios, which has a length of approximately 350 km, has its source in the mountainous region in the vicinity of the town of Gostivar, has many confluents, runs through the city of Skopje to the south-east and finally flows into the Aegean to the west of Thessaloniki [Mehlan (1939), p. 252; Todorova (1984), p. 47]. When the Byzantine emperor Basil II traversed surprisingly the swollen river Vardar / Axios in 1003, Samuel had to retreat from Skopje [Iō. Skyl. 346; Iō. Zôn. Epit. XVI 8, 14 (p. 560)]. In the 12th century the Byzantine historian Nikephoros Bryennios is locating the river between the towns of Strumica and Štip [Nik. Bryenn. 285 (IV 18)]. The river is described to be flowing around the fortress Prosakos of the local ruler Dobromir Hrs at the end of the 12th century [Nik. Chōn. 502; Nik. Chōn., Or. 107, 109; Theod. Skut. 422]. In 1299 a Byzantine embassy to the Serbian king Milutin exchanged hostages kata meson ton potamon Bardarion [Geòrg. Pach. II 285]. The Vardar / Axios is also mentioned by the Byzantine historian Nikephoros Gregoras in 1326, who was part of a Byzantine embassy to the Serbian court. He is also attesting the navigability of the Vardar / Axios in Byzantine times [Nik. Grég. 380].
What we lack in many cases is research on the confluents of the above-mentioned huge rivers in the historical region of Macedonia, which offer amongst others interesting hints to the local transportation infrastructure in medieval times. Essential hints in this respect are those to the fords through which rivers were crossed. The terms used in the written sources do not provide unambiguous indications about the nature of these passages. In general the Byzantine term πόρος (“ford, ferry, bridge”; Liddell/Scott/Jones (1996), p. 1450f.) corresponds to the Old Slavonic term brodŭ [Miklosich (1977), p. 45; Mišić (1999); Mišić (2007), p. 155-172]. The definition of a ford then and now is most probably the same and reads as follows: “Bestimmte Stellen eines fließenden Gewässers, die bei normalem Wasserstand von Fußgängern oder mit Fahrzeugen durchquert werden können. Beim Durchfurten sind Strömungsgeschwindigkeit, Gewässertiefe und Beschaffenheit des Grundes zu berücksichtigen. Die Durchquerung einer Furt zu Fuß ist bei festem Grund möglich: – bis zu Kniehöhe bei reiβendem Wasser, – bis zu Bauchhöhe bei mittlerer Strömungsgeschwindigkeit, – bis zu Brusthöhe bei träge fließendem Wasser.” [Zewedin (1991), p. 54; cf. also Mehlan (1939), p. 270]

The Serbian scholar Gavro Škrivanić has already indicated the difficulties in the translation of both terms πόρος and brodŭ. According to him the depth as well as the width of the respective river determined, if a ford was walkable or if a ferry barge was needed to cross the water course [Škrivanić (1974), p. 23; Mehlan (1939), p. 276]. In principle, four different means existed to cross rivers in medieval times, if we leave the existence of a bridge aside:

a) Rivers could be either forded by foot or traversed by mount or by cart.

b) The respective passage across a river could have a masoned substructure in the riverbed in order to facilitate its crossing, as was the case in Marmarion on the lower Strymon in the vicinity of the ancient town of Amphipolis. This substructure was destroyed in the wake of river regulations in the 1830s [Soustal, Makedonien (in preparation)].

c) Rivers could be crossed with boats, which was done by a Byzantine embassy together with the Byzantine historian Nikephoros Gregoras in 1326. According to Gregoras the embassy counted 140 men and pack animals and had only one (!) small boat [ἀκάτιον; cf. Liddell/Scott/Jones (1996), p. 48] at its disposal to traverse the river of Strymon at Amphipolis [[Nik. Grēg. 375; Belke (2002), p. 83f.].

d) Instead of a boat, a ferry barge (in German “Prahm”) could be used, which was pulled across a river with the help of ropes or of chains spanned over the respective water course [Mehlan (1939), p. 276]. Diaries of Austro-Hungarian officers on surveying missions in the Ottoman Empire from the second half of the 19th century report that the officers were not able to ford the river of Struma in the vicinity of the town of Petrić in June 1874, but had to use a poorly kept ferry barge: “Überfuhr über Struma, schlechte Fähre für 10 Pferde. Struma 200 Schr:[itt] [200 Schritt equate 150 m] breit erdige Ufer, schlammiger Boden, 4-5’ Tiefe [4-5 Schritt equate 3-3,75 m], an einer Stelle 3-4’ Gesch:[windigkeit] [3-4 Schritt equate 2,25-3 m], sonst träger Lauf. Nicht durchfurbar”. [Austrian State Archives / Kriegsarchiv B III c 19-04, Marsch 31]

The difficulties in localising fords remain largely unresolved as a consequence of river regulations in the 20th and 21st centuries in the Southern Balkans. It might be of interest to point out that the majority of named fords bear the first names or the surnames of their owners or beneficiaries (i.e. Syrmanos, Staurakes, Phrankopulos, Bodin etc.). Besides, the designation of fords can also describe
certain features of the surrounding landscape like the πόρος τῆς Κερασέας, which derives from the Greek word κερασέα meaning “cherry-tree” [Liddell/Scott/Jones (1996), p. 941].

Apart from the above-mentioned huge rivers of Vardar / Axios and Struma / Strymon I would like to introduce the river of Strumica (Strumešnica), being a confluent of the Struma / Strymon, and the river of Kriva Lakavica, being a confluent of the rivers Bregalnica and Vardar / Axios, into the discourse.

As I have argued in a former publication of mine [Popović (2010), p. 427f.], there is no clear proof for the continuous navigability of the river Strumica (Strumešnica) between the 13th and the 16th centuries. The same conclusion is also true for the river Kriva Lakavica. However, what can be found in the medieval charters, is evidence for the existence of several passages across both rivers, which played a vital role for the transportation networks of the respective areas. Altogether four passages are indicated by name in the valley of the river Strumica (Strumešnica). Whereas two fords (πόρος τῆς Κερασέας; πόρος τοῦ Συρμάνου) mentioned in the year 1320 can only be roughly located in the vicinity of the village of Palaiokastron (Veljusa), two others (πόρος τοῦ Σταυράκη, brodĭ Stavrakĭ; πόρος τοῦ Φραγκοπούλου, Frugopulovi brodĭ) were successfully placed on the basis of delimitations described in the medieval charters [Popović (2014), p. 122-139].

According to Mirjana Živojinović, the ford of Staurakes is to be located at the confluence of the river Turija into the river Strumica, approximately 11 km to the east of the town of Strumica and immediately to the south-west of the village of Turnovo. The ford of Phrankopulos lies about 24 km east-south-east to the town of Strumica, that is directly to the south of the village of Novo Konjarevo [Živojinović (2008), p. 219].

During my survey in the area in August / September 2010 I tried to locate the ford of Staurakes. Due to the fact that the river Strumica had been regulated, and the area was covered with vegetation, no decisive result could be obtained in situ. It could be that the ford was immediately downriver from the confluence of the river Turija into the river Strumica. However, the inhabitants of the nearby village of Turnovo are not familiar with the existence of a ford, because a bridge is nowadays used in this section in order to traverse the river. The same result was found in the case of the ford of Phrankopulos in the vicinity of the village of Novo Konjarevo. Again river regulations impeded us from obtaining a reliable result.

In addition to these four passages across the river Strumica (Strumešnica) mentioned by name, an Old Slavonic medieval charter from 1376/77 lists an unknown number of nameless fords in connection with the boundaries of the villages of Mokrino, Mokrievo, Borisovo and Gabrovo. All these villages lay and still lie on the right (southern) shore of the river Strumica (Strumešnica). Thus, the fords were used without doubt to enable an interaction with the main route of transportation between the towns of Strumica and Petrič on the left (northern) shore of the river.

In the case of the valley of the river Kriva Lakavica the “Praktikon of Konče” (after 1366) lists three fords (podĭ Bodinovi brodĭ; konĭ Livadna broda; na brode Priševiskomî) in the vicinity of the village of Konče [Solovjev (1955), p. 88f.]. Although their localisation is not possible because of the scarcity of information in the written sources, they were most probably used for the crossing of the river Kriva Lakavica. A survey in the area in September 2010 made it clear that nowadays the river can be forded at any place. One proper crossing is located for example in the immediate vicinity of the Ottoman funerary monument “Gazi Evrenos”.

842
Last but not least, examples of early modern maps will be presented (e.g. the map of Freiherr von der Goltz and French maps of the Salonica Front from 1915 until 1918), which enable a localisation of microtoponyms as well as of fords in the area of research.
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From the Fields to the Pot: Food Choice and Availability in Byzantium

Introduction

The word ‘landscape’ in archaeological terms refers to anything involving the interaction between humans and the natural environment, a much researched and debated issue in the framework of archaeological field or landscape projects. Landscape archaeologists have been heavily relying on environmental, economic and geographical approaches, placing emphasis on land use, resource exploitation, and settlement topography. On the other hand, the study of foodways, “as an interrelated system of food conceptualisation, procurement, distribution, preservation, preparation and consumption”, goes hand-in-hand with landscape and environmental exploration.

A variety of different methodologies and specialisations are nowadays available for the holistic approach to food choice and preferences in the past, including ceramology, zooarchaeology, palynology, chemistry, historical geography, philology and art history. This contribution aims to explore issues of food choice and availability in Byzantium by combining ceramic data from different parts of the Eastern Mediterranean with textual sources and visual imagery, as well as palynological studies, zooarchaeological and organic residue analyses, drawing relative information from the countryside around Sagalassos in South-west Asia Minor, and several sites in Cyprus.

Cookware and tableware shapes

The application of interdisciplinary approaches to material and visual culture developed in Northwest Europe has allowed various scholars working on the medieval Aegean to identify a shift in tableware shapes, from the large open dishes of the Byzantine era (10th to late 12th century) to the deep bowls of small rim diameter of the succeeding High Middle Ages (early 13th to middle/late 15th century). This change is well attested in the archaeological record and visual imagery, and is thought to suggest a shift from Byzantine-style vegetable or fish dry or semi-dry dishes to more western-inspired liquid dishes, such as meat stews, in the period that followed Latin domination in the area.

However, the transmission of established forms in the artistic vocabulary of the Byzantine and Latin periods, used extensively in medieval food studies, has rarely been taken into account. For example, the iconographic pattern of a large communal dish or bowl with two cups or chalices on either side on Middle Byzantine Last Supper scenes, repeated also in later centuries, does not always depict everyday reality or the shift from communal to individual dining, nor the preference of dry over liquid dishes and vice versa. This iconographic pattern could have become a standard form in the artistic vocabulary rather than a real representation of dining or cooking practices. Thus, cooking vessels and other archaeological and environmental information may tell us more, operating as direct sources of evidence, about diet and food preferences from one period to another in comparison to table vessels or their iconographic representations.

Features such as the size or shape of a ceramic vessel and its distribution can also provide evidence for changes in diet and cooking practices, in combination with references in textual sources. Given the aforementioned traditional picture that Byzantine diners favoured dry dishes,
vegetables and roasted meat, scholars have assumed that it was the Latins of the Fourth Crusade who introduced the use of wet heat and the preparation of meat stews into the Aegean lands and the Eastern Mediterranean, around the beginning of the 13th century. Louise Joyner’s (2007) study of the shape of late 13th-14th-century (Frankish) cooking pots from Corinth seems to support this hypothesis: the pots have a taller neck that “was probably an adaptation to retain a greater proportion of liquid, keeping the stew relatively moist.” However, cooking pots of the 12th-13th centuries (Byzantine) from the site of Sagalassos exhibit similar characteristics; they have a closed shape, a rounded body, a small rim diameter, and a relatively high neck. These vessels would also appear to have been designed “for greater heat and water retention, through stewing and boiling, generally leading to the production of semi-liquid foods.” Thus, the cooking pots from several Byzantine sites pose the question of whether the inhabitants of Byzantine or previously Byzantine lands were enjoying meaty stews prior to any Western influence on their cuisine.

Paul Arthur (2007) has shown that throughout the ancient world, the distribution of open cooking pots (or casseroles) seems to coincide with the distribution of areas in which faunal assemblages are dominated by sheep and goat, whereas closed globular cooking vessels (or ollae) are generally a feature of more Northern areas (from Britain across the Rhineland to central Europe), where cattle- and pig-breeding was dominant. If Arthur’s model is correct, then the Byzantine flat- and round-bottomed closed cooking pots from Sagalassos and other sites in Anatolia, as well as from Constantinople, Corinth and mainland Greece, should correspond to a diet rich in cattle and pig, rather than sheep and goat. But the combination of such a model with our ceramic data and other types of evidence is not as straightforward.

Our ongoing research on cooking-pot technology and foodways in Cyprus, combining textual evidence and visual imagery with ceramic typology, fabric petrography and organic residue analyses, has been revealing in terms of food availability and choice on the island. Although cookware from Cyprus presents a wider variety of shapes of the 12th-16th centuries, the main ones comprise of (a) closed globular pots with short or long necks in the 12th-14th centuries and (b) open pans with shallow body and concave base in the 15th-16th centuries. Interestingly enough, this long survival of the ‘Byzantine-style’ closed cookware shape well into the 14th and its partial replacement by a shallower form in the 15th century is supplemented by a technological distinction between two main fabrics (on the basis of petrographic analysis), each one corresponding to one of the two aforementioned vessel shapes and chronological phases. This technological change in cooking-pot fabrics and shapes in the 15th century could be related to a range of social and technological factors, such as changes in dietary habits that had an impact on pottery production and/or technological changes in established cooking-pot traditions. What the evidence from Cyprus suggests is that this change cannot be related to influences brought in by the new Frankish elite, which was well-established on the island by the early 13th century.

Landscape data and scientific analyses

The analysis of other data and factors, and the employment of a more holistic approach are of emergency here in order to appreciate such complex phenomena and counterbalance the evidence from Byzantine cookware-shapes. The results of three methods of lipid analysis of Byzantine cooking-pot samples from Sagalassos revealed a 12th-13th-century food pattern different from that of the Late Antique town population from the same site: the diet of the Byzantine population seems to have relied on animals with a high meat yield, mainly beef, followed by pork. On the other hand, study
of the faunal remains from the Byzantine layers has shown the clear dominance of beef, followed by pork, and to a much lesser extent by sheep and goats, among the meat consumed from domestic animals. The presence of game (red deer and fallow deer) is noted rather frequently, representing about 10% of the consumed animals. The increased proportion of red deer and fallow deer may point to a change in vegetation: because deer prefer landscapes that include forested sections, it is possible that the environment around Sagalassos was much more wooded during the 12th-13th centuries than it had been in preceding periods.

It should be noted, that beginning in the 11th century, the arrival of Seljuk nomads in this part of Asia Minor would have brought instability to the region. Palynological analysis suggests that an increase in pastoralism occurred between 1000/1030 and 1295/1390 AD in the wider territory of Sagalassos, probably as a result of seasonal settlement by Seljuk nomads and Turkmen tribes in the area. This switch to a pastoral economy implies the gradual or partial abandonment of agriculture during the 11th-14th centuries, and meant an increased reliance on sheep and goat herding. Considering that pastoralism would also have reduced the number of cattle kept as draft animals, how can one explain the preference of the occupants of Sagalassos on beef and pork, whose production is closely associated with agriculture?

The palynological record in the valley of Ağlasun, immediately to the south of Sagalassos, has shown that despite growing insecurity in the period, olive and cereal cultivation continued, if on a reduced scale, despite the evident signs of a rise in pastoralism in the wider territory of Sagalassos. In other words, farming continued into the 12th-13th centuries in patches of the immediate territory of Sagalassos, albeit on a smaller scale, and was apparently not interrupted by the increase in herding activity. This case-study confirms the Byzantine model of settlement formation and land-use as reconstructed by Alain Decellier (1986) on the basis of textual evidence. According to this model, a village (defined as a cluster of houses surrounded by farmland) was associated with nearby vegetable gardens, a wider area of cultivable fields, pasturelands, isolated farmsteads, and hamlets or agriadia occupied by peasants or serfs who were dependent on the main village. Gardens and patches of cultivable land in the immediate territory of Sagalassos would have supplied the Byzantine population with staples such as cereals, dry legumes, vegetables, and probably olive oil, despite the presence and landscape interference of the nomadic Seljuks.

Turning to Cyprus, although cooking pots of the 12th-14th centuries remain largely closed, the still wide orifice allowed not only easy access into the vessel's content for mixing and simmering, but also the escape of moisture, producing semi-dry dishes, such as vegetables, legumes, and meat. The same function is met by the range of open shapes, such as the pans of the 15th-16th centuries. Considering that Cypriot cooking and diet is mostly based on dry or semi-dry dishes to today, it is hard to imagine that the early group of cookware was intended solely for the production of liquid meat stews, as the study of cookware shapes and their association with Western trends would let us assume.

The mixture of foods and dishes, based on meat- and legume-protein and on a wide variety of alkaline-rich vegetables and wild greens, as revealed by organic residue analyses of cooking-pot samples, seems to have been a dietary preference for Cypriots at least since the 12th century, regardless of cookware shapes, social standing or ethnic origin. The mixed food processing in Cypriot cookware pinpoints to a long-established cultural and culinary tradition, based on a mixture of meat products, vegetables and legumes throughout the Middle Ages, rather on cultural or ethnic affiliation. Various types of meat (mainly pork and lamb) mixed with colocasia, bulgur and/or vegetables and legumes, is a culinary tradition that survived in Cyprus into the Ottoman and early modern eras.
Conclusions

On the basis of the evidence presented and the arguments built above in order to explain changes in cooking-pot shapes and the relation between pottery, texts, laboratory analyses and environmental data, we could summarise the following:

1. It goes without saying that a more holistic approach to food patterns needs to be employed in order to draw a picture of foodways closer to Byzantine reality,

2. Although deeper table vessel forms and visual imagery from Northwest Europe have been used as comparanda for explaining possible changes in serving Western-style stews and broths in the medieval Eastern Mediterranean, it should be recognised that such iconographic patterns in the Byzantine repertoire may not always comprise a real representation of dining or cooking practices,

3. Evidence from Asia Minor and Cyprus suggests that the closed shape of cooking-vessels, common in the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean since the 12th century, although designed for stewing, boiling, and the production of semi-liquid foods, does not preclude their use for the production of a mixture of dry or semi-dry foods,

4. Cooking-pot technological and typological changes could be related to a range of social and technological factors, such as changes in dietary habits that had an impact on pottery production, technological changes in established cooking-pot traditions, changes in the organisation of cookware production and distribution, and/or a search for different raw material resources,

5. Landscape history and palynological analyses from different parts of the Eastern Mediterranean provide vital information about farming practices and herding activities that determine food resource availability and choice of indigenous populations, irrespective of culinary influences from Seljuk or Latin newcomers,

6. Organic residue analyses reveal that rural Byzantine populations favoured the consumption of stewed meat and meat products already since the 12th century, before the firm establishment of Westerners in the Eastern Mediterranean, and contradict the picture sketched by certain Byzantine authors,

7. All in all, it emerges that foodways tend to be a conservative part of culture, resistant to dramatic changes and that consumption and production are not mutually exclusive processes, while consumer choices are linked to production; thus, newcomers cannot alter long-established traditions so drastically, and that potential changes in cookware and tableware forms and technologies should be looked at from a different angle.
The Chickpea (ἐρέβινθος; Cicer arietinum L.) as Food and Medicine in Early Byzantine Medical Writings

Leguminous plants were a crucially important element in the Mediterranean diet since antiquity and so they remained until the seventh century. It is important to note that the medical literature demonstrates that they were believed to have been rich in active ingredients (φάρμακα); out of these plants, the chickpea (ἐρέβινθος) is one that appears very frequently in the sources.

The dietary and pharmacological characteristics of the chickpea

Medical doctrines concerning this plant developed over centuries. The earliest characteristics of the chickpea appear in the De diaeta, I – IV (4th c. BC) as well as in the works of Diocles of Carystos (4th/3rd c. BC) and Diphilus of Siphnus (3rd c. BC). A more developed form of medical theory on the chickpea appeared as late as in the first century AD and is attributable to Dioscorides; the topic received an even more detailed treatment in the writings of Galen (2nd c. AD), in particular in his De alimentorum facultatibus and De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac faculatatibus. The teachings of both these authors became fundamental for the doctrines of early Byzantine physicians.

In order to study the views of early Byzantine doctors, one has to do research on the works of Oribasius (4th c.), Aetius of Amida (6th c.) and Paul of Aegina (6th/7th c.). Oribasius described the chickpea in the first book of his Collectiones medicae and made further references to this plant in books III, XIV and XV. The main dietary characteristics of the plant, based on the doctrine of Galen, is contained in book I. The author mentioned its considerable nutritional value and discussed its other qualities, such as the flatulent and cleansing effects as well as its role in arousing sexual desire and stimulating the production of semen. Book III complements these observation with further remarks. Unripe chickpeas were included to the group of products which are characterised by significant amounts of indigestible moisture (περιττωματικά) and thereby to the class of moisturising nutrients. For all its nutritional value, the author was rather sceptical about its capability to produce good bodily humours and argued that it cannot be included into the category of εὖχυμα. Moreover, in book III the chickpea appears in the catalogue of foods that are hard to digest and have flatulent and cleansing effects. The therapeutic qualities of the plant are discussed in books XIV and XV, where Oribasius mentioned its warming qualities and included the chickpea into the following categories of substances: unblocking (ἐκφραττικά), thoroughly detoxifying (διακαθαρτικά), diuretic (οὐρητικά), attractive (ἑλκτικά) and stimulating the production of semen. In book XV, however, Oribasius based his main pharmacological characteristics of the chickpea on the De materia medica by Dioscorides, simplifying the narrative of his predecessor.

In the sixth century, Aetius of Amida based his description of the chickpea directly on the knowledge and doctrine of Oribasius. His main dietary-pharmacological characteristics of the plant does not differ from that of Collectiones medicae. A systematic study of the dietary qualities of this plant
is given in book II of the *Iatricorum libri*, where Aetius presented the categories of substances grouped according to their dominant features. The chickpea is thus included into the nutritious foods which increase body temperature and have flatulent and cleansing effects (and also moisturising effects in case of green chickpeas). The pharmacological catalogues presented in book II qualified the chickpea as warming, a substance able to draw bodily juices to the surface of the body, a semen production stimulant, and (in case of green chickpeas) a part of the περιττωματικά group.

The work of Paul of Aegina clearly illustrates the lasting quality of the presented doctrine. A brief characteristics of the plant is contained in book I, while the main description can be found in book VII of his encyclopaedia.

**The therapeutic uses of the chickpea**

The first references to the medicinal use of the chickpea can be found in the work of Diocles; further considerations were made by Dioscorides and Galen, and, finally, Oribasius, Aetius of Amida and Paul of Aegina.

Neither *Collectiones medicae* nor *Eclogae medicamentorum* by Oribasius contain a significant number of prescriptions for the medicinal use of chickpeas. However, the ones that have been preserved, with reference to the already mentioned dietary-pharmacological characteristics described by the physician, allow for the conclusion that the plant continued to be applied as a cure for analogous ailments. Accordingly, Oribasius, having analysed the works by Galen, made a selection of his views on curing callosities and oedemas for the *Collectiones medicae*; he quoted the already known statements from the doctor of Pergamon on the effective use of chickpeas as a remedy for parotid gland and testicle inflammations (which implies that chickpeas were applied as softening and diaphoretic compresses). What is more, the popularity of the latter application in the fourth century medicine is testified in the treatise *Eclogae medicamentorum*, since the chapter concerning the treatment of scrotal hernia contains a prescription for orchitis, including chickpea flour mixed with boiled μελίκρατον. It must have referred to a compress applied on the sore glands, which, as we know from other sources, had become sclerotic. From the writings of Oribasius one may also infer that chickpeas were commonly used as a treatment for hepatitis. Patients suffering from jaundice were thus treated with a decoction made from the white variety of chickpeas. Another medicament recommended by the same author was prepared on the basis of chickpeas and fennel, boiled until the plants became sufficiently soft. Subsequently, they were removed and the decoction was then administered with an admixture of οἰνόμελι. Moreover, the *Eclogae medicamentorum* recommend that women having irregular periods should eat chickpeas (presumably boiled). It has to be emphasised that an analogous prescription appears frequently in both earlier and later medical literature.

Aetius of Amida also described a number of medicinal uses of chickpeas in his *Iatricorum libri*. Following the doctors of antiquity, he referred to the cleansing and purging qualities of this plant in prescribing a decoction made from chickpeas for emptying the small intestine. He also suggested that the plant had anti-inflammatory properties as he discussed the use of the white chickpeas concoction as a remedy for chronic hepatitis. Apart from this, the doctor included the chickpea decoction into the group of τμητικά, which were said to be an effective cure for renal stones, and generally recommended it as a medicine for urogenital disorders. In his view, a decoction of chickpeas with thyme was a particularly efficient medication for problems with the urinary bladder.
From his work one may infer that in the sixth century a decoction of chickpea seeds with pepper and rue was prescribed to induce periods, especially for women of cool temperament, while a decoction of chickpeas and styrax was administered for laryngeal disorders which potentially might have resulted in loss of voice. The chickpea was also used in dermatology; Aetius recommended it as a remedy for dandruff. Supposedly, the therapy would begin with detoxifying the whole body with the use of laxatives and blood-letting. The text suggests that the patients went through a series of medicinal procedures, including compresses made from boiled chickpea seeds and rinsing the head with a chickpea concoction. It is interesting to note that the work of Aetius provides a number of prescriptions for various cosmetics such as, for instance, στίλβωμα προσώπου, which was applied on facial skin to make it brighter and give it a nice rosy sheen. The ingredients included vetch flour, broad beans, lupins, barley, chickpeas, wheat and narcissus bulbs. A different remedy was recommended for dark spots: it was a sui generis peeling made of incense, thoroughly washed white lead, iron oxide washed in a white chickpea decoction, starch, white marble filings, mastic, potassium nitrate, sepia shells, Gallic soap and egg white. Last but not least, a significant part of book VIII of the *Iatricorum libri* is devoted to the cosmetic prescriptions of Crito (2nd c.) for protecting the skin from heat; one of these was made from iron oxide (thoroughly sun-bleached in a chickpea concoction), Nepalese cardamom, kassia cinnamon, spikenard, alum and iris.

The medical encyclopaedia by Paul of Aegina indicates that at the turn of the sixth and the seventh centuries the chickpea was still used in therapeutic practice in the traditional way. Let us begin with cosmetology. Paul observed that pallor disappears due to mirth and appropriate diet, which, as he recommended, includes green chickpeas. In studying the early Byzantine sexology one has to notice that Paul of Aegina included in his work certain considerations concerning the vital role of chickpeas as a nutrient enhancing sexual performance. What is more, in book III one can find a stimulant made of chickpea seeds, black pine, rocket, pepper and honey; the mixture was added to wine and administered as a healing potion. The encyclopaedia also describes a cure for orchitis, which is more detailed than that of the earlier authors. In case of acute inflammation, Paul of Aegina recommended that a cataplasm made of henbane leaves mixed with wheat or chickpea flour should be applied on the glands. Another medication of the same kind was more complicated, as it included pitted raisins, boiled chickpea seeds, cumin, sulphur, baking soda and resin; all these ingredients were ground and mixed with honey. It was still believed in the seventh century that the chickpea had diuretic properties and was particularly useful in the treatment of menstrual disorders. As a result, Paul of Aegina recommended using the plant as a cure for renal stones, providing a detailed aetiology of the disease and specifying the reasons for utilising this particular plant. His encyclopaedia also includes a recipe for φοῦσκα which was prepared as a medication crushing the renal stones, and was administered to patients as a healing potion to be drunk in a hot bath. The drink consisted of a vinegar-based mixture of the black chickpea decoction, asparagus roots, celery and maidenhair fern. In addition to that, the doctor discussed the use of chickpea flour in cataplasms for soothing painful inflammations. Notably, if the pain was moderate, the compresses were prepared on the basis of cabbage and celery, but in case of more acute pain the doctor prescribed a medication made of fenugreek flour, darnel ryegrass and chickpea mixed with μελίκρατον (or wine) and a tinge of cypress or spikenard oil. The chickpea was also administered in the form of compresses for the effective treatment of scabies and lichen planus.
Conclusions

The above considerations call for a summing-up. Firstly, the presented material illustrates the profound knowledge of ancient and early Byzantine doctors concerning the chickpea. All of them described this plant as both food and an active therapeutic agent, i.e. φάρμακον.

Secondly, given the fact that medical doctors discussed its use already in the fourth century and that the described dietary characteristics is similar for all authors, it seems that the chickpea was considered to have been a basic foodstuff, since it attracted the attention of medical scholars on account of its considerable role. Nonetheless, a more sophisticated theory concerning its nutritional value was proposed by Dioscorides and further developed by Galen; subsequently, their teachings became fundamental for the Byzantine medical encyclopaedias compiled by Oribasius, Aetius of Amida and Paul of Aegina. Thus, the Byzantine medical thought in this respect rested on the basis of ancient teachings, and it did not form a doctrine of its own.

Thirdly, the data indicate that chickpeas must have been a remarkably important component of the Mediterranean diet throughout the period from the fourth century BC to the seventh century AD. Had it been otherwise, the medical writers would not have discussed the uses of this plant in their treatises. Additionally, one may also infer from these texts that over the centuries the same varieties were known and grown. What is more, as the sources repeat similar pieces of information on the methods of preparation of the plant, one can also come to a conclusion that in the given period the culinary uses of the chickpea remained largely the same. This means that chickpeas were used in boiled dishes and seasoned with locally available herbs.

Fourthly, it has to be emphasised that in the given period the therapeutic qualities of the chickpea and its uses in medicinal procedures were regularly discussed by Greek physicians. There is no reason to believe that the availability of chickpeas for medicinal uses was in in any way limited. Aetius of Amida is the only author who provided a list of imported and, as such, costly ingredients, including the Nepalese cardamom, κασσία cinnamon, spikenard, myrrh and myroxylon resin. These recipes, however, do not belong to the class of basic medicines, but rather to that of cosmetics.

Finally, one should remember that the list of ailments treated with the use of chickpeas is long and consistent throughout the period. The first such list which may be termed as exhaustive can be found in Dioscorides. The preserved texts allow for the conclusion that the chickpea was considered to have been an efficient therapeutic agent and, as such, a worthwhile crop, which only confirms the impression that it must have been commonly popular.
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How do texts depict reality? And how is actual practice informed by literary accounts? It is not only theory that adjusts to reality. Reality and daily experience may also act as reflections of scientific thought. For example, in the field of medicine, in addition to epitomes by named authors such as Paul of Aegina or Theophanes Chrysobalantes, there is a substantial number of unedited manuscripts, the so-called *iatrosophia*, consisting of usually anonymous collections of recipes, written in a simple style, presumably to be used in daily practice. Is there a correlation between these texts and contemporary medical activity? What was the role of the Byzantine xenons in this process? Furthermore, from the eleventh century onwards we can attest to a growing circulation of Arabic and Persian medical and astronomical texts in Greek translation, which became very popular and were disseminated in various redactions. These texts make use of oriental pharmacological ingredients - can we attest the circulation of such *materia medica* through archaeology and the study of contemporary trade and commerce?
Ptolemy between the Byzantine and the Islamic World

In the second century A.D., Claudius Ptolemy wrote a number of works that in modern terms can be classified as both astronomical and astrological. These works had an important reception into Arabic from the ninth century onwards; most were translated into Arabic in the course of the Greek-into-Arabic translation movement in the ninth and tenth centuries and continued to be consulted, updated, and critiqued in the Islamic world into the beginning of the early modern period, marked by the so-called Copernican revolution. At the same time, between the ninth and the fifteenth centuries, there was a Byzantine reception of Islamic science through the translation of originally Arabic and Persian treatises into Greek, as well as other forms of contact between Byzantine and Islamic scientific practice. These exchanges involved both astronomical and astrological practice. Modern research has not elucidated what implications this may have had for scientific theory and its philosophical background. The paper will provide an overview of the Byzantine and Islamic exchanges as evidenced in the medieval transmission of Ptolemy’s various works. It will also assess the significance of this under-researched process for our understanding of Byzantine and early modern science.
Alchemy and Medicine in Byzantium: Some Notes for an Open Question

This paper will provide a map of historical relations between alchemy and medicine in Byzantine period promoting a deeper understanding of the various interactions that can be historically ascertained. The main question is how alchemy is being related to other disciplines, how it affects everyday life, what technological applications it brings about, what interactions can be detected between alchemical and medical practices.

According the texts by Byzantine scholars who presented works on alchemy, medicine and natural philosophy, as for example Michael Psellos and Nikephoros Blemmydes, this presentation will focus in the concepts of matter, common among the scholars from early Byzantine era until the end of Byzantine state, its characteristics, properties and of course its potential transmutation, within the epistemological, educational, technical and also religious context of this period. On the other hand, our study will mainly examine how this concept relates with medicine and the concept of human body in an orthodox Christian context.

Another question is how the Byzantine scholars evaluated the alchemical practices and techniques, as a tool for scientific knowledge, not occult or magic, and how this perception connected with the medicine.

The above questions are important for the value of knowledge in Byzantium and also the relation of empirical and theoretical knowledge in historical societies, an open question for the history of sciences.
Theory and Praxis in Byzantine Uroscopy

Uroscopy is the branch of medicine in which the contribution of the Byzantine physicians was the greatest: now we have a large number of works on this subject, dating from the fifth to the fourteenth century AD. Although writing in form of treaties favors forcibly the theoretical aspect of this science, it is possible to find in these texts elements of physician practice, to an extent not too different from the testimonies of other types, mainly iconography, which are also subject to a certain degree of conventionality, peculiar of the art that has expressed it.

First, in our works we find reflected the practice and theory of Hippocratic Prognostic and Aphorisms. Byzantine uroscopy writers saw in Hippocrates the initiator of their science and they accepted with enthusiasm his views: as well the possibility of finding dead parts of the internal organs into the urine, as the fundamental elements of observation, Hippocrates had established once and for all the principles upon which the doctor should operate his urine test: color, viscosity, sediment, behavior over time. The construction of a more elaborate theoretical system by the Byzantine physicians leads to extreme consequences the statements attributed to the physician of Cos, but more on an exegetical basis, than on an experimental one. From this point of view the contribution of iatrosophical school of Alexandria was decisive, because the commentators of the text of Hippocrates in this Egyptian city strongly defended this author, mainly resorting to the letter of his statements, on which they built corollaries and implications that were pursued with conviction.

However, a careful reading of these writings also provides practical information on the activity of Byzantine physicians in the observation of urine: the reference is primarily to the manipulation of the matula, and particularly to heating and agitating the liquid contained therein. These activities are important if you believe that the reconstruction of the environment inside the body, where the urine had been generated, is essential for a proper examination. Thus we find quotations of real byzantine laboratory experiments, based on the belief that the simple observation of the liquid, which has changed the status once escaped from the body, is misleading. Of course, we do not underestimate the reaction of those who believe that such recreating the conditions in which urine was formed does not play any role and that therefore deny any scientific value to this practice.

Of course, of great interest is the mention of the authors of the testimonies gathered from everyday medical practice. Again we must not go overboard in searching a practical reflected in the clinical cases tales. As a form of literature, they have a certain degree of conventionality in which some elements of the narrative always return equal. But, when they are collected to test certain theoretical notions, they must have a degree of likelihood and plausibility for the reader such as to reproduce the real observations done by these physicians.
Quantifying Diagnosis:
Medical Signs between Galen and Early Byzantine Medicine

My paper is about the role of measurable medical diagnosis in some authors of the late antique - early Byzantine period.

Diagnostics is one of the most enduring aspects of the Galenic legacy, with the doctrine of pulse in particular being taken as a standard diagnostic tool from late antiquity well into the eighteenth century. Galen's pathological works are interspersed with clinical diagnostic observations; his pharmacology makes use of accurate distinctions in the grades of the active qualities; his system of nature relies on a theoretically-informed ‘diagnosis’ of the elementary qualities; texts such as Crises and Critical Days give a rationalistic account of doctrines rooted in the popular tradition and prominent in the Corpus Hippocraticum. Finally, in his Hippocratic commentaries he tries to quantify with a high degree of accuracy the semantic strength of the Hippocratic pathological descriptions, deploying a variety of arguments that range from judicial oratory to the Aristotelian distinction of ‘generic’ and ‘strong’ signs (or ‘proofs’). In all his works we can recognise as evident an attempt at giving an exact measurement of the diagnostic signs by means of empirical experience, linguistic analysis, logical distinctions and theoretical deductions. More than a comprehensive theory, this is a flexible, dynamic notion, developed diversely according to the subject under enquiry.

Although the measurability of diagnostic signs is regarded as one of the hallmarks of modern medicine, a noticeable quest for exactness can be traced in early Byzantine medical authors working in Galen's wake. Authors such as Oribasius, Aetius, Alexander of Tralles and Paulus of Aegina, as well as Theophilus and the many other authors of uroscopic treatises, show different approaches to ‘quantifiable’ diagnosis where specific developments emerge from the Galenic legacy. In my contribution I consider whether diagnostic methods such as the analysis of pulses and urines became popular precisely on account of their measurability whereas others such as e.g. the analysis of solid excrements could not lay such a claim, and the extent of their debt to Galenic ideas. I also consider some theoretical assumptions of diagnostic techniques both from the physiological and pathological point of view, examining the conclusions we can draw, from this literary evidence, about the practical relevance of ‘measurable diagnosis’, including the therapeutic rationale and the institutional role of the doctor.
Versions and Editions of Theophanes Nonnos’ De curatione

Theophanes’ work *De curatione* is one of the major Greek medical works that has not received an appropriate amount of scholarly attention. The text has been edited twice, in the sixteenth and the late eighteenth century, and it was translated into Latin. In the mid 1980, Joseph Sonderkamp began to work on Theophanes, which led to the publication of an article and a book; the latter contains a comprehensive catalogue of all manuscripts known at the time. However, the main focus of the book is on another work of Theophanes. Therefore, his stemma is only of limited value, as some witnesses are not taken into account. But his list of manuscripts is still fairly accurate today, and only very few new witnesses have emerged insofar.

Sonderkamp’s research was tragically cut short by his untimely death. Some decades later, I used his book, and some other resources as a basis for a new edition of *De curatione*. In the times of digitization, scans and online catalogues, the work proved much easier, and even though the sheer amount of manuscripts made it a rather time consuming task, it was possible to establish a stemma of the text.

Today, I am going to talk about an unusual topic, namely editions, or rather versions, that present a completely revised text of *De curatione*. These versions are not being taken into account for my edition of the text, as they are clearly later developments. They do, however, reveal a substantial amount of linguistic and medical data that allows us to understand the reception of the text.
Substitute Drugs in Byzantine Medicine: The Question of Availability

The practice of substituting one drug for another was known as *de succedaneis* (on the substitutes) or *quid pro quo* (this for that) in medieval Western Europe, *abdāl al-adwiya* (substitution of drugs) in the Islamic world, and *περί των αντιβαλλομένων* (on the substituted ones) in Byzantium. Availability of such texts reflects a common need around the medieval Mediterranean to adapt the pharmacological lore to a number of contemporary conditions or priorities. The purpose in finding substitutes can be manifold and may be triggered by issues of availability and/or medical preference. While the subject of commercial availability has been raised frequently (Helena Paavilainen, Martin Levey, Efraim Lev, and Zohar Amar), concerns of the composers of these works other than commercial availability have been less pronounced (John M. Riddle, Rudolf Schmitz, Alain Touwaide). My aim is first to analyse texts entitled *περί των αντιβαλλομένων*, some of which are directly attributed to Galen, and to study the similarities and differences among these texts. Such a comparison would allow us make observations about the aims and concerns of the writers/copyists of this genre. Secondly, I plan to examine recipes in some practically oriented medical treatises (such as Paul of Nicaea and Leo the Physician), and recipe collections in hospital texts (such as the Mangana texts and *prostagai*), in which the writer recommends a number of alternative ingredients for a simple or compound drug (in the form of *use x or y or z*). The data collected from this group of medicinal recipes will be compared to the set of data in *περί των αντιβαλλομένων* in order to see how the texts of *περί των αντιβαλλομένων*, usually attributed to Galen, relate to the practical world of Byzantine physicians and pharmacists.
Before Iatrosofia. Therapeutic Formularies in Byzantium

The iatrosofion is a genre in medical literature that is often considered to be typical of the Post-Byzantine period. In its most typical form it is presented as a medical book by Hippocrates, Meletios, Dioscorides and Galen that contains mostly prescriptions of remedies for a wide range of medical conditions. The examination of multiple Greek manuscripts with medical content dating back from the 6th to the 16th century has made it possible to identify numerous similar therapeutic manuals. The paper will present the data resulting from the survey of Greek medical manuscripts, both Byzantine and Post-Byzantine, and will offer some insights on the possible development(s) of the genre of therapeutic manuals.
The Introduction and Circulation of Oriental Materia Medica in Late Byzantium

Pharmacology has often been considered the most dynamic part of Byzantine therapeutics. In particular, the late period saw the production of extensive pharmacological compilations, such as Nicholas Myrepsos’ Dynameron and the last two books of John Zacharias Aktouarios’ Medical Epitome, the introduction of Arabic medical texts disseminated in Greek translation, such as Ibn al-Jazzār’s Ephodia tou Apodēmountos, and a huge number of usually anonymous collections of recipes, the so-called iatrosophia. However, detailed studies on pharmacology are scarce; this might be partly due to the lack of modern critical editions of Byzantine medical texts. Thus, the place of these manuals in actual medical practice or the impact of transcultural influence remains largely unexplored.

In my paper, which is based on research undertaken during a recently awarded Wellcome Trust funded project on late Byzantine pharmacology, I would like to explore references to newly introduced oriental materia medica, such as galangal, zedoary, camphor, and cubeb pepper, and show to what extent late Byzantine pharmacological works were influenced by other cultures, mainly Islamic but also from the Christian European West. Such an exploration will not only raise scholarly interest in a neglected area of Byzantine therapeutics, but more specifically it will contribute to the wider debate of knowledge transmission in the field of medieval pharmacology. On another level, it could help us to suggest the precise dating of various anonymous works, and discuss the identification of compilers and translators. I also examine references to oriental ingredients in non-medical late Byzantine texts, including legal and trade sources, in an attempt to determine their level of circulation. It is noteworthy, for example, that a special control tax, the so-called garbellatura, was levied on several imported ingredients in late Byzantine Constantinople.

The above exploration ultimately raises the following questions: What is the ratio of traditional ingredients to newly introduced oriental substances? Were these newly available ingredients used to treat previously incurable diseases or were they just an index of prestige and reputation for the physicians and/or pharmacists providing them? Was the normally high cost of exotic ingredients linked to moral issues, especially as regards healthcare for the lower classes?
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Constantinople as a Focal Point of Amalfitan Mediterranean Trade, 11th – 12th Centuries

Located on important east-west and north-south trade routes, the Byzantine capital, Constantinople, was the most important commercial center of the Eastern Mediterranean – Black Sea region. While the city attracted in large numbers foreigners and people from the provinces who came to buy and sell in its bustling markets, its regulations concerning the sojourn of visitors remained highly restrictive, at least until the third quarter of the eleventh century.

The movement and numbers of foreign traders in Constantinople and their business transactions were closely monitored and tightly controlled by the city prefecture. The “people from outside Rome” (hoi exo Rhomes) were entitled to a limited, three-month stay in the imperial capital. Upon the expiration of their permit of stay, foreigners and provincials had to sell the remainder of their merchandise to a representative of the eparch and then leave the city. Foreigners were not allowed to buy and export the types of goods that were listed as ta kekolymena (‘the forbidden ones’): precious metals and stones, high-quality silks and other luxury goods, and strategic materials such as iron, copper, iron ore and timber.

As Byzantine gold currency could not be taken out of the country, before their departure the foreigners ought to buy new merchandise on the money they had made, and only then embark on their home-bound voyage.

Although the exact date of the Amalfitans’ appearance in the Constantinopolitan market is not known, they seem to have been the first Italians to set foot in the Byzantine capital. While the Amalfitans do not seem to have enjoyed such great privileges as the ones that were later granted to their Venetian rivals (e.g., partial or total tax exemption), they were not confined to mitata (that is, gated inns) or even special districts of the city. As has been noted by Vera v. Falkenhausen, the fact that there was no Amalfitan district in Constantinople suggests that the Amalfitans may have arrived in the Byzantine capital earlier than anybody else from Italy – in a time period when the city authorities did not consider it necessary to accommodate the growing numbers of Italians by settling them in special districts. Even in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Amalfitans such as the wealthy merchant Pantoleone de Comite Mauronis appear to have settled in any part of the city they liked, without having to obey any restrictions.

The earliest written evidence of Amalfitans in Constantinople can be found in Liudprand of Cremona’s Antapodosis. In 949, rumors spread in the city that the legitimate emperor, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, may have been murdered by his brothers-in-law. Angry crowds gathered at the palace gates, demanding proof that the emperor was alive. Among those present there were people from the southern Campanian duchies of Amalfi and Gaeta. Probably, these Italians were merchants, although Liudprand does not specifically say so. About twenty years later, during his second visit to Constantinople, Liudprand witnessed Emperor Nicephorus Phokas’s naval forces sailing away to the Middle East, on an “Assyrian” campaign, with some of the commanding officers in the Byzantine navy being Amalfitans and Venetians.
Liudprand of Cremona does not mention the presence of Amalfitan merchants in the Byzantine capital in 968. Amalfitans trading with Constantinople are only mentioned in 992, in the chrysobull, which the emperors Basil II and Constantine VIII issued on behalf of the Venetians. While granting a number of privileges to Venetian merchant ships, the imperial charter makes it clear that these concessions apply only to Venetians carrying Venetian cargoes: any Venetian ship found to be carrying the wares of Amalfitans, Jews, Langobards from Bari or elsewhere would forfeit its entire load. As has been noted by D. Nicol, however, this cannot have been a very troublesome restriction: Amalfitans trading with Constantinople did so in completion – and not in co-operation – with Venetians. The rivalry between the two Mediterranean powerhouses, Amalfi and Venice, had a long history going back to the centuries that inaugurated the rise of the two cities.

Located in remote corners, isolated from the world except by water, the two cities took naturally to the sea and began to build predominantly export-orientated economies as early as the mid-700s, quickly adapting to the role of middlemen between the East and the West. Their exports were somewhat similar: timber, grain, and cereals. But Venice also engaged in slave trade and the export of iron to the world of Islam, despite the continuous efforts of its sovereign, Byzantium, to ban the exports of strategic materials to the enemies of Christendom. In the ninth and tenth centuries, however, the Venetians definitely lagged behind the Amalfitans in their efforts to win the markets in the Eastern Mediterranean and Constantinople for themselves. It was only from the eleventh century onward that certain circumstances allowed Venice to finally overcome Amalfitan competition in the eastern markets.

In the ninth and tenth centuries, Amalfi retained a determined, if at times precarious, independence from its larger neighbors in South Italy while still acknowledging some dependence on Byzantium, largely as a means of protection against the aggression of the Langobard princes. The Byzantine re-conquest of South Italy in the latter part of the ninth century resulted in the weakening of the Muslim attacks from Sicily and North Africa. The beginning of the tenth century marked a significant change in southern Italy, with regard both to its internal stability and also to its relative freedom from external threat. From ca. AD 900 onwards, the political structures of southern Italy remained, more or less, in equilibrium, which had a beneficial effect on the development of Amalfi, Gaeta and Naples, in spite of the fact that each of them was only one city with a small dependent territory. Given the fact how limited their hinterlands were their economies were largely dependent on overseas trade.

Entrepreneurial freedom and an almost complete lack of regulations regarding ship ownership were among the main factors that contributed to the rapid growth of Amalfitan trade. For example, while a sea captain in Naples had to have a special registration of his ship as well as a license to sail (Lat. licentia navigandi) in order to engage in overseas trade, no such regulations existed in neighboring Amalfi. Amalfitan ship owners, who – in most cases – appear to have been sea captains and merchants as well, were not subject to any restrictions regarding ship ownership or overseas trade. As a result, in the ninth through the eleventh century, it was Amalfi’s liberal regime at home that helped the Amalfitan traders achieve success abroad.

Because the exports of Amalfi were almost identical with the exports of Byzantine South Italy, the Amalfitans could not go directly to Byzantium. Instead, they would go to the North-African markets first; from there, they would sail to Alexandria and Cairo; eventually, with the commodities they had acquired in Egypt, they would show up in Constantinople. From the Byzantine capital, they
would go back to Italy, selling, as is shown by *Liber Pontificalis* and other sources, luxury textiles, sacred vessels, incense, and spices in the markets of Rome and the rest of central and southern Italy. This long trade route encompassing the coasts of North Africa, Egypt, some of the South Aegean islands, Constantinople, Dyrrachium on the Adriatic and parts of Italy, has been described by A. O. Citarella as “the triangular route of Amalfitan commerce”. Knowing that the sailing season in the Mediterranean lasted only about seven to seven and a half months per year, we may surmise that it took a minimum of two, or maybe even three, years for an Amalfitan to complete the journey and return home. The evidence of the Amalfitan commerce with Byzantium and the Arabs is mostly drawn from sources, the earliest of which were written in the tenth century. Before that, the written evidence is rather thin.

Amalfitan trade received a boost in 966 from a peace treaty between Byzantium and Fatimid Egypt. Amalfi, whose dependence on Byzantium was only notional, seized the moment to expand its franchise and opened a trade post in Cairo. By the late tenth century, Amalfi had carved out a position as a valued business partner for emperors, caliphs, and popes, with outposts at the opposite ends of the Mediterranean.

While, in their voyages to the North African coast, Egypt and Constantinople the Amalfitans stuck to the sea, on their way back, that is, from Constantinople to Italy, they traveled by sea and land, loading and re-loading their goods on pack animals and boats. Thus, on their way from Constantinople to Dyrrachium on the Adriatic, Amalfitans traveled along the ancient *Via Egnatia*; upon crossing the sea, they continued their journey, following the overland route that linked Bari (or Brindisi) via Melfi to southern Campania; from there they travelled to Rome via Naples, Gaeta and Terracina. In an 1162 Venetian document, it is recommended that, on their way from Constantinople to Italy, the Venetians too should use that route because it seemed to be best suited to the needs of merchants who carry light but valuable goods.

The charters from Amalfi make it clear that, before setting out on a long journey, the Amalfitans were keen on taking care of legal matters that they felt should not be left unsettled: e.g., inheritance, transfer or sale of property, etc. Some documents authorize relatives or friends to take care of certain things in the mariner’s absence. The phraseology in that kind of charters tends to be rather obscure with regard to the destination of the man’s journey and the nature of his cargo: it is said the absentee “will be at sea” (*esse ad navigandum*) or “will be away from this country, unable to come here” (*esse foris de istam terram, non posse hic venire*). One comes across similar phrases in the documents that were compiled, in the same time period, in other South-Italian cities as well: e.g., Gaeta, Salerno, Bari, Barletta, and Brindisi. Obviously, the shippers and traders who were clustered in that part of the Italian peninsula shared in the same mentality while the local notaries shared in the same legal culture.

It is hard to tell at what point in time Amalfitan traders began to be granted permanent residence in the Byzantine capital. There is no evidence of how they lived in Constantinople in the ninth and tenth centuries. In that time period, merchants did not write about themselves. Neither did they act as sponsors of intellectuals who might have penned descriptions of the foreign merchants’ ways of life in Byzantium. But by the end of the tenth century the Amalfitans seem to have been actively exploiting their Byzantine connections in order to establish spiritual centers of their own in Byzantium. Thus, the Amalfitan monastery on Mount Athos was founded around 985 or 990 and
soon became a center of literary activity, standing in close contact to Monte Cassino. In the eleventh century, the Amalfitans had their own church, *Santa Maria de Latina*, built in Constantinople in an unspecified location.

Some modern scholars (e.g., P. Magdalino, A. Ducellier, and M. Balard) argue that, even though no Byzantine emperor may not have issued a *chrysobull* for the Amalfitans in Constantinople, there was an Amalfitan colony in the *Perama* district along the Golden Horn, with workshops, warehouses, shops, and a church in it.

Toward the middle of the eleventh century wealthy Italian merchants residing in Constantinople took an interest in the arts and began to sponsor translations of hagiographical texts from Greek into Latin. Thus, the well-known writer and translator Giovanni d’Amalfi lived and worked in the home of “the noblest Lupino, son of seigneur Sergio”, in Constantinople. Lupino was a wealthy merchant, belonging to the influential Amalfitan family *de comite Mauronis*. In the 1060s and 1070s, his residence served as the focal point of meetings of the Amalfitan diaspora in the imperial capital.

Another member of the same influential Amalfitan family was the above-mentioned wealthy merchant Pantoleone. He resided in Constantinople and was conferred upon the high imperial rank of *hypatus* (i.e., consul), and later – *dishypatus*. Thanks to his connections and his immense wealth, Pantoleone was capable of acting as a diplomatic and cultural mediator between east and west: in the wake of the 1054 schism, he tried to patch up the relations between Constantinople and Rome. Also, he endeavored to create an anti-Norman coalition, to liberate South Italy from the Sicilian Normans. When the last Langobard prince of Salerno, Gisulf II (1052–1077), visited Constantinople in 1062, he took with him the bishop of Palestrina and the archbishop of Salerno. The party stayed at the patrician home of Pantoleone in the Byzantine capital and the rich house aroused the jealousy of Gisulf.

Last but not least, in the 1060s and 1070s Pantoleone ordered a number of bronze doors, which were built in Constantinople and then sent to Italy. Well-known are the doors in Amalfi, Atrani, Monte Cassino, Rome, and Venice. The transportation costs were covered by Pantoleone’s father, Mauro – himself a wealthy Amalfitan merchant who was known for his founding of churches and hospitals in Amalfi, Antioch, and Jerusalem. In 1061, a certain Constantine, who was an Amalfitan citizen and a distant relative of Pantoleone’s, became an *imperialis hypatus et protospatharius*. The *de Maurone* family played an important role not only in the economic and political relations between Amalfi and Byzantium but also in the transmission of Byzantine culture to Italy.

After the Norman conquest of Amalfi in 1073 contacts with Byzantium continued, but the Amalfitans were soon superseded by the Venetians. The *chrysobull*, which Alexios Komnenos issued for the Venetians in 1082, envisaged that the cathedral of St. Mark in Venice was to receive three gold coins every year from each of the establishments owned by merchants from Amalfi in Constantinople and the empire. The Amalfitan traders, who had long been established in Constantinople and who had been singled out as competitors in 992, were now classed as tribute-paying subordinates to Venice. With its overseas trade entirely based on private initiative, from the last quarter of the eleventh century onwards Amalfi began to lose the competition with Venice, Pisa and Genoa. Amalfi’s franchise gradually eroded and slipped into Venetian hands. In Italy and elsewhere, the old aristocratic families from Amalfi began to play a lesser role in societal matters and trade.
Members of the wealthy de Maurone family, however, continued to serve as mediators between Byzantium and the West throughout most of the twelfth century. During the first thirty years of that century, in Constantinople there were several de Maurones who were bearers of such high-ranking imperial titles as kouropalatai and protonobilissimi. In 1163, a certain Landolfo de Maurone went on a Byzantine diplomatic mission to Laodicea and Syria. In the twelfth century, another Amalfitan, Mauro Iactavecte de Leone comite, also rose to the rank of an imperial protospatharius. Other Amalfitans who are known to have acted as intermediaries between Byzantium and the West were Maur, Bishop of Amalfi, and the judge Musco. In September 1108, an agreement between Alexios Komnenos and Bohemund was drafted; the document closes with Bohemond’s solemn oath to fulfill the provisions of the agreement, and was witnessed by Bishop Maur, who had come as papal legate to Alexios Komnenos, and a few other Italian clerics and crusaders. In 1111, the Amalfitan judge Musco acted as an intermediary in the signature of the first trade agreement between Byzantium and Pisa; in 1112 Musco was appointed papal legate in Constantinople by Pope Pascal II (1099–1118).

The Byzantines made a clear distinction between the Amalfitans, on the one hand, and the rest of the Italians who were generally referred to as either “Franks” or “Latins”, on the other. Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus (913–959), in his treatises De Cerimoniis and De Administrando Imperio, makes a special reference to Amalfi. The vita of St. Athanasius the Athonite (written ca. 1025) mentions the control on boats as a key to the control of commercial activities their ownership made possible; Amalfitans are excluded from the restriction on sailing beyond Thessalonika and Ainos, a city in eastern Thrace. Finally, when describing the conquest of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade (1204), Niketas Choniates says that, of all the foreigners residing in the city at that point in time, it was the Amalfitans, the Venetians and the Pisans who were best acquainted with the Roman ways of life.

As we have seen, while in the late eleventh and the twelfth century trade between Amalfi and Constantinople may have dwindled, Amalfitans of noble extraction continued to play a significant role as intermediaries between Byzantium and the rest of the medieval world.
Métal, bois et vin en Italie méridionale aux VIe-VIIe siècles : production et trafic

Les possessions byzantines de l’Italie méridionale évoluent sans cesse à partir de la fin du VIe siècle, lorsque le duché de Bénévent et la majeure partie de la Pouille sont conquis par les Lombards. L’actuelle Calabre, est longuement disputée : entièrement occupée, à l’exception de quelques îlots entourant les ports fortifiés, elle est reconquise par Constant II qui l’organise en duché. Celle-ci est ancrée administrativement à la Sicile, dont elle est économiquement complémentaire et avec laquelle elle entretient d’étroits rapports. Après la mort de l’empereur, la Lucanie et la plaine de Sibari sont envahies par Bénévent et la frontière lombarde se fixe provisoirement à la hauteur de l’isthme de Catanzaro, mais la reconquête byzantine, bien que progressive, est rapide et reporte la limite de la domination impériale sur le cours du Crati.

L’étude de la partie « continentale » du dominiun byzantin en Italie méridionale aux VIe-VIIe siècles a été négligée au profit de la Sicile ou du nord de la péninsule, mais les récentes recherches en archéologie, numismatique et sigillographie ont contribué à combler les lacunes de sources écrites extrêmement rares qu’elles ont en outre incité à reconsiderer, renouvelant l’image de cette région dans une période longtemps considérée comme obscure et vide.

Les hauts reliefs de la Calabre, Apennin au nord-ouest, Sila à l’est et Serre/Aspromonte au sud sont le cadre d’une riche économie forestière et renferment des aires métallifères ; s’y ajoutent de nombreux coteaux favorables à la vigne et quelques plaines et plateaux céréaliers. De plus la longueur des côtes ouvre largement la région sur les deux parties de la Méditerranée : le versant tyrrhénien participe aux échanges économiques et culturels du bassin occidental tandis que le littoral ionien est intégré à la sphère maritime de l’Adriatique, dont il porte d’ailleurs le nom. Les relations avec l’Orient, devenues prépondérantes au Ve siècle, sont largement renforcées par la conquête justinienne, avant que les succès carolingiens au nord puis l’attaque de la Sicile au début du IXe siècle n’obligent pour un temps les forces byzantines à se tourner vers l’île.

La prospérité économique de l’Italie méridionale se maintint jusqu’à la fin du VIIe siècle : malgré la perte de la riche vallée du Crati, puis de la plaine de Sibari, la production agricole et industrielle ne fut guère entachée par les guerres, car elle était concentrée dans les vastes massae pontificales épargnées par les Lombards, ou bien se trouvait à l’abri dans le saltus et le sud de la région, tôt récupéré par Constantinople. Les frontières linéaires étaient d’ailleurs remplacées par de vastes zones de contacts : si l’on excepte les moments de crise provoquée par les deux vagues lombardes, rien ne faisait obstacle à la circulation des individus, des sauf-conduits étant par ailleurs accordés aux marchands. Les opérations militaires se limitaient à la reprise périodique de villes côtières par les flottes byzantines : au total l’histoire politique intervint surtout dans la direction et la nature des échanges, sans les entraver.
D'après les sources écrites et archéologiques les gisements métallifères variés et abondants, dont l'exploitation est encore bien attestée à l'époque normande, constituaient la richesse et l'intérêt de la Calabre : l’or et l’argent de même que le fer, le cuivre et l'étain, étaient thésaurisés après réduction et affinage, ou transformés en produits manufacturés à des fins commerciales. Hormis les mines du nord-ouest, définitivement annexées par le duché de Bénévent au VIᵉ siècle, trois aires métallifères étaient alors exploitées et âprement disputées entre Lombards et Byzantins. L’argent de Longobucco, cité seulement au XIIᵉ siècle, alimentait déjà l’orfèvrerie de la Grande Grèce et semble avoir été extrait depuis sans interruption : l’entretien des puits et galeries de mines comme le fonctionnement des fours expliquent, avec l’exploitation intensive du bois et de la poix par l’empire romain, l’épuisement des forêts au nord du massif de la Sila.

La vallée du Savuto était déjà réputée, au VIIᵉ siècle avant JC, pour ses gisements de cuivre et d’argent, mais aussi d’étain, métal qui alimentait depuis l’Antiquité tardive les fours de bronzier de Reggio. Le métal y était travaillé à l’époque romaine sur le promontoire de Pian della Tirena, qui abritait dans l’Antiquité tardive la statio de Temesa, siège d’un évêché rural à l’embouchure du fleuve. Enfin des gisements d’or et d’argent étaient exploités dans la chaîne des Serre depuis le début du VIᵉ siècle.

Après une période d’accumulation des richesses par les églises locales et par l’aristocratie foncière, phénomène qui culmina au milieu du VIᵉ siècle, la guerre gréco-gothique et la première invasion lombarde provoquent, notamment par le biais de rançons, un vaste mouvement de redistribution des terres, des esclaves et des biens mobiliers, dont les ministeria ecclésiastiques, argent et vases sacrés de métal précieux ou d’ambre. L’élite laïque investit aussi dans les bijoux, faciles à emporter en cas de fuite et désormais ensevelis avec elle.


Plusieurs solutions s’offraient aux autorités byzantines : sous Heraclius, l’or des impôts du sud de la péninsule fut utilisé pour payer fonctionnaires et soldats et on importa en masse de vieux folles de bronze stockés dans la capitale qui furent contremarqués pour acheter tout le blé sicilien, grâce à une sorte de coemptio ou achat réquisitionnel. Même si l’île suffit alors à ravitailler la capitale où la population avait diminué et même si l’Afrique du nord envoyait encore du blé en Italie, cette ponction massive n’aurait pas manqué de provoquer à son tour à Rome une crise frumentaire génératrice de révoltes. Les massae calabraises furent donc mises à contribution, ce qui renforça le volume du trafic tyrrhénien en direction de l’Italie centrale : la céréaliculture y avait été intensifiée jusqu’à se hisser au VIᵉ siècle en tête des productions de la province ; l’occupation prolongée du nord du duché poussa ensuite à développer plus au sud ce secteur agricole.
L’administration impériale, qui se substituait aux services bien rôdés des *massae* ecclésiastiques et laïques, dut alors improviser, ce qui explique l’apparition, en 652-654, d’un *Kommerkion Sikelia*, chargé d’organiser des entrepôts et l’acheminement des grains : diverses solutions furent adoptées pour le fret, dont des contrats passés avec des armateurs privés, parfois capitaines de leurs propres navires ; de même les rôles des impôts furent revus.

Constant II opta pour la reconquête de l’Italie méridionale qui cumulait avantages stratégiques, matières premières et ressources vivrières. Il récupéra à Rome pour les refondre le bronze des statues et des tuiles de l’ex-Panthéon, puis les *ministeria* des églises ; il s’efforça de développer et garantir pour le futur l’extraction et la fusion de métaux, l’or calabrais tout d’abord, qui ravitaillait l’atelier monétaire de Syracuse où la frappe fut intensifiée, mais aussi l’étain et le cuivre. Il reconquit les mines de l’extrême sud qu’il protégea en y « refondant » des *kastra* urbains : l’or des Serre était acheminé via la vallée des Salines vers Reggio, dont ce trafic assurait la richesse au moins jusqu’au Xᵉ siècle, et vers l’île. Dans la composition des monnaies siciliennes entrent en effet deux qualités d’or, dont l’une était fournie par la Calabre, qui a même pu en expédier à Constantinople.

Les deux autres districts miniers étaient tout aussi intéressants : Romuald Iᵉʳ s’empara de l’argent du Savuto puis, dans les années 680, de Longobucco, pour alimenter la frappe des siliques à Bénévent. Mais les deux zones furent rapidement reconquises par les autorités impériales et défendues par des glacis fortifiés : au nord, le puissant *phrourion* de Thurii constituitait, avec le nouveau *kastron* de Rossano, un barrage face à la plaine lombarde de Sibari. À l’autre extrémité du bassin des fleuves Crati et Savuto, les mines étaient protégées par deux « grandes enceintes perchées », retranchements typiques du VIIᵉ siècle, qui furent aménagées à *Temesa* et sur le promontoire voisin d’Amantea ; cette dernière, comme Rossano, fut promue siège épiscopal dès le début du VIIIᵉ siècle. Le site de *Temesa*, évoque l’établissement métallurgique égyptien de Bir Umm Fawakhir, hauteur défendue uniquement par la raideur de ses pentes et deux postes de garde.


Mais dans la zone de riches *villae* du sud-est, mines et bas-fourneaux, divisés en petites unités dispersées, étaient sans doute aussi gérés par les *possessores* et, une fois prélevée la taxe, alimentaient des ateliers d’orfèvres. On y fabriquait des fibules discoïdales d’argent recouvertes de feuilles d’or, des boucles d’oreilles à pendentifs coniques d’argent et des fibules de bronze qui circulaient dans
toute l'aire adriatique, depuis la Sicile jusqu'à la Pouille et en Dalmatie. Prisées de la nouvelle élite de fonctionnaires et de l'élite locale en voie d'hellénisation pour ses motifs religieux orientalisants, les *bratteate* étaient commercialisées par les colonies de marchands hébreux et orientaux, assez nombreuses sur la côte adriatique.


Enfin les troncs de haute futaie étaient expédiés depuis la chaîne apenninique et la Sila vers Rome pour la reconstruction – fréquente – des grandes basiliques et dans toute la province lors des campagnes de fortification qui se succédèrent à un rythme séculaire à partir du VIe siècle. Les forêts alimentèrent surtout les arsenaux en bois et en poix, quand Constant II décida de construire une flotte locale pour contrer les Lombards et les Arabes ; il utilisa les *nauticationes*, qui obligaient certains établissements à financer et réaliser un certain nombre de navires en fournissant les matériaux, le savoir-faire de leurs architectes et la main d'œuvre, ainsi que les équipages.

La vigne couvrait de vastes surfaces, les prélèvements légers de l'annone ayant incité les *possessores-negotiatores* à intensifier la production de vin et d'amphores et à investir les fonds amassés grâce au *saltus* dans le commerce au long cours : les amphores *Keay LII* calabraises ont été retrouvées dans toute la Méditerranée et constituent, à Rome et Ostie, 25% des conteneurs vinaires au VIe siècle, ce qui représente les versements fiscaux et sans doute un apport du commerce privé. La papauté qui gérait l'approvisionnement de Rome en blé et en vin, continuait à ravioler la ville après la suppression de l'annone civique en 619 : le pourcentage de denrées prélèvées sur son impôt pour la ville était négocié annuellement avec le fisc impérial. La production des *massae* pontificales du versant tyrrhénien et de la Sicile continua à être drainée pour être réexpédiée vers Ostie.

L'extermination de l'élite foncière laïque désorganisa en revanche une partie de la chaîne production, au sud-est du *Bruttium* et mit sans doute fin au commerce de vin à longue distance, tandis qu'un nouveau réseau de distribution fiscal se mettait en place, les amphores étant distribuées aux fonctionnaires impériaux et aux unités militaires stationnées dans les fortresses, grandes enceintes perchées ou *kastra* urbains, jusqu'au nord-ouest de la péninsule. Les *Keay LII* furent remplacées par des amphores « globulaires », imitées de manière significative des « Late Roman 2 » orientales, qui circulaient dans tout l'empire aux VIIe-VIIIe siècles ; leur capacité, de 25 à 30 litres, pourrait correspondre à la ration de vin mensuelle d'un soldat dans le cadre de l'annone de la fin du VIe siècle. De nouveaux fours fonctionnèrent à proximité des grandes villes (Otrante, Crotone, Locres) et la viticulture se maintint dans les *chôria* des zones les mieux protégées ; la production diminua et, pour des raisons de commodité, les autorités impériales utilisèrent toujours plus le vin fiscal pour les besoins locaux.
L'état trouvait plus commode de laisser aux propriétaires la charge de la *coemptio* en cas d'*adaeratio*, ainsi que celle du transport des denrées fiscales : le pape disposait de sa propre flotte et utilisait celles des patrons de navires endettés ou *commendati*. Le paysage côtier devait être encore très animé au VIIe siècle, avec un cabotage actif entre les petits ancrages situés à l'embouchure de cours d'eau souvent encore navigables et qui se prêtaient en tout cas au flottage du bois, avec des zones de portage en amont pour le bois. L'espace tyrrhénien était tourné vers Rome et le nord de l'Italie, où étaient convoyés troncs d'arbres, grains et amphores ; le tronçon septentrional, plat et commode, de la route côtière permettait aux convois maritimes et terrestres de cheminer parallèlement. Vers le sud les côtes des *massae* de Tropea et de Nicotera étaient également jalonnées d'établissements dont certains produisaient des conserves de poisson pour l'exportation. Reggio, grand port des échanges avec la Sicile, assurait le relai entre les deux bassins de la Méditerranée ; tous les voyageurs et les marchandises y transitaiient jusqu'à la fin du VIIe siècle. Le versant oriental de la Calabre était pleinement inséré dans le fructueux commercial de l'Adriatique : les navires de gros tonnages byzantins mouillaient, avec quelques éclipses, dans les ports fortifiés de Crotone, Tarente et Otrante, dont le trafic se maintint.

En conclusion, au-delà des objectifs stratégiques, les efforts consentis par Constantinople pour se maintenir en Italie méridionale étaient dus à la conscience qu'avaient les empereurs de l'importance des ressources naturelles du Salento et de la Calabre, grâce au maintien d'une réelle prospérité. L'économie de guerre créa au VIIe siècle, dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée, un nouveau courant orienté d'ouest en est, qui concernaient les métaux et les grains ; en retour arrivaient des fonctionnaires, des troupes ainsi que la vaisselle et les amphores. Les rapports commerciaux avec l'Afrique, qui envoyait vin, huile et grains étaient aussi intenses ; denrées et objets de métal, de céramique et de verre circulaient dans toute la région.

Le VIIIe siècle marqua une césure : la crise démographique culmina avec la dernière vague de la peste de Justinien et les habitats côtiers dispararurent. Avec le début des expéditions sarrasines sur les côtes, les *kastra* achevèrent de se retirer sur les premières hauteurs. Les échanges interrégionaux furent désormais tournés vers la Campanie, la Sicile et la Méditerranée orientale et les ressources agricoles furent affectées au plus près.
Economic Relations between the Norman Kingdom of Sicily and the Byzantine Empire, 1130–1194

The Norman Kingdom of Sicily (1130–1189) was one of the richest kingdoms of the Latin West. But the wealth of the Norman kings was not simply a matter of legend. It was real. The Normans epitomized Mediterranean culture and trade, knitting a kingdom that, as the Mediterranean itself, connected Africa, Europe, and the East. At its height the civilization of Norman Italy and Sicily was a remarkable combination of Greek, Arab, and Latin cultures. The founder of the Regno, Roger II (1130–1154) had not only acquired large wealth through his royal patrimony but also through his military campaigns and their financial rewards. For example, gold and silver were gained through the campaigns in Greece in 1147. His reign of more than four decades saw the birth of a great trading empire. Recognizing the importance of North African trade, he conquered several cities on the coastline of Ifrīqya and challenged the naval supremacy of the North African, Muslim states in the Mediterranean. Sicily’s geographic location at the centre of the Mediterranean, royal monopolies over wheat-, salt- and silk-trade and the overall state control on tax-collection have also influenced the economy of the Norman Kingdom.

InByzantium, the Komnenian period of (1081–1185) was an era of social and economic growth. The archaeological record registers a considerable growth in Byzantine glassmaking and ceramics production, with provincial centres such as Corinth and Thebes showing a sustained intensification of production from the late eleventh century through the twelfth. Written sources bear testimony to extensive trading of ordinary foodstuffs within the Empire. Venetian documents illustrate that in Manuel's reign (1143–1180) agricultural surpluses were sold to Italian merchants for resale elsewhere in the Empire and likely abroad.

While Manuel I was busy preparing for the arrival of the armies of the Second Crusade (1147–1149), Roger II of Sicily took the opportunity to plunder the Aegean. The coastal regions of the Balkans were never adequately defended against maritime raids, and Manuel’s removal of troops to guard the road into Constantinople left the coastal regions more vulnerable than ever.

In the summer of 1147, Roger captured Corfu and raided Thebes and Corinth. It is well known that after capturing Thebes and Corinth Roger II deported many of romanoi silk workers to his capital, Palermo, obviously because his royal workshop could not produce the high-quality silks manufactured by the Greek and Jewish artisans. Indeed King Roger II of Sicily was clearly aware of the importance of the silk industry in Western Byzantium and of the high quality of its products. Even his silk cape, later used as coronation mantle, was made of a silk of Byzantine or Muslim origin (Among productions open to various influences, oriental in particular, a style specific to the Norman period is clearly identifiable in the finery of the mantle of state of Roger II (1133-1134), preserved in Vienna as one of the treasures of the old Holy Roman Empire).
His successor, William I (1154–1166), refused to repatriate them when he concluded a peace agreement with Emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143–1180) in the year of 1158. A letter of Hugo Falcandus, dated 1190, lists several types of Byzantine silks produced in that workshops, all of which bear Greek names: amita, dimita, triamita, examita, diarodon, diapisti, etc. Additionally, we will present some interesting evidences for silk trade in East Mediterranean: 1/ after 1147 some Jewish silk workers from Egypt joined the labor force in Thebes, in addition to Byzantine artisans. Jewish emigration from Egypt to Thebes is suggested by a Geniza letter written somewhat earlier, around 1135; 2/ according to the Arab geographer al-Idrisi the manufacturing of silks ceased in Palermo, between 1139 and 1154; so was there a lack of silk workers in the Mediterranean during 12th c.? However, Jewish traveler Benjamin of Tudela, who visited Thebes around 1160 noticed that the local silk industry had speedily recovered after that event and was again producing high-grade silks on a large scale (Jacoby 2004, 197–240).

The Mediterranean silk-trade undoubtedly played a major role in the transmission in particular of Byzantine influence to the West. Not only were the silks economic and political pawns on the Mediterranean stage, but they provided perpetual scope for direct cultural and religious intercourse between Byzantium and her Western allies. It is remarkable that by the 12th century there was an international style of silk weaving in the Mediterranean, so that Islamic and Byzantine workshops were producing similar silks. At that point, one might expect the West to have acquired an equal number of Byzantine and Islamic silks (later Norman silks) from markets centred in Constantinople, Palermo, Fustat and Trebizond. For example, Goitein has concluded from more than 1200 letters of Jewish traders, that between the eleventh and twelfth century in general, most cloth was traded across these principle areas.

But why were the Sicilian kings so interested in silk production? Was this yet another of their attempts to mimic Byzantine imperial practices in trade and economic domination?

In the Norman period, luxury pottery was one of the rare items to circulate in vast quantities over great distances, and, after importing eastern models, Norman Italy in turn began to export them. In the early 12th century, a fair proportion of the pottery used in the Mezzogiorno was imported from the Byzantine or Moslem East. These were notably luxury ceramics with designs that were passed on by the workshops of Sicily (Piazza Armerina, Agrigento, Cefalu), which remained an area of intensive production during the Norman rule. The most refined pieces were also used for the architectonic decoration of churches and palaces where geometrical polychrome compositions made copious use of this material during the Norman period, here again copying models taken from Eastern civilizations.

More important for the economic relations between the Norman Kingdom of Sicily and the Byzantine Empire was phenomenon of gift exchange (Traviani 2001, 179–196): important examples of cultural and economic exchanges can be seen in works of art and power in Norman Italy. Roger II was tolerant of other religions and cultures and issued laws in different languages, such as Arabic, Latin, and Greek, depending on which community he was addressing. He also kept Muslim officials in his administration to help keep continuity within the administration from the previous Islamic rule. The court of Roger II was highly cosmopolitan, as evident by the presence of an Arab geographer, who was commissioned by Roger II to create a map of the world, Arab poets, who sang praise of Roger II, the famous Byzantine theologian, monk Filagato da Cerami,
and Nilo Doxopatres, who had been a deacon of Hagia Sophia. The palace workshop of Roger II employed Arab, Greek, and Jewish artisans. Although the religious practices during the Norman reign were distinctly Latin, Roger wanted to emulate the kings of Byzantium. During the rule of Roger II, his coins and seals were based on the images of previous Byzantine Emperors. He petitioned to the Byzantine Emperor for a Byzantine princess to be his bride, and he fashioned the culture of his court on the model of the Byzantine state. The Cappella Palatina, Cathedral of Cefalu, the Church of the Martorana, and the Cathedral and Cloister of Monreale display the mixing of cultures in Sicily through architectural style and ornamentation. These four sites, some of the best preserved in Sicily, are most fitting to demonstrate the concept of cultural complexity through their form and decoration. The four sites discussed were commissioned by the Norman kings of Sicily, Roger II and William II, but were produced by craftsmen from the varied cultures: mosaicists from Byzantium, artists from Greece, and craftsmen from North Africa combine their artistic traditions in the four royally commissioned structures. Yet, in the context of a society made up of several cultures, Byzantine art flourished in Sicily well into the twelfth century. Bearing the marks of Orthodoxy, the Normans’ earliest Roman Catholic churches, featuring mosaic icons and other Byzantine elements, look more Eastern than Western. Although most luxury part: the mosaics have similar counterparts only within the Byzantine world. On the other hand, there are other, little known examples of Byzantine-Norman trade, cultural relations and pilgrimage: 1/ Glass ampulla used as a reliquary to contain the blood of St. Demetrius from Sirmio, martyr of Salonika. Nowadays empty (Palermo, Trésor de la Chapelle Palatine); 2/ glass ampulla used as a reliquary to contain De liquore capitis S. Caterina (Palermo, Trésor de la Chapelle Palatine); 3/ walnut rectangular box, ivory plated, with phytomorphic patterned squares, sliding closure and handle. Probably Byzantine art. Supposed from the 12th c. (Palermo, Palazzo dei Normanni); 4/ plated box of parallelepiped shape, ivory plated, with carved figures into panels, circled by a frame of rosettes gripped in carved rounds, probably 11th-12th c.; 5/ reliquary in embossed and incised silver holds the relics of the ap. Matthew (the inscription names Abbot Didier of Montecassino as having commissioned the work, and its intended recipient, a Roman noble belonging to the Frangipani family). The ornamentation’s Byzantine and Islamic influences confirm the place and time of its production, southern Italy at the beginning of the period of Norman domination (Rome, chiesa dei Santi Cosma e Damiano); 6/ seal affixed to a deed of Roger II concerning privileges granted to a certain Ursus. The lead seal is a direct descendant of the bulls in use in the Eastern Empire (Byzantium). The deed is dated Messina, 3 November 1144; 7/ Cross-shaped reliquaries. The first on the left is constituted by two cross-shaped valves with hinges, that, when closed, give shape to the recipient of the wooden relic. One of the two parts of the second (made of wood) is missing (fig. 1–8).

Furthermore, the Normans had a trimetallic system, with many denominations – almost the same like Byzantines coinage. The fame of the Byzantine and Islamic gold coins remained alive, and it is seen by the design and the legend of the tari: mainly cufic and chrstian mixture (IC XC NI KA). P. Grierson suggested that the new concave ducalis created by Roger II in 1140 might have been produced by Byzantine workmen. Otherwise L. Traviani explains that Roger had already issued a concave coin as count (ca. 1112-20?) and concave coins might well have been produced by local workmen inspired by Byzantine coins.

During 11th–12th c. Byzantine coins were gradually replaced by local onse (norman follari mainly) and subsequently North Italian communes billion denari and grossi. It is more important
that the small Norman follari of the twelfth century are the same like the Byzantine tetartera after 1092. Also Byzantine gold coins are virtually nonexistent in finds despite the many references to them in written records, especially from Apulia. Byzantine gold coins are referred to as bizantei or skiphati, while the term solidus is used as money of account (Grierson 1973, 44–62; Martin 1986, 85–96). In the twelfth century, king Roger II undertook to pay the sum of 600 squifatos (bizantei) to the pope (as his feudal lord), but presumably he paid the sum in his own Sicilian taris, counting them 4 to 1 scyphatus. In practice the last type of nomisma to be represented in Italian hoards is a histamenon nomisma of Basil II and Constantine (hoard of Ordona).

On the other side Norman billion was progressively debased in the second half of the 12th c., and probably became rare. At the same time, there was an increasing penetration of other foreign billion with denarii of Pavia and Lucca being largely replaced by those of Pisa, Geonoo, Veneta and Champagne (provisini). Otherwise numerous hoards of Norman Sicilian taris show how these gold coins became the caput monetae in the trade of the whole Regno. Monetary exchanges with the Islamic world are largely known thanks to the Geniza documents. We have already seen how African merchants coming to Sicily had to change their gold coins into local taris. Sicilian taris have only occasionally been found in the Latin East, but we know that they were commonly used by the Geniza merchants (Goitein 1967, 40). For example a hoard from south Italy (1981) contains five taris and Venetian grossi. Some were probably shipped abroad: a number of tarreni are among the coins found in 1177 in a cardinal's ship attacked by pirates off Dalmatia (Metcalf 1979, 180). Even Norman copper finds are noted in the excavations at Athens (Traviani 1995, 393). Some of William's large (heavy) follari have been found in the East, and a few specimens of the Turkoman copper dirhams were found in Sicily; copper coins of William I and William II have been found in Aleppo, Caesarea and Tyre; Turkoman copper dirhams were found in Sicily: so these finds may demonstrate a link between Norman Sicily and the Seljuk Turks (Traviani 2001, 179–196) (fig. 8–11).

The role of Amalfitan trade was important for Regno and Byzantine trade flourishing, but that of Pisa and Genoa is also relevant for the economic history of Norman Italy. In other words, with their imports/exports via Sicily and to the eastern Mediterranean the Italian maritime republics became great economic power, and Venice played a prominent role in events. In the twelfth century there are many references to Italians trading in Constantinople, mainly Venetians, Pisans, and Genoese. Amalfitans still held prominent positions. So, although the Amalfitans are described by Niketas Choniates as the best educated in Byzantine customs, the northern Italians took over. The northern Italian merchants were becoming more and more important for the kingdom of Sicily and Byzantium at that time. Coins of Genoa were brought to Sicily, and Sicilian taris were used by the Genoese. Even if Byzantium manipulated the West: her constant aim was for political support in return for the promise of trade concessions, the liberalisation of Byzantine markets for Northern Communes was a step for so-called economical prosperity during the reign of Komnenos: trading concessions granted to Venice by Byzantium spanned the period 992-1198, endorsed within eight major treaties; Pisa drew up three similar treaties in 1111, 1170 and 1192; Genoa also concluded trade treaties between the 1140s and 1192. In fact Venice at one stage received 4,320 gold pieces per annum from Byzantium silk trade concessions in exchange for being on call to defend the Byzantine Empire at all times. But Venice was on duty whenever Byzantium needed help; in particular against Robert Guiscard, Bohemond, or Roger of Sicily, but Pisa and Genoa were obliged to provide naval support only if they were in the immediate vicinity at times of unrest. For example Venice received direct
trade concessions in 1082 and in 1147/48 in the face of Norman threats. The revival of commerce in Byzantium did not necessarily influence the aristocracy (δυνατοὶ and ἄρχοντες), which perceived the trade as more or less a necessary evil but certainly not a venture enhancing one’s social prestige. Instead of conducting long distance trade, the Komnenian aristocracy facilitated clearing new lands in order to be utilized for agricultural purposes: the long distance trade was in the hands of Italian merchants. In fact the commercial situation of Byzantium and Norman Kingdom was similar – to some extent the true was that Norman Kings imitate the economic patterns and fiscal policy of Byzantine empire. The Norman Regno must be seen as both an oriental-type luxury market and as an occidental-type agricultural producer. King William I’s pact with Genoa, in 1156, confirmed Genoese privileges within South Italian cities. In the Adriatic, Venice had close contacts with Apulian cities. So in the short term the presence of the north Italians was advantageous if not to the kingdom at least to the kings: the normans and the merchants grew very rich in partnership like the Komnenian aristocracy. We are tempted to say that patterns in Medieval trade, described by Armando Citarella, revived, but with other players (instead of the Southern Italian cities came Northern Communes). Unfortunally in the very long term the north Italian presence may have had drawbacks for southern Italy (the same like the Byzantine economy). The main coastal cities of southern Italy always enjoyed long-distance trading contacts and were relatively bustling entrepots. However, they were not able to attain the same level of long-distance commerce as their North Italian counterparts, and they largely tended to become more passive transit stages within a wider Mediterranean trading nexus supervised by the Genoese, Pisans and Venetians (Abulafia 1977, 217–283).
Les relations commerciales entre Byzance et le sultanat mamelouk (XIIIᵉ–XVᵉ siècles)

Notre étude couvre la période allant de la fin du XIIIᵉ siècle jusqu’au début du XVᵉ siècle durant laquelle les relations entre Byzance et le sultanat mamelouk ont connu des hauts et des bas accompagnées de plusieurs initiatives prises de la part des empereurs et des sultans pour donner un nouvel essor au commerce entre les deux États. Elle aborde la question des marchands byzantins en Égypte, leurs privilèges cités dans les traités et leur application réelle, et les produits échangés entre Byzance et l’Égypte.

Les privilèges accordés aux marchands byzantins en Égypte

Le traité conclu en 1281 entre l’empereur Michel VIII Paléologue et le sultan Qalâwûn contient une clause qui garantit la sécurité des personnes et des biens des ressortissants des deux souverains se rendant dans le pays de l’autre, la liberté d’exercer leurs activités commerciales en payant les taxes perçues sur leurs marchandises, la protection contre les vexations et les injustices qui peuvent causer des dommages aux marchands. En 1349, l’empereur Jean VI Cantacuzène obtient du sultan al-Nâsir Hasan le privilège de garantir la sécurité, la protection et le bon accueil de marchands byzantins qui viennent dans les pays du sultan pour le commerce.

Les marchands byzantins obtenaient des facilités et la liberté d’exercer leurs activités commerciales dans les pays du sultan. L’intérêt des marchands était avant tout de pouvoir circuler en sécurité partout où leurs affaires les appelaient. Les négociateurs des traités, l’empereur et le sultan, avaient donc insisté pour que la liberté leur soit accordée. Mais les autorités locales avaient cependant assorti cette dernière de certaines restrictions, justifiées principalement par la nécessité d’un bon recouvrement des taxes perçues sur les échanges.

Bien que les marchands byzantins jouissent de facilités commerciales, ils n’avaient jamais obtenu les privilèges qui leur accordaient une totale liberté de commerce. Pour des raisons stratégiques et économiques, les marchands étrangers, byzantins et Européens, étaient restés sous le contrôle des autorités mameloukes dans les lieux de leur résidence, et également lors de la fréquentation des marchés et le déplacement à l’intérieur des villes: il semble que les lieux publics avaient été ouverts aux marchands, mais il leur était interdit de pénétrer dans les mosquées.

À la différence des communautés marchandes européennes en Égypte qui étaient fortement organisées et présidées par des consuls, les marchands byzantins en Égypte durant le XIIIᵉ siècle et jusqu’à la deuxième moitié du XIVᵉ siècle n’avaient pas de consul exerçant des fonctions économiques et judiciaires. Il ne semble pas que leur nombre ait été important durant cette période, de plus, ils avaient été probablement représentés par le consul génois à Alexandrie. C’est l’interruption des relations commerciales entre Gênes et le sultanat mamelouk entre 1383 et 1386, et l’intensification des opérations militaires menées par les Génois contre les ports et les villes des deux littoraux égyptiens.
et syriens qui avaient nécessité la nomination d’un consul byzantin pour s’occuper des affaires de ses ressortissants et surveiller le respect des privilèges accordés par le sultan aux marchands byzantins. Le chroniqueur al-Maqrîzî nous informe que l’empereur Jean V Paléologue avait envoyé en 787H/1385 des ambassadeurs au Caire auprès du sultan Barqûq pour solliciter l’autorisation aux marchands byzantins d’exercer leur commerce en Égypte et en Syrie et d’avoir un consul à Alexandrie à l’instar des autres communautés marchandes européennes ; le sultan exauça sa demande. Il ne semble pas que le poste du consulat byzantin à Alexandrie ait duré ou ait réussi : d’une part, les sources n’en font aucune mention, et d’autre part, Gênes a conclu un traité de paix avec le sultan Barqûq en 1386 et les marchands génois ont repris leurs activités commerciales en Égypte. Les marchands byzantins ne possédaient pas les moyens de rivaliser avec les marchands génois.

Il est clair que les marchands byzantins avaient tout de même été soumis à des difficultés durant leur séjour au Levant : paiement de gratifications, confiscation de leurs marchandises, détention et prison. Mais, il faut distinguer entre difficultés, obstacles et tracasseries administratives effectuées dans un encadrement rigoureux, et des calamités soudaines. En observant les différentes étapes suivies par les marchands byzantins dès leur arrivée en Égypte, on remarque que, dans certains cas, il ne s’agissait pas de vrais obstacles mais des tracasseries administratives ordinaire qui n’affectent pas l’activité des échanges commerciaux : c’étaient des mesures préventives pour que les marchands étrangers, Byzantins et Européens, ne puissent pas se dérober au paiement des taxes.

**Les produits échangés entre Byzance et l’Égypte**

Le commerce de Byzance avec le sultanat mamelouk était limité à l’échange d’un nombre réduit de produits. Le traité de 1281 contenait une série de clauses qui organisait les échanges commerciaux entre les deux pays parmi lesquelles une clause qui concernait le commerce des esclaves et leur transport par les marchands sujets du sultan ou les marchands venant de Sûdâq (Soudak) en Égypte à travers le territoire de l’empire byzantin. L’empereur Michel VIII Paléologue promit que « Si des marchands du pays de Sûdâq désiraient voyager au pays du sultan, ils pourraient traverser librement, aller-retour, le territoire de mon empire sans obstacle ou objection après avoir payé le droit perçu. Et si les marchands de Sûdâq et ceux du pays du sultan emmenaient avec eux des esclaves, ils pourraient se rendre dans les pays du sultan sans obstacle ou objection à condition que les esclaves ne soient pas chrétiens parce que notre loi et notre doctrine ne nous permettraient pas de traiter les chrétiens de cette façon». Donc seul le passage des esclaves musulmans vers l’Égypte était autorisé alors que le transport des esclaves chrétiens était interdit. Cette clause nous permet de constater que l’approvisionnement de l’Égypte en esclaves n’était pas assuré par les marchands byzantins. Les autorités byzantines facilitaient le passage et le transport des esclaves à travers les territoires de l’empire byzantin, percevaient des taxes et exerçaient un contrôle sur les esclaves pour identifier les chrétiens parmi eux.

On ne dispose guère d’informations précises sur le commerce byzantin des métaux, mais probablement, à l’instar des marchands occidentaux, parmi les articles exportés par les marchands Byzants vers l’Égypte, les métaux, en particulier le fer, l’argent, le cuivre et l’or étaient les plus intéressants à cause de leur manque sur les marchés levantins. D’après le manuel marchand de Pegolotti rédigé vers 1340, on trouvait sur les marchés de Constantinople du fer, du plomb et de l’étain provenant de toutes les régions (d’ogni ragione).

En outre, il est très probable que les marchands byzantins envoient en Égypte les produits qui se trouvaient en abondance sur les marchés de Constantinople: le blé et toutes sortes de grains et de légumes et d’autres denrées alimentaires comme le riz, le sel, l’huile d’olive, les fruits (raisin sec, amande, noix, noisette, datte, figue sèche, pistache), le miel, et d’autres produits comme le coton et la laine. L’agriculture byzantine durant le XIIIᵉ siècle jusqu’au milieu du XIVᵉ siècle était productive et rentable. Dans le traité de 1281, l’empereur accorda la permission aux émissaires du sultan d’acheter ce que ce dernier désirait des meilleurs bons produits de son empire (kayrât bilâd mulki). Marius Canard avait traduit le mot khayrât par « céréales », alors que ce mot ne se limitait pas aux céréales mais à tout ce qui était produit dans l’Empire.

Un autre produit était exporté par les Byzantins vers l’Égypte : la galle de Turquie (galla di Turchia) cherchée de l’Asie-Mineure et de la Grèce. Elle constituait un article de commerce assez important. Il s’agissait d’un insecte dont les excroissances en faisaient un ingrédient utile en médecine et dans certaines industries. Le marché d’Alexandrie en recevait de Gallipoli, de Palatia, de Satalia et de Candelore.

Les Byzantins expédiaient vers l’Égypte du bois extrait des forêts impériales de la Morée. Dans les sources du début du XVᵉ siècle figuraient le nom de deux marchands engagés dans ce commerce mais il ne semble pas que le commerce du bois byzantin avec l’Égypte ait duré longtemps.

Il est clair que le commerce entre Byzance et l’Égypte au XIIIᵉ et XIVᵉ siècle était basé dans sa plus grande partie sur le commerce des esclaves, en mer et en terre, à travers les régions soumises à l’autorité de l’empereur byzantin. Byzance ne fournissait pas d’esclaves à l’Égypte mais son rôle se limitait à contrôler le commerce des esclaves, à assurer le passage et le transit des marchands, et percevoir des taxes et des droits. En ce qui concerne les produits et les articles de luxe exportés vers l’Égypte, il ne semble pas qu’il s’agisse de grandes quantités. L’approvisionnement de l’Égypte par les Byzants était secondaire et ces derniers ne pouvaient pas y vendre leurs produits à des prix élevés parce que les mêmes produits étaient écoulés en grandes quantités par les Européens : Vénitiens, Génois et Catalans.

De l’Égypte, les Byzantins cherchaient les épices, les produits orientaux et les chevaux.

Les achats des marchands byzantins à Alexandrie englobaient toutes les variétés des épices et les produits orientaux locaux et régionaux comme le lin, les tissus orientaux, les tapis, et les denrées alimentaires qui manquaient à Constantinople. Les sources ne fournissent pas d’informations qui nous permettent d’identifier avec précision les produits cherchés par les marchands byzantins en Égypte et particulièrement à Alexandrie. Mais il y avait le lin d’Alexandrie (lino d’Allessandria) qui était exporté d’Alexandrie à Constantinople. Pegolotti le cita parmi les produits qui figuraient sur les marchés de Constantinople.
D'autre part, dans le traité de 1281, l'empereur s'adressa au sultan pour qu'il permette aux envoyés de l'empereur d'acheter des chevaux de race (khaylan jiyādan) dans son pays. Il semble que l'empereur s'intéressait à l'achat et le croisement des chevaux pour obtenir de bonnes races.

**Quelques observations sur les échanges commerciaux entre Byzance et l'Égypte**

Les marchands byzantins, désireux de participer au commerce avec le Levant, ont utilisé la puissance, les moyens de transport et l'expérience des principales villes marchandes comme Gênes et Venise, mais ils ont pu aussi profiter des circonstances pour préparer des voyages vers le Levant par leurs propres moyens en utilisant les ressources locales. Le commerce de Byzance avec l'Égypte n'a pas connu un développement important durant le XIIIᵉ et le XIVᵉ siècle, parce que Byzance s'était intégrée dans les réseaux des grandes villes déjà marchandes, en particulier Gênes et Venise, qui exerçaient une suprématie dans le commerce méditerranéen. Ainsi, les nombreuses initiatives prises par les empereurs byzantins n'arrivaient pas réussi à établir des échanges réguliers et intenses avec le sultanat mamelouk indépendamment de Gênes et de Venise.

Mais il y a eu également une série de facteurs qui ont joué un rôle essentiel dans le rétrécissement du commerce byzantin avec le sultanat mamelouk. L'absence de grandes compagnies commerciales organisées sur le modèle italien, disposant d'un dense réseau de correspondants et de comptoirs installés aux ports levantins n'ont pas permis le développement des échanges commerciaux : le commerce est resté modeste. De même, l'instabilité de la situation politique, militaire et économique a empêché les investissements importants, et le déplacement des capitaux n'a eu lieu que durant des courtes périodes. Comme la monnaie byzantine (hyperpère) ne cessait de se déprécier, le seul investissement sûr était la terre.

Il faut y ajouter que le nombre de navires byzantins envoyés annuellement à Alexandrie durant le XIIIᵉ et le XIVᵉ siècle n'a pas été important.

Durant le XIVᵉ siècle, la présence des marchands byzantins en Égypte s'affaiblit sensiblement. La baisse des échanges diplomatiques et l'absence de traités conclus entre les deux pays est un signe révélateur de l'impuissance des empereurs byzantins à intervenir constamment pour soutenir les activités des marchands byzantins au sultanat mamelouk. Sans doute les relations entre Byzance et l'Égypte furent interrompues durant la période des guerres civiles à Byzance de 1321 à 1354. Ce fut en 1349, durant le règne de l'empereur Jean VI Cantacuzène (1347-1354), qu'une ambassade arriva au Caire pour rencontrer le sultan al-Nâsir Hasan. Ce dernier mentionna dans sa lettre que les empereurs byzantins envoyaient des ambassades auprès des sultans, mais « cette habitude avait été longtemps interrompue ». La deuxième ambassade byzantine auprès du sultan Barqûq avait eu lieu en 1385. Il semble qu'au début du XVᵉ siècle, le nombre de marchands byzantins en Égypte ait beaucoup diminué, par conséquent, les échanges commerciaux tombèrent à leur plus bas niveau. En 1411, l'empereur Manuel II Paléologue envoyait une lettre au sultan Faraj portée par un marchand de Constantinople qui s'appelait Sûrmash « qui avait l'habitude de fréquenter les États du sultan ». L'empereur s'adressa au sultan pour accorder la bienveillance et l'aide aux patriarches, aux chrétiens et aux églises ; il ne fit aucune mention de marchands byzantins en Égypte.

En général, le commerce maritime entre Byzance et le sultanat mamelouk demeura fragile, basé dans sa plus grande partie, d'une part, sur le passage des convois d'esclaves à travers les territoires byzantins et l'expédition de certains produits vers l'Égypte, et d'autre part, sur le transit...

**Conclusion**

Les relations commerciales entre Byzance et le sultanat mamelouk aux XIIIᵉ et XIVᵉ siècles étaient d’une part le résultat d’une nécessité économique et politique pour chacun des deux royaumes, mais d’autre part, elles formaient un moyen pour que Byzance garde ses rapports avec les communautés melkites en Égypte et en Syrie. Les échanges commerciaux entre Byzance et le sultanat mamelouk n’étaient pas réguliers et leur volume variait selon les circonstances et la situation intérieure dans chacun des deux pays.

Si à la fin du XIIIᵉ siècle le sultanat mamelouk avait besoin d’entretenir des relations politiques et commerciales avec Byzance pour faire face au danger mongol, au XIVᵉ siècle aucun danger extérieur ne menaçait le sultanat mamelouk : c’était une période marquée par l’apogée et l’expansion durant laquelle le commerce méditerranéen n’avait pas cessé de progresser et le port d’Alexandrie était devenu le terminus des navires chargés de marchandises et d’hommes d’affaires. Byzance, avec le grand essor commercial en Méditerranée, avait participé au trafic du Levant, profitant et bénéficiant de gains et de fortunes ; elle avait essayé de consolider la présence de ses citoyens à Alexandrie. Mais vu ses moyens et ses conditions politiques et économiques, et la perte successive de ses territoires, elle n’avait pu jouer qu’un rôle très limité, et ses activités commerciales n’avaient pas duré longtemps.

Le XVᵉ siècle marqua la décadence des relations entre Byzance et le sultanat mamelouk qui allait s’accentuer progressivement, mais il ne s’agissait pas d’une rupture commerciale complète puisque le transport et les échanges des produits entre les deux pays allaient continuer par le biais des marchands italiens, Vénitiens et Génois en particulier. Les informations fournies par les sources, bien qu’elles soient fragmentaires et médiocres, nous permettent de constater que malgré les bouleversements des situations à Byzance, des marchands byzantins continuèrent à se rendre à Alexandrie, mais il fallait prendre en considération qu’elles ne constituaient qu’une très petite partie de la documentation conservée et il faut éviter de tirer d’elles seules des conclusions générales. Il s’agit d’une question de disponibilité de sources, de conservation ou de perte de documents, qui transmettent l’information à partir desquelles on peut estimer et évaluer le commerce de Byzance avec le sultanat mamelouk. L’absence de documents restitue une image tout à fait partielle de l’activité économique des marchands byzantins dans le sultanat mamelouk au XVᵉ siècle, ce qui a repoussé à l’arrière-plan le secteur économique de Byzance avec l’Égypte et la Syrie moins spectaculaire, retransmis d’une façon moins satisfaisante et moins visible, mais qui ne véhiculait aucun symptôme de contraction ; de ce déséquilibre découle une image globalement trop sombre.
Fourteenth-Century Hospitaller’s Rhodes as a Hub in the World Trade

Up until the beginning of the (so called) modern era and the drastic change in the means of transportation, the beautiful Aegean isle of Rhodes was an important centre for the Mediterranean and the worldwide trade. It was due to its important strategic position near to the coasts of the southwestern end of the Asia Minor peninsula. Since the sailing in the Antic and Medieval age was predominantly *cabotage*, i.e. following the coastline, the majority of the ships going from Europe to the Near East (including Egypt) passed through the harbor of Rhodes. The latter which bore the same name as the whole island, was placed at the northwestern tip of the island. After the massive fortification work that had begun since the times of Antiquity and perhaps the Bronze Age, the harbor offered very good protection against the winds and the other threats coming from the sea. The town of Rhodes dominated the narrow strait between the Asia Minor (the hills of the opposite continental coast are well visible from it) and the island, through which had to pass the ancient ships going to or coming back from the multitude of the rich and mercantile coastal towns of the Levantine littoral.

This made Rhodes an important hub in the world trade at very early moment of its existence. In the Hellenistic Age Rhodes was one of the strongest and richest independent Greek states due extensively to its role in the world trade. In III-I century BC the citizens of Rhodes had built and possessed the largest fleet in the Eastern Mediterranean and, in certain moments, ruled not only their island but also the whole archipelago of the so called Dodecanese (that means “The Twelfth” for the 12 main islands in this island group that is called also the Southern Sporades) and the region of Lycia in Asia Minor. Only the powerful Romans succeeded to bring the proud Rhodes on its knees. During its existence as part of the Roman and then the Byzantine Empire Rhodes gradually lost its significance and its famous capital shranked to the level and the influence of a simple provincial town, which not among the larger ones. This decay was due not only to the loss of its independence but also to the crisis in the world sea-trade that was particularly big during the times of the so called “Dark Age” and the wars between Byzantium and the Arabs also had negative effect. Anyway, the ships still had to pass through the Rhodes Strait and, even sporadically, they did it. For example, the fleet of such famous Crusaders as the King of England Richard III and the King of France Philip II had sojourned there at their way to the Holy Land at the end of XII century. But the continuous warfare and the insecure political situation in this region had taken its toll, limiting the number of the merchants and the volume of the trade between the East and the West, and therefore the significance of Rhodes.

Despite the flourishing of the world sea-trade caused by the extensive development of the merchant fleets of the city-states of Venice (the Republic of San Marco) and Genoa (the Republic of St. George) operating mainly in the Mediterranean Sea, the situation for Rhodes was probably the hardest at the end of XIII and the beginning of XIV century. In this age the power of the Byzantine
Empire over the West Asia Minor totally collapsed and was replaced by a multitude of small warlike states dominated by one or another Turkish tribe. These new-founded Turkish states mainly counted on the so called “Ghazi”-ideology for its existence. That was meaning they had proclaimed a holy war (jihad) to all of the Christians, including the Mediterranean merchant-shipping dominated entirely by the Italian city-states and the Aegean islands divided among Byzantium, the former and some Frank lords-descendants of the Crusaders who had created the Latin Empire a century earlier. These Turkish emirates (or “beyliks”) placed on the coasts opposite to Rhodes soon began to build their own fleets to invade, harass and conquer the islands and the “infidel”’s merchant shipping. Rhodes was attacked not once before 1306 AD when the Order of Knights Hospitaller took its decision to move the Hospitaller’s headquarters to the once famous capital of the island. At the times when the Knights conquered the island (in 1306-1310 AD), its Greek population was estimated to be only ar. 10 000 people, the others being killed or kidnapped into slavery by the Turkish pirates. Therefore, it was not surprising that the Greeks, although Orthodox, soon accepted the Knights belonging to this Catholic military Order as their liberators, defendants and rightful lords, assuring in this way their peaceful and fruitful co-existence for the future two centuries (1306-1523).

Under the rule of the Knights Rhodes began to return some of its old glory and strategic and commercial meaning. It was becoming visible very soon after the establishment of the headquarters of the Hospital there. After some armed and economic conflicts caused mainly by the envy of the Genoese and the Venetians, the latter reconciled with the presence of the Order of St. John there, valuing the protection the Knights gave to the harbor. The Italian and the Spanish ships that in these times led an extensive trade with Egypt and Syria began to use Rhodes as their way station and the last secure place before entering the “infidel” waters where they were left only on the mercy of the Muslim rulers. The same was valid even more to the Western pilgrims to Jerusalem. In XIV century the pilgrimage to Jerusalem was still considered a mandatory obligation to the pious Christians, and most of the latter preferred to travel by sea for the reason of faster speed and less other logistic problems. As the Knights Hospitaller brought to the islands many of their valuable relics they had acquired in the Holy Land, found some more and built various churches and chapels, Rhodes in its turn became an object and center of pilgrimage by itself.

By the preserved, even insufficient data in the Archives of the Order of St. John in Malta and elsewhere, concerning the XIV century, we can conclude that in this age the capital of Rhodes became one of the most important Christian ports in the Levant and a hub in the international trade. One should not forget that in XIV C. Christians still dominated unchallenged over the Mediterranean Sea, and that the Mediterranean basin was probably the place where the most intensive merchant traffic in the world for that period existed. However, after the conquest of Syria, Palestine and Cilician Armenia by the Egyptian Mameluks, only a few ports in the Levant were left in Christian hands and Rhodes was one of them, i.e. one of the most eastern “secure” harbors (for western Christians in particular). That’s why one traveler called Rhodes “a French medieval town, somehow, by unknown way, forsaken at the end of the world, in the land of the Infidels and Barbarians”. However, that was also the main reason for its prosperity and wealthiness. The Knights Hospitaller that began to be called “the Knights of Rhodes” valiantly fought against the Turkish pirates from the opposite coasts, holding the sea around the Dodecanese free of dangers and made their capital a preferred place for the foreign merchants, especially for the westerners who sought protection behind the heavily fortified walls of the Rhodes’ two harbors. Even if the Italian merchant city-states were not always
friendly towards the Knights because the latter supported the policy of the Papacy which sometimes placed ban on the trade with the “infidels”, the security that presented Rhodes prevailed over the other problems. Among the latter was the protection that the Knights sometimes gave to certain Christian pirates who served as corsairs of the Order, attacking the Turks. However, the borders between the piracy and the trade in these waters were easily passed over when the word was about the prize. Last but not the least, the island became an asylum for Christian slaves fleeing from their Muslim masters. There should be mentioned also the merchant traffic pursued by the Hospitallers themselves which included trade with locally produced goods such as citrus fruits and sulfur from the isle of Nysiros and import from the Turkish beyliks (sometimes paid as tribute since in certain periods the nearby emirates like, e.g. Menteshe, were vassal to the Order of St. John) with wheat and horses as the most important and necessary goods.

It can be concluded that in XIV century the port town of Rhodes was a preferred way station for the western sea-merchants because of the secure that the heavily-armed presence of the Knights Hospitaller provided, and the excellent geo-strategical position it hold. The Knights had created their own, smaller traffic-system connecting their capital situated in what was then the “Far East” (for the West Europeans) with their extensive holdings in West Europe and the surrounding countries that provided the military and the civil inhabitants of the island with everything necessary. Since the “New World” and the routes to the desired riches of India and China round Africa had been laying ahead in the future to be discovered, a huge part of the world trade passed through the Eastern Mediterranean and, therefore, through the harbors of Rhodes. The Hospitaller’s rule brought back some of the old glory of the ancient city but turned it into a thorn into the eyes of the holy warriors of the Islam fighting against the Christianity. The Turkish Ghazis and the Egyptian Mameluks were natural and deadly enemies to the Knights of St. John and that was a fight which was destined to leave the island and its capital in ruins. But that was going to happen more than a century later, in 1522-23 AD and, until then, Rhodes was a bulwark of the Christianity and a safe haven for the Christian sea-merchants.
Byzantium as Part of the World-Economy in the 13th through the 15th Century

The paper focuses on the interaction between the Byzantine Empire under the Palaiologos dynasty and the proto-European thirteenth-to-fifteenth-century world-economy. Actually the “world-economy” is a concept introduced by F. Braudel to designate a fragment of the world, an economically autonomous section of the planet able to provide for most of its own needs, a section to which its internal links and exchanges give a certain organic unity. Braudel constructs a typology of world-economies and formulates a set of rules or tendencies which are condicio sine qua non for each of them. First of all every world-economy has its own area with boundaries that define it and give it an identity. Secondly, a world-economy always has an urban centre of gravity, a city, as the logistic heart of its activity. As a rule it is a cosmopolitan super city, a hub where the information, merchandise, capital, credit, people all flow into and out of this. There may be shifts of the centre of gravity: cities with international destinies - world-cities - are in perpetual rivalry with one another and may take each other's place. Thirdly, there is always a hierarchy of zones within a world-economy. At least three different areas or categories can be distinguished: a narrow core, a fairly developed middle zone and a vast periphery. Braudel considers the presence or otherwise, in a given region, of colonies of foreign merchants as the best criterion for defining the hierarchical position of the particular area within the world-economy.

There have been different world-economies back in history. For example ancient Phoenicia was an early version of a world-economy, surrounded by great empires. So too was Carthage in its heyday; or the Hellenic world; or Rome and of course Byzantium. Till the very end of the 12th c. the Byzantine Empire was at the centre of the world-economy, being an exceptional state, strong, aggressive and privileged, dynamic, simultaneously feared and admired. It was a state with a great amount of visible wealth, with a monetized economy, with a currency which has been called “the dollar of the Middle Ages,” and with cities which had a true economic life. Constantinople, the great economic and political center of the Empire was the heart of the Byzantine world-economy. However in the 13th c. a new geopolitical constellation was established in the Eastern Mediterranean following the Fourth Crusade and the conquest of Constantinople by the Latins and Venetians. A brand new world-economy emerged on the grounds of the old Byzantine one. This novel trade network was run by the Italian maritime republics (Venice and Genoa) which were once a part of the imperial political, cultural and economic orbit. The European world-economy appears to have rested on the slender basis of two main city-states, ones with perfect or near perfect freedom of movement, but with few resources outside themselves. In order to compensate for its weaknesses, such a city would frequently play off one region or community against another, taking advantage of the differences between them, and relying heavily on the few dozen towns, or states, or economies which served it. Nor is it paradoxical to think that the cities needed the space around them, the markets, and the protected circulation zones - in short that they required larger states to batten on:
they were obliged to prey on others to survive. Venice and Genoa would have been unthinkable without the Byzantine Empire. Regarded as being under the hypothetical rule of Byzantium, Venice was able to penetrate more successfully than any other power the huge, ineffectually defended imperial market rendering many services to the empire and even contributing to its defense. In return, she obtained massive privileges. It was however beyond all question that the Crusades really launched the trading fortunes of Christendom and of Venice.

The predominance of the city-states can only be explained in the context of the first world-economy ever to take shape in Europe, between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. It was in this period that the extensive trading-zones were established of which the cities were at once the instruments, the articulations and the beneficiaries. Economic growth in Western Europe was instrumental for the process of the development of exchange and marked the so called Medieval Commercial Revolution, eloquently argued by R. S. Lopez. Large-scale colonization and the discovery of new resources increased the endowments of various areas of Western Europe. Very important was the eventual linkage of two areas of Europe that were well along in terms of economic growth: the northern areas and the Mediterranean. A larger population, the perfection of agricultural techniques, the revival of trade and the first wave of craft industry were all essential factors for developing an urban network, an urban superstructure, with inter-city links encompassing all underlying activities and obliging them to become part of a “market economy”. This market economy, though still modest in size, would also lead to an energy revolution, with the widespread use of mills for industrial purposes, eventually creating a world-economy on a European scale. Federigo Melis locates this first Weltwirtschaft within the polygon Bruges-London-Lisbon-Fez-Damascus-Azov-Venice, an area taking in the 300 or so trading cities to and from which the 153,000 letters in the archives of Francesco di Marco Datini, the merchant of Prato, were dispatched. Heinrich Bechtel speaks of a quadrilateral: Lisbon-Alexandria-Novgorod-Bergen. Fritz Rorig, the first historian to give the meaning ‘world-economy’ to the German word Weltwirtschaft, suggests that its eastern frontier was a line running from Greater Novgorod on lake Ilmen, to Byzantium. The intensity and volume of trade all contributed to the economic unity of this vast area. This world-economy was centered on the Italian maritime republics whose merchants had created a global trade system that linked in a kind of international market, for about the century during which the Pax Mongolica lasted (c.1250–c.1350), a huge area starting from China and including the Middle East, the eastern Mediterranean, Italy and continental Europe. According to Ang. Laiou the nuclear of this trade system involved the eastern Mediterranean and Italy in the first instance. It was characterized by the functioning of supply and demand mechanisms that result in a fairly uniform price formation, once transportation costs have been compensated for; by the existence of widely accepted or convertible currency as well as banking, and by the existence of efficient techniques for acquiring and disseminating economic information. The most important trait, however, was division of labor.

The mercantile activity was greatly influenced by the ubiquitous presence of Western merchants in cities large and small and even in the countryside, as well as by the existence of the Italian dominated international market, in which the Byzantine Empire was integrated. These two overarching facts framed the structure of the Byzantine market and the activities of Byzantine merchants. A third important factor is a major shift in the trade partners of Byzantium: the role of the Arab states declined drastically, while that of the Italian states increased. Most of these conditions existed in the eastern Mediterranean in this period. Specifically regarding the supply and price of wheat, it seems
that the Black Sea region, Turkish Asia Minor and Crete functioned as a vast area where supplies were interchangeable, and the price of wheat tended to revert to normal after disruptions produced by acute crises, mostly political. The division of labor is the factor that is the most clearly discernible. The eastern Mediterranean, globally speaking, became an area which exported to the West raw materials and alimentary products, while it imported from the West manufactured products, primarily woolen cloth. From the eastern Mediterranean also were re-exported the spices and other luxuries of the Eastern trade. To the extent that this was an international market, local economies responded to a greater or lesser degree to international demand; this was mediated by Venetian, Genoese and other merchants who ruled the waves and had access to the Western markets. The effect on the local economies differed from place to place. Along with the crusader states, it was the Byzantine Empire that felt most strongly the effects of this division of labor. The reasons are many. The very fact of the occupation of large parts of the former Byzantine Empire by Westerners, for varying periods of time, gave Western merchants, at first the Venetians, then the Genoese and then others, a highly privileged position which did not end with the Byzantine recovery of territories. Secondly, the importance of the Black Sea, both as a wheat-exporting area and as a series of outlets for the products of the Eastern trade, heightened the interest of Western powers in this area, as well as in Constantinople through whose straits the ships had to pass. The opening of the Black Sea to Western merchants was one of the most important results of the Fourth Crusade in the economic realm. The Venetians profited at first, but after 1261 the Genoese had the upper hand, although others were active there as well.

After its restoration (1261) the Byzantine state no longer functioned as an efficient mechanism of integration. An integrating factor did exist in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: it was international trade, dominated and organized by the Italian city-states, Pisa for a while, but primarily Genoa and Venice. The needs and activities of the Italian merchants made of the eastern Mediterranean an integrated trade system, in which the various regions were drawn, each with its own relations with the Italians. As a result, there are regional economies—those of Black Sea coasts, Macedonia and Thrace, Epiros, Thessaly, and the Peloponnese—with some contact with each other to be sure, but with the important factor being their relationship with the Italians and their role in the trading system of the eastern Mediterranean.

The economic life of the late Byzantine capital was much more strongly influenced, and in many respects even dominated, by numerous Latin bases and quarters. The Venetian one included a palatium as the seat of their bailo, a loggia or banchus juris, several churches. In addition to the Venetians, the Pisans, Catalans, and other cities and states of the Latin West also had bases in the late Byzantine capital, through which they exerted influence on the economic life of the city. All these western communities and their bases inside Constantinople were overshadowed in their influence on the city's economy by the Genoese settlement outside the city boundaries on the other shore of the Golden Horn. Byzantine economic forces, facilities, and institutions, meanwhile, were pushed into the back section of the port, and some moved to the urban regions along the shore of the Sea of Marmara. In this way the increasing dependence of Byzantine merchants and artisans on western wares and trading convoys, on western capital, connections, and economic rhythms also manifested itself topographically.

Western economic forces were not able to secure the same kind of advantageous positions in the city of Thessalonike. The Venetians clearly had the strongest presence and position since the
city became a part of the Venetian trade subsystem. There were consuls of the Venetian Republic in Thessalonike nearly throughout the entire late Byzantine period. However the Venetian consuls were blocked in various ways in their efforts to gain control of the trade with certain foodstuffs and raw materials and had to take large financial losses since the export of grain, peas, beans, and other produce was not permitted. Actually during the Palaiologan period, Thessalonike was, more so than Constantinople, the center for a genuine Byzantine economic development, a refuge for Byzantine independence and Byzantine pride.

By the early fourteenth century, Venice and Genoa had created in the old Byzantine territories commercial subsystems each of which was dominated by one or the other of these powers, although the domination was never complete and was constantly contested. Both old marketplaces and new ones must be seen in the context of these subsystems and the needs of international commerce. In the Venetian dominated system (*The Venetian Romania*), western Greece enters the commercial record. Durrazzo (Dyrrachium) and Avlona are “old” marketplaces, since they had been active since the eleventh century. Arta, Naupaktos, and other, smaller cities were new marketplaces. Wheat, salt and meat were important exports from these areas. The city of Ioannina had a considerable mercantile element, most probably trading in grain and animal products. The Peloponnese, whether occupied by Westerners or by Byzantines, formed part of the subsystem, and had an active trade, in large part tied to Venetian interests. Crete and the Venetian-occupied islands of the Aegean belonged to the same subsystem. Modon, Coron, Clarentza, Candia (Chandax) are only the best-known of the new ports/marketplaces.

The Genoese subsystem (*The Genoese Romania*) was located in the Eastern part of the Empire. It was more powerfully contested than the Venetian one, in part because Genoa did not have territorial ownership on much of it, but in part also because some of the most important commercial areas were located here. The Venetians, and, for a short period, the Byzantines, wanted and got access to the Black Sea. The Trapezuntine ports, on the Asia Minor coast of the Black Sea, were marketplaces where both Venetians and Genoese were active. Constantinople was home to the merchants of both cities, although the Venetian quarters in Constantinople formed less highly developed a colony than the semi-autonomous Genoese settlement in Pera (Galata). Genoese dominance resulted in the appearance of a number of marketplaces that may have been older but acquired new importance. After the middle of the fourteenth century, Caffa, the major Genoese base in the Black Sea, was insecure because of problems with the Tatars. A number of smaller ports in the Danube Delta, Chilia, Licostomo and others, sprang up in partial replacement of Caffa; they exported primarily wheat to Pera and thence to Genoa. Chios and Phocaea formed part of the subsystem. In the first part of the fifteenth century, as Caffa declined, Chios became the fulcrum of Genoese trade with the eastern Mediterranean. There was intense trading activity within each of the two subsystems, as networks of merchants were established, connecting native traders, as well as Venetians or Genoese respectively, to each other within broad geographic areas. However, the subsystems were not impermeable. There was competition between the two major sea powers, which at times became intense, leading to open warfare; warfare that became more acute and more merciless in the second half of the fourteenth century, when economic crisis engulfed the Mediterranean and caused states to fight savagely for dwindling resources. Both Venice and Genoa, as the strong players in the area, pursued a policy with a double aim: to acquire for themselves what they called freedom of the sea (libertas maris), that is, privileged trade conditions, monopolies if possible, and to impose adverse
conditions on everyone else; clearly two competing aims when more than one state is involved. These policies are evident in the Byzantine Empire and most powerfully in Constantinople and the Black Sea area. Here, the Genoese tried to keep the sea closed to everyone else. The Venetians fought for freedom of trade (meaning, for safeguarding their own presence there).

International developments worked to the disadvantage of the Byzantine economy. In an increasingly internationalized commercial world, economic power was in the hands of those who controlled commerce. Progress in commercial techniques, shipping, banking, and manufacturing became rapid in parts of Western Europe in the thirteenth century and after. In this world, Byzantine products could not compete, and the Byzantine economy itself became, to some degree, ancillary occupying a peripheral position. The trading system affected more than distribution: the pull of demand and the mechanisms developed by the Italian city-states became structuring factors for manufacturing and for primary production that were geared, in certain areas, to the demands of an international market. The economy of the Byzantine or formerly Byzantine territories was unable to profit from the positive effects of Western markets and, instead, eventually relinquished control of commerce and manufacturing to the Western Europeans, most particularly to the merchants of the Italian maritime cities. It was attended by a shift in the place of manufacturing from Byzantine territories to Western European ones. The Byzantine economy lost its currency advantage, as the territories of the Empire saw the proliferation of Western, especially Venetian, coins used for transactions even among Byzantines, from the second half of the thirteenth century. By the late fourteenth century, coins of Byzantine issue circulated only in Constantinople and its hinterland. Thus the integrating role of the Byzantine coinage, with the attendant benefits for the Byzantines, was lost. The role of the state in the economy, then, was greatly reduced. The role of Constantinople was also reduced, since the functions it had filled in the past either disappeared, or changed. It is not even the case that Constantinople set fashion, and therefore elite demand, any more. That role seems to have devolved to Italy.
Textiles. Home Economics or Workshop Production?
Preliminary Results from the Study of Alassarna/Kardamena, Kos/Greece

The excavations carried out in Kardamena, Kos by the University of Athens, under the supervision of Professors Sophia Kalopissi-Verti, Mary Panagiotidi-Kesisoglou and Georgia Kokkorou-Alevra, have brought to light the remains of a Hellenistic Temple dedicated to Apollo, along with an array of lesser structures related to the shrine, as well as a settlement with a lifespan from the 4th to the mid-7th century AD.

Among the finds are loom weights, spindle whorls, fishing weights, dices and checkers, objects that reveal everyday activities, associated with the preparation of food and the making of cloths, as well as with leisure.

This paper will examine the loom weights and spindle whorls. The aim is to document through these artifacts the textile production in the area either in the form of an organized textile manufacture, or as simple installations for domestic use. We will discuss the differences in shape, dimensions and weight of loom weights not only with regard to technical issues, such as the type of loom and the fabric quality, but also as factors related to the organization of the local community.

Finally, we will attempt to address the issue of dating these artifacts, since both their material and typology seldom differ over time and across cultures. Further research into this material may help establish evidence for further comparisons with relevant material both from within as well as beyond the Byzantine Empire.
Agricultural Production and Installations in Byzantine Cappadocia: 
A Case Study Focusing on Mavrucandere

Unlike the extensive research on the Byzantine religious architecture in Cappadocia, the number of inquiries about the agricultural installations is very limited. Apart from a few recent studies, agricultural installations in the region have not been investigated in terms of their chronology, architecture, location, and process of production.

In particular, wine and linseed oil were two of the most important goods produced in Cappadocia during the Middle Ages. Current research in Cappadocia has revealed a number of carved wine presses within the secular settlements or religious buildings. In fact, in some of the settlements, several of these wine presses are clustered in a specific area so that these installations are used for mass production purposes. These mentioned sites used to vary in their architectural features. The architectural planning and the number of components that constitute the wine press (treading floor, collecting vat, pipes) provide valuable information about the production process. These features, though in different scales, have been used in agricultural installations since Late Antiquity throughout the Mediterranean basin. In addition, as Cappadocia is located at a major intersection of roads during the Middle Ages, it is highly probable that the produce of these wine presses was commercially traded.

The valley of Mavrucandere contains a settlement which has a remarkable agrarian installation complex in Cappadocia. The valley is located in the south of the province of Kayseri (Caeserea). In the present-day, the valley is also known as Güzeldere, while it was named as Potamia by its Greek population in the nineteenth century. The settlement is positioned between the primary medieval transportation hubs of Aksaray (Koloneia) and Kayseri (Caeserea). During our survey in Mavrucandere, we discovered a group of rock-cut wine presses. These installations are located in close proximity to one another in an area known as “Ağaçlık,” on the hillside of the valley. There are both simple, single-roomed installations and more complex plans, indicating the presence of large-scale production. Resembling a factory, this area highlights the architectural and the organizational structure of the wine presses in Cappadocia. Undoubtedly, our archaeological evidence about the Byzantine wine presses in Mavrucandere suggest that the settlement was deliberately planned.

In the light of the mentioned findings and the research results, this paper aims to introduce the architecture of the wine presses, the organization of wine making process, the location of the installations in the settlement, and the importance of the installations for the region’s trade activities during the Byzantine period.
Alms, Loans, and Usury in the Byzantine Worldview: An Essay in Comparison

The moral evaluation of credit and financial operations can serve as one of the clearest indicators of a society’s “economic worldview”. Byzantium, where trade went hand in hand with an extensive development of credit and usury, was not an exception. It has become commonplace to assert that usury was perceived negatively in Byzantine society, that charging interest was condemned energetically, that this condemnation derived its power from the spontaneous popular attitude towards such practices, and that it actively employed Christian rhetoric. To support such claims, scholars usually cite hagiographic sources, where trade and finances are often mentioned.

For instance, Byzantinologists often bring up The Miracles of the Great-Martyr Artemius (570–660). This text relates the story of the son of a money changer and usurer, whom his parents tried to get to join his father’s occupation but who, being a religious boy, was so ashamed of his father’s “miserable and shameful livelihood”, gained by charging the debtors enormous interest, that he became a cleric.

Gregory of Nyssa also wrote about the rapacity of usurers, who desired people to suffer “deprivations and misfortunes” and come to them for financial aid. In his words, the money-lender “counts his income daily, and is never satisfied with it; deplores the gold that lies in his home, for it remains without any employment and profit.” According to John Chrysostom, many trapezites “attach interest to interest and pursue by way of iniquity any lucre”.

“The mental trap” of the Byzantine society was created on the one hand by the developing trade, which demanded credit institutions, and on the other hand by the condemnation of usury. It required an adequate solution at the level of ideology and worldview. Probably one way to resolve the contradiction can be detected by comparing the «theoretical» level of the attitudes towards usury, most fully elaborated for the early Byzantine times in the A Word against Usurers by Gregory of Nyssa (335–396), with the «practical» level of credit operations.

In A Word against Usurers it is said that the borrowing of money is “the same as begging for alms, only having an air of propriety,” and therefore one should give to the needy not only without charging them interest, but also without demanding the money back, i.e. not requiring the return of the principal. The preacher considered an interest-free loan to be “the second degree of charity,” following the first degree, “gratuitous giving”. He claimed that “both are worthy of punishment when one person refuses to favor and the other person borrows more than a tax”. It seems interesting to impose this framework from Gregory of Nissa’s sermon on the data from The Life of St. Spyridon of Trimythous (died about 348 AD) by Theodorus, Bishop of Paphos (c. 625).

Spyridon gave alms to a naukleros who solicited it under the pretense of a loan (with an air of propriety), that is, he implemented the “first degree of charity.” The saint’s indifference as to the
repayment of the debt is notable – he does not inquire or confirm whether or not the merchant returned the money, or if the merchant did it in full, because Spyridon has given alms, not a loan. And when the merchant, having deceived Spyridon and not returned what he had taken, asks for money again, the saint does not refuse him and allows the merchant to take what he asks for from the chest. Without a doubt, the saint once again perceives this act as a giving of alms, and is willing to do it if his means prove sufficient.

The merchant interprets the situation differently. Initially he is consistent in returning what he has received from the saint, and later, when his fraud is exposed, he begs for forgiveness and evidently believes it mandatory to repay the debt. He seems to perceive the saint’s actions as “the second degree of charity.” He is probably certain that his perception of the saint’s giving him money as an interest-free loan coincides with Spyridon’s view of the events.

Thus *The Life of St Spyridon of Trimythous* demonstrates how the model of a byzantine believer’s relation to alms, loans, and usury, worked out by Gregory of Nyssa on a general theoretical level, could and was supposed to function in practice, allowing even a saint to act as a money-lender.

As we can see, even a saint could, according to the hagiographic literature, act as a money-lender, if he did not charge any interest. We also find this motive in the *Life* of St. John the Merciful, Patriarch of Alexandria (610–619), written by Leontios of Neapolis (620s–640s). John repeatedly lent to merchants in Alexandria both money (including considerable sums of five to ten liters of gold) and goods and did not complain when a borrower was not able to repay the debt even after a successful return to Alexandria.

Even more interesting is another aspect notably emphasized in *The Life of St. Spyridon*, namely the idea of the just repayment of the money borrowed. Obviously, the *Life* stresses, it is proper not only to lend money without interest, but also to repay debts in a timely fashion and in full. Probably this is how the principle of business relations laid down in the New Testament (“do to others what you would want them do to you,” Matthew 7:12) was supposed to be applied in practice.

However, demands postulated by preachers could not be consistently realized in practice, and simple considerations of piety, not connected to receiving profit, could not force potential lenders to part with their assets: “We will not lend, or lend but on the condition that the borrower pay such and such amount of interest,” relates Gregory of Nyssa the typical attitude of early-Byzantine lenders. Note that, according to Nicholas Kabasilas, late-Byzantine usurers acted similarly: “They (the usurers – *A. D.*), because it is prohibited to charge interest, decide not to lend, themselves abolish creditors in cities and censure the law for it”. And even more clearly: “No one will lend money if there is no hope of receiving interest”.

The inviability of the preached treatment of usury was unequivocally demonstrated by Basil I’s (867–886) attempt to prohibit charging interest on loans (Prochiron. XVI. 14). Only to minors and orphans were excluded from the prohibition. Based on the Christian attitude toward the charging of interest, the emperor’s measures were hailed by the broad populace. But they did not last long, and already Leo VI (886–912) relinquished them in his novellas. While considering Basil’s law wonderful, he had to admit that without charging interest the very existence of credit is threatened (Les Novelles de Leon VI le Sage LXXXIII). “This instruction (of Basil I’s about the prohibition of interest – *A. D.*), as a result of the poverty of the people, led not to the better, as the lawgiver had thought, but to the worse. Previously, hoping for interest, many would lend money willingly; but
when the law appeared according to which it was prohibited to derive profit from lending, some
became inhuman, cruel, and unfeeling towards those in need of a loan... As a result... the law that
was in itself benevolent has not brought benefit but has caused harm... The nature of man has not
reached the heights at which this law obtains, and therefore we abolish this wonderful law.” Thus
the church’s appeals about the prohibition of interest, “reduction of debts and complete forgiveness
of debt obligations (chreon apocopai, othlematon synchoreseis),” as The Life of George of Amastris
puts it, remained futile.

In other words, practice showed that the high ideal reflected in the law of Basil I was
incompatible with the realities of everyday life, had a negative impact on business dealings, and
impeded the progress of trade. These circumstances forced Leo VI to return to the old legislation
of Justinian, which acknowledged the practice of charging interest but regulated its upper limits
depending on the social status of the creditor (Basil. XXIII. 3. 73, 74, 76; compare: Cod. Just. IV. 26;
IV. 32; Nov. Just. 32, 1 etc.). Just like in the sixth century, professional usurers were allowed to charge
8 percent annual interest, members of the nobility – 4 percent, and everyone else – 6 percent. In
special cases with the high risk of the loss of capital (primarily loans for maritime trade), charging
12 percent was allowed (Basil. XXIII. 3. 72, 74, 76; compare: Cod. Just. IV. 26; IV. 32; Nov. Just. 32,
1). The highest allowed interest could not be exceeded even by the mutual agreement of the parties.
If, in violation of the law, excess interest was actually charged, the money paid unlawfully were to
count toward the repayment of the principal.

Clearly, such interest rates were quite sufficient for the normal conduct of credit operations
and for decent levels of profit. Eastern Islamic cities of the eleventh century arrived naturally at
commensurate levels of interest rates – they rarely went over 6–10 percent annual.

Thus Leo VI considered usury a “necessary evil”, avoiding which would be desirable but,
unfortunately, impossible. The realities of life inexorably compelled the abandonment of abstract
ideas. We can observe a similar pattern in the medieval Islamic East, where on the one hand usury
was condemned, but on the other hand the impossibility of conducting trade without credit was
acknowledged.

This is why the general attitude towards usury in Byzantium was, it seems, ambivalent rather
than purely negative. This ambivalence was reflected, among other things, in hagiographic works,
where usurers were sometimes shown in even the most positive light. So it was in the prologue about
Theodore the merchant and the Jewish usurer Abram. In this text, Abram agreed to give Theodore a
loan three times without demanding the repayment of the previously lent sums and accepting only
an image of Jesus Christ as a surety of sorts. In the end, when the debtor after a successful trading
voyage was able to repay the loan handsomely, giving back four thousand liters instead of just one
thousand that he had borrowed, the Jew was so struck by the power of the Christian God that he
changed his faith and put all his money into building a chapel where he then served as a
minister.

Clearly, even the negatively perceived occupation of usurer was still not, using the expression of R.
Lopez, “an object of indiscriminate hatred.”

We may suppose that “indiscriminate hatred” and total condemnation was avoided by those
usurers who did not dare to break the law and charge higher interest than prescribed. The activities
of such moneylenders were allowed by the state itself, when the latter determined the interest
rates the charging of which did not incur a breach of the Christian canon. To some extent, the law
that regulated the charging of interest performed a kind of compensatory function – it allowed
moneylenders the easier to agree to engage in an activity generally frowned upon in the society
pervaded by Christian traditions. As Nicholas Kabasilas noted, moneylenders did not shun their
income precisely because their pursuits were not condemned by the law (and were even encouraged,
or at least acknowledged as necessary, we can add).

Certainly this is only a conjecture, but we should note that such an attitude existed in the
Ottoman Empire. There, credit operations at fixed interest (20 percent) were not considered usury
and not perceived as a breach of the Qur'anic prohibitions. Only those credit transactions that
entailed the charging of interest in excess of 20 percent were considered riba (usury as such). It is
quite possible that something like this could be the case in the early medieval Byzantium as well,
where secular and religious customs and practices were closely intertwined. This was the way in
which religion, in the words of Fernand Braudel, while constantly saying no to “the innovations
of market, money, speculation, and usury,” in the end said yes and accepted the “aggiornamento –
adaptation to modernity”.

It is interesting also to juxtapose the idea of limited interest with the idea of a “just price”
(iustum pretium, to dicaion timema) and regulated profit margins for the members of some of
Constantinople's corporations. The “just price” idea also found its way into the hagiographic
literature, and the hagiographer of Anthony the Great (fourth century) put the following words in
the saint's mouth: “In this present life the price of a thing bought is equal to what it is worth, and the
seller receives no more than that. But the promise of eternal life is acquired for too little a price: it is
given to us for a life momentary”. In Byzantium, as in Western Europe, the activities of a merchant
were considered justified if the principle of just compensation was not violated. It is quite possible
that the same applied to usury.

Clearly, the described attitude towards usury was not only the most expedient, but also the
only possible one in a Christian society that experienced not only religious purism and fanaticism,
but also the sense of gain and profit. It infiltrated so deeply into the worldview of the Byzantines that
even alms for the poor were equated with a loan extended to none other than God himself: “For it
is said, 'He who gives to a poor man, lends to God. And Holy God will recompense... and bestow
the kingdom of heaven’” (see: Еще история Человека Божье, которая была записана в городе
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Traduzioni di testi agiografici e liturgici e rielaborazione delle fonti nella metafrasi linguistica in epoca umanistica

Il bisogno urgente degli Umanisti di traducere, piuttosto che transferire, transvertere o interpretari, esprimeva con un vocabolo nuovo nel settore delle traduzioni il passaggio dalla ‘schiavitù’ medievale della sottomissione alla lettera del testo alla libera capacità della persona di penetrare nel testo reinterpretandolo e modificandone talora le qualità, in una tipologia di operazione simile a quella che il mondo greco definiva con il vocabolo metaéfrasiv. Con questo lo scritto letterario, fuoruscendo dai limiti angusti della mera fedeltà della resa testuale, si rivestiva della prospettiva di opera in continuo divenire nella logica della continuità storica con il passato.

Al servizio di questa operazione, e in risposta a esigenze a cui non possono dirsi estranei anche peculiari obiettivi di natura didattica, si pongono non soltanto celebri manufatti come codici bilingui, di contenuto soprattutto liturgico e grammaticale, ma anche figure eminenti di eruditi, la cui attività ruotò intorno allo studio e alla diffusione della filosofia neo-platonica: tra costoro spiccano, insieme a molte altre, le personalità di Nicola di Cusa e Ambrogio Traversari che nel 1436 pubblicava la sua nuova traduzione del Corpus Dionysiacum. Il Concilio di Ferrara - Firenze, insieme agli altri che ne costituirono nella prima metà del sec. XV le premesse, costituiti, oltre che una circostanza di utilità politica ed ecclesiale, un incontro di spiriti eletti e un’occasione di promozione culturale, la cui portata – spesso segnalata – resta tuttora poco esplorata: ad essa vanno connesse anche numerose iniziative di traduzione in ambito «agio-liturgico» che pongono in luce interazioni tra mondo greco e latino fiorite a cavallo degli anni 1438-1439.

Alcuni casi risultano particolarmente emblematici. Qualche segnale ‘pre-umanistico’ non di traduzione, ma almeno di familiarità degli ambienti colti dei sec. XIII-XIV per l’ambito agiografico può ravvisarsi in autori quali Niceforo Blemmida, Giorgio Ciprio, Teodoro Metochita, Niceforo Callisto Xanthopulos, Gregorio Palamas, Niceforo Gregoras, Nicola Cabasilas. In essa vanno individuati i prodromi dell’interesse per questo genere letterario né ora né in seguito disdegnato da eruditi e filologi bizantini – a giudicare dall’attività di autori quali Giorgio Scolario e Bessarione –, a cui si deve anche la discreta fioritura nella copia di codici contenenti testi agiografici tra i secc. XIV-XV.

Forte della venerazione tributatagli in ambito sia orientale sia occidentale e dell’ampio interesse suscitato dal problematico corpus di scritti a lui attribuito, può, a mio avviso, individuarsi nel complesso dossier agio-liturgico greco e latino di s. Dionigi l’Areopagita un caso paradigmatico di filtrazione e reimpiego di elementi nelle due tradizioni ecclesiali, favorito da reciproche opere di traduzione. Una intensa, sia pure ancora embrionale, operazione di traduzione e progressivo adattamento può fissarsi alla fine del sec. XII, epoca a cui è possibile far risalire l’introduzione di inserti di vistosa derivazione greca nella Messa dell’ottava di s. Dionigi in Occidente. Ma è lo stesso cospicuo repertorio di Vitae agiografiche del santo a confermare un’intensa opera di scambio e metafrasi, in cui si distinguono, in particolare, tra i complessivi altri 65 testi repertoriati dai Bollandisti: – una Passio greca (BHG 554) tradotta da un ancora non bene identificato originale
Laudatio di Giorgio Ciprio (BHG 557); – una Passio (BHL 2184), erroneamente attribuita a Metodio patriarcha di Costantinopoli e tradotta in latino da Anastasio Bibliotecario, ancora copiata ai primi del sec. XVII per essere trasmessa al Card. Caetani e confluire così nel codice miscellaneo Rom. Alexandr. 95 (alias l.h. 1-3); – una Laudatio (BHL 2189) scritta da Michele Sincello e tradotta in latino da Guglielmo monaco di Saint-Denis nel sec. XI, in tre codici parigini dei secc. XIV (BNF, Paris. lat. 2447 e Nouv. acq. lat. 1509) e XV (BNF, Paris. lat. 2873 B).

Analoghe vicende di sovrapposizione tra agiografia e liturgia hanno consegnato al Missale Romanum serie eucologiche, come ad es. quella per s. Policarpo martire, coniata sul testo della passio greca del santo.

E ben documentato è anche il passaggio di formule benedizionali dagli eucologi greci alla Chiesa latina, il cui studio pone attenzione sulla particolarità dei criteri adottati per simili traduzioni, come nel caso della 'preghiera di s. Matteo apostolo' per benedire vino, olio o miele', nel Vat. gr. 1833, ff. 46^a-47, coincidente con la eu'caristòa però u6datov kai elJaou, a sua volta derivante da Constitutiones Apostolorum, VIII, ritoccata per adattarla maldestramente alla nuova destinazione con sgrammaticature e poca destrezza linguistica.

Anche un altro volume agio-liturgico di confine, l'omiliario, testimonia, sempre a cavallo tra i sec. XII-XIII, tracce di una accorta operazione intellettuale, in questo caso di più squisito interesse teologico, documentata da manoscritti che trasmettono un elevato numero di umili traduzioni anonime nei campi sia dell'agiografia sia dell'omiletica, confermando, per quanto concerne l'Occidente latino, l'impressione che il prestigio delle tradizioni greche in ambito ecclesiastico affascinasse molto i monaci italiani.

L'interesse per questa tipologia di traduzioni accompagna in Occidente la redazione di libri liturgici propri, soprattutto di ambito monastico, fino alla riforma tridentina. Al suo avvento il Breviarium Romanum si presenterà dotato di lectiones agiografiche, il cui stile pare modellato secondo l'exemplum del Sinassario; canti e formule melurgiche attesteranno un fenomeno molto particolare in cui le varie liturgie latine non si limitarono alla semplice traduzione fedele dei testi originari, ma ricalcarono perfino modi letterari e addirittura melodie, adattandole ovviamente alle esigenze linguistiche e celebrative, in alcuni casi giungendo anche a conservare, nella forma di semplici traslitterazioni, il testo greco a fianco della traduzione latina. Tuttavia, il Martyrologium Romanum interverrà ad offrire, a distanza di oltre un secolo da quelle premesse, un esempio vistoso di diffidenza nell'acquisizione da parte latina di una tradizione che si riteneva evidentemente incerta e irta di difficoltà.

Quali i casi in questione? Quali le possibili ragioni che hanno favorito il processo di interrelazione? Quali i meccanismi specifici della traduzione e della metafrasi documentabili attraverso l'agiografia e la liturgia?
Testi religiosi occidentali in greco: 
la Regula bullata di Francesco d’Assisi

In un manoscritto della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana si conserva una traduzione in greco della Regula bullata di Francesco d’Assisi. Il testo originale, redatto in latino nel 1223, riflette la “regula et vita” (in greco: κανὼν καὶ βίος) della primitiva comunità dei fratres Minores, le loro origini, la loro esperienza di vita “secondo la forma del santo Vangelo”, le disposizioni normative.

In realtà, il codice Vaticano, che contiene per lo più traduzioni dal latino al greco da s. Tommaso d’Aquino, da Boezio, da s. Anselmo, ai ff. 104v-106r reca una versione dal latino al greco soltanto dei primi quattro capitoli della Regula bullata – cap. I: Nel nome del Signore. Incomincia la vita dei frati Minori; cap. II: Di coloro che vogliono intraprendere questa vita e come devono essere ricevuti; cap. III: Del divino ufficio e del digiuno, e come i frati debbano andare per il mondo; cap. IV: Che i frati non ricevano demani – che invece consta di dodici capitoli.

Il manoscritto risulta vergato per buona parte dalla mano del protopapa di Candia Giovanni Symeonakis (il suo nome figura nel margine superiore del f. 221r), che verosimilmente ha assemblato e confezionato per uso personale questa raccolta di traduzioni, dovute per lo più a Manuele Caleca, frate domenicano e tomista greco, e a Demetrio Cidone, fervido oppositore del palamismo, che partecipò ai tentativi di riunione della Chiesa cattolica e della Chiesa ortodossa e, grazie alle sue traduzioni, contribuì alla diffusione della teologia occidentale in Grecia e, nel contempo, della cultura greca in Italia.

Nulla sappiamo, invece, in merito alla versione in greco della Regula franciscana, di cui non abbiamo altre attestazioni. Da chi è stata realizzata? Da Symeonakis stesso? Da quale codice? Qual è stato il modello latino utilizzato per la traduzione? A questi e ad altri interrogativi si proverà a dare una risposta.
Traduzione latina degli Atti dell’VIII Concilio Ecumenico 
a Costantinopoli (sec. XIV)

The translation of the acts of the so called 8th Ecumenical Council or more precisely the Local Synod of 869/70 in Constantinople was performed in two versions under different conditions and at different time. For the synchronic translation of the Greek texts into Latin is responsible the envoy of the Western Emperor Louis II, Anastasius bibliothecarius. Although the original Greek acts were robbed, Anastasius could translate the text from an own copy. The Latin texts is preserved in the contemporary copy codex Vaticanus Latinus 4965 (about 870/71, Rome), the original Greek text vanished.

What remains of the Greek original, is an abbreviated version that is closely connected to the Vita Ignatii of Niketas David Paphlagon. Its earliest manuscript dates from the end of the 13th or the beginning of the 14th c. In the 14th c. the text became of interest in the Latin circle of Dominicans in Pera (and for their policy of conversion among the Greeks as well as for their attacks against the Greek faith); there a Latin translation was initiated. About this enterprise we are well informed by an excellent study of Thomas Kaeppeli of 1953. In his analysis of synchronic works of the Dominicans active in the Contra Graecos debates he proved Filippo de Bindo Incontri being initiator of the translation for which Incontri collaborated with the well-known translator Demetrius Cydones. In his libellus qualiter Greci recesserunt ab obediencia Ecclesie Romane Incontri clarifies the circumstances under which the translation was tackled: It was the question of the primus actor divisionis of the Latin and Greek church and its reason that caused him to look for sources. For this investigation Incontri was assisted by Cydones who found a copy in the Prodromus Petra monastery in Constantinople and fecit transcribere et michi eciam tradidit, ut ego (= Incontri) transcribere facerem. Then they started together with the translation (post hec statim ipse una mecum transtulimus in linguam Latinam). Furthermore, Incontri informs about the date of discovery of the manuscript in his libellus (anno praeterito). Kaeppeli created the chronology of the works of Incontri, based on all data he collected from different sources of his life, and could date the discovery and translation in the period of 1355—1356.

Thereby the translation presents itself as one of the rare cases where circumstances, translators and time are fixed and determinable. On the other hand, the use of the epitome of the acts (including the relevant letters between East and West) and not of the Greek original (whose text can be compared only from the literal Latin translation of Anastasius Bibliothecarius) in the mid 14th century strongly argues for the absence of the full version at that time, presumably at least since the period of Lascarids (?) and Palaiologans. Only the abbreviated version was privileged to be used in the following centuries, obviously due to the content-related link to Ignatius and his life. Besides, the new translation elucidates a kind of ignorance of the earlier and more complete Anastasius version, present at least in Rome. It appears that this text was not available or more precisely known to the Dominicans in Pera.
The Latin version of Incontri and Cydones is preserved in one known copy which, due to its mistakes, seems not to be the original. While the Anastasius version is recently critically edited, both the Greek epitome and its Latin version are still waiting for a critical or even first edition. The Greek epitome has to be used in the insufficient Mansi edition; its Latin version waits for a first edition which is prepared during a new project on the editions of the 869/70 and 879/80 synods at the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

For the history of translations in Byzantium this epitome enables, too, a study on the cooperation of Cydones with a Dominican for a text that was of basic interest in their disputes against the Greek dogmata and that was demonstrably quoted in Dominican circle.

As regards the modus operandi of a translation in Byzantium, the Incontri / Cydones version follows the Greek version more or less closely which underlines their caution against falsification of such a delicate text or the mere reproach of falsification. Interesting is a tendency of actualisation of terms.

The contribution will give samples how the text was translated and how they managed to copy with terminological problems.
Metodologia ecdotica della traduzione del Libro I della Summa contra Gentiles di Tommaso d’Aquino da parte di Demetrio Cidone

Ho dato annuncio dell’edizione critica del Libro I della *Summa contra Gentiles* dell’Aquinate (= *SG I*) in un articolo pubblicato nella *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici* 48 (2011) [2012], pp. 137-266.

Nessuno dei ventuno codici a me noti contenenti *SG I* è autografo. Dei quindici manoscritti finora collazionati, i più autorevoli sono il *Marc. gr.* 149 (M) e il *Barberin. gr.* 318 (B). Questi due codici contengono due Redazioni diverse della traduzione cidoniana. La Redazione contenuta nel codice Marciano è più fedele al testo latino e linguisticamente migliore di quella contenuta nel Barberiniano: perciò sarà quella a occupare essere lo specchio delle pagine. Non vi sono elementi per stabilire il lasso di tempo intercorso tra la prima Redazione e la seconda.

Un codice importante per la storia della tradizione manoscritta della versione greca di *SG* è il *Marc. gr.* II 2 (m). Non tutti i capitoli di *SG* che questo codice contiene sono interamente tradotti: del Lib. I, il codice ne contiene interamente tradotti solo ventisette (su un totale di centotré). Si direbbe che il *Marc. gr.* II 2 sia (l’unico?) testimone della primissima fase della versione cidoniana, quando Demetrio, come egli stesso c’informa, tradusse per intero “parecchi capitoli” di *SG* per esercitarsi nella lingua latina. Negli spazi interlineari e nei margini dei fogli questo codice presenta numerose cancellature, correzioni, integrazioni, apportate evidentemente su indicazione di Demetrio: il testo che si legge sulla superficie delle pagine è sostanzialmente differente rispetto a quello sottostante, frutto di una traduzione eseguita *verbum de verbo*. La maggior parte di queste correzioni sono regolarmente integrate nello specchio delle pagine di tutti i codici di entrambe le Redazioni. Benché, quindi, non contenga la versione completa, il *Marc. gr.* II 2 assurge al rango di archetipo. E come tale esso verrà considerato nella formazione dello *stemma codicum*.

Nella sua rapida e vasta diffusione nel mondo greco, la versione di Demetrio subì arbitrarie mutilazioni da parte di alcuni dotti bizantini (cf. le cosiddette *synopseis* di Gennadio Scolario); ma essa subì anche modifiche positive conseguenti alla collazione della versione greca con l’originale latino. Tra di esse spicca quella di Bessarione: il lavoro filologico del Cardinal Niceno ha prodotto un testo (= *Marc. gr.* 148) assai distante rispetto a quello uscito dal calamo di Cidone. Pur dando a queste modifiche il dovuto rilievo, l’edizione critica di *SG I* le dovrà senz’altro eliminare, allo scopo di restituire alla versione cidoniana il suo *status* genuino e primigenio.

L’edizione di una traduzione dal latino, oltre a individuarne il manoscritto archetipo greco deve individuare anche il codice latino, che è situato *epokeina* di quest’archetipo. L’affermazione di Demetrio secondo cui, per la sua versione, egli fece ricorso a più codici latini è corroborata dalla critica interna. Individuare questi testimoni latini, è arduo. Dalla critica interna del testo emerge che essi appartengono tutti al ramo della tradizione manoscritta latina chiamato “tradizione corretta” (siglato β).

La mancanza di un codice autografo di *SG I*, che non permette di conoscere gli usi grafici e l’ortografia di Demetrio, crea non poche esitazioni nel momento di decidere quale delle varianti riscontrate nei manoscritti siano le più opportune da adottare.
La peculiarità di alcuni termini tecnici del testo tomista di difficile traduzione, la qualità non 
buona dei codici latini di cui Demetrio si servì e le limitate informazioni che, per la sua giovane 
età, egli poteva avere della teologia occidentale inducono alla cautela nel momento di proferire un 
giudizio sulla validità della traduzione cidoniana e sulla ricezione della stessa nel mondo greco.
Traduttori e traduzioni dal latino sotto i Paleologi

Se, secondo la celebre espressione oraziana, la Graecia capta, ha subito affascinato i conquistatori romani, i quali vi hanno scoperto una cultura diversa e più evoluta della propria, il mondo greco è rimasto tenacemente attaccato a un’altra prospettiva, quella di una sostanziale indifferenza verso ciò che gli stranieri, oij bavbaroi (etimologicamente, coloro che non riescono ad esprimersi), potevano aver prodotto sotto il profilo culturale. Un riscontro puntuale di questi atteggiamenti contrastanti lo si osserva nell’ambito delle traduzioni. Là dove nel passaggio dal greco al latino si osserva, nonostante frequenti periodi di decadenza, una sostanziale continuità e abbondanza dall’età repubblicana fino all’età moderna, i testi che hanno compiuto il tragitto inverso sono, comparativamente, una sparuta pattuglia e, per riprendere una felice espressione di Daniele Bianconi, «i silenzi furono assai più numerosi ed eloquenti delle voci»*. Qualcosa cambia quando i rapporti di forza mutano, vale a dire quando i Crociati, dopo aver messo Costantinopoli a ferro e fuoco nel 1204, portando la distruzione come mai era avvenuto in passato nel cuore di un impero forse troppo fiducioso delle proprie sorti, costringono la corte imperiale a esiliarsi a Nicea. Nel periodo che si estende fino alla seconda caduta della capitale, nel 1453, una trentina abondante di scritti vengono tradotti dal latino, assieme a un numero indeterminato di passi occidentali inseriti in trattati polemici*. Non sembra moltissimo, ma equivale, e forse addirittura supera, tutto ciò che è stato tradotto nel millennio precedente. A prima vista, si tratta di un insieme eterogeneo: che cosa può accomunare le opere di Agostino o quelle dell’Aquinate ai Disticha Catonis o alla Rhetorica ad Herennium? Ma, a guardare più da vicino, sembra di scorgere un certo numero di direttrici che spiegano, almeno in parte, le scelte di Massimo Planude, di Giorgio Pachimere, di Manuele Olobolo, di Demetrio e di Procoro Cidone e Manuele di Caleca, nonché, più tardi, quelle di Gennadio Scolario e di Teodoro Gaza. Gli errori dei greci La direttrice che si lascia individuare con più facilità è quella polemica, ormai vecchia di più di tre secoli, ma che entra in un fase nuova, forse grazie ad un’autentica provocazione: il trattato, redatto nel 1177 da Ugo Eteriano, allora uomo di fiducia di Manuele I, sotto il titolo De sancto et immortali Deo, ma noto anche come De haresibus quas Graeci in Latinos deuolunt*, allestito in latino, ma corredato da una traduzione greca*. Sulla stessa linea si colloca più tardi, nel 1252, un anonimo Tractatus contra Graecos, anch’esso redatto in latino, ma affiancato da una traduzione greca. Questo scritto sembra collegarsi a quell’autentica quinta colonna che è il convento dei domenicani a Costantinopoli, poi scacciati a Pera, cioè non molto lontano. Al servizio della polemica, soprattutto su questioni trinitarie, vanno imputate le traduzioni del De Trinitate di Agostino, eseguita da Planude, prima del 1281; più tardi sarà la volta dell’omonimo trattato di Boezio assieme al Cur Deus homo di Anselmo, e a una nuova traduzione del Quicumque che escono dalla penna di Manuele Caleca*. I Domenicani in Oriente Il trattato anonimo è chiaramente collegato all’ambiente domenicano, ma i Frati predicatori hanno portato con sé anche la teologia scolastica, intrisa ovviamente di filosofia aristotelica, che gode in quel momento di un certo apprezzamento in ambiente bizantino, sebbene ancora fortemente legata alla tradizione patristica, soprattutto latina.
È sicuro che, in qualche misura, hanno promosso la traduzione di opere della grande scolastica, anzitutto di quelle di Tommaso d’Aquino, come la Summa contra Gentiles, finita da Demetrio Cidone nel 1355, di quella della Summa theologica, completata attorno al 1358 dal fratello Procoro. Demetrio tradurrà altri scritti dell’Aquinate (De articulis fidei et ecclesiae sacramentis e De rationibus fidei contra Saracenos, Graecos et Armenios, nonché forse il De corpore et sanguine). Suo fratello vi aggiungerà De mundi aeternitate e le Quaestiones disputatae de potentia, oltre ad usare abbondantemente Tommaso nel suo trattato PeriV ousivaç kaiV ejgergeivaç. Più tardi un ponderoso insieme di opere di Tommaso verrà tradotto e/o glossato da Gennadio Scolario*. In queste scelte si avverte certamente il bisogno di far conoscere, nell’ambito dei movimenti unionistici, il pensiero di Tommaso in polemica contro i bizantini. Tuttavia, sembra di intravedere anche un’altra diretrice, meno sottolineata, quella della polemica antimusulmana, indubbiamente riflesso dell’urgenza politica del momento. Il trivio Un numero consistente di opere patristiche latine sono state tradotte per motivi che sembrano più letterari oppure legati alla disponibilità degli originali a Costantinopoli, e le loro motivazioni andranno indagate di volta in volta. Tuttavia, un altro insieme di scritti additano chiaramente un’altra prospettiva, quella dell’insegnamento. Si tratta di opere che, come è evidente dalla loro tradizione manoscritta in Occidente, sono legate al sistema scolastico, in particolare alla grammatica, alla dialettica e alla retorica, cioè alle materie che formavano il trivio. Se la grammatica non è stata privilegiata, pur senza dimenticare l’esistenza del cosiddetto Donatus graecus*, le altre due discipline sono abbastanza bene rappresentate. Ciò spiega che Planude abbia tradotto gli spuri Disticha Catonis, il Sominum Scipionis, assieme al commentario di Macrobio e probabilmente anche la Rhetorica ad Herennium, attribuita a toro a Cicerone. Inoltre, sempre Planude è (o sarebbe) responsabile del De consolatione philosophiae di Boezio assieme alla Vita Boethii, del De differentii topicis (del quale esiste anche un’altra traduzione, di Procoro Cidone) e del De hypotheticis syllogismis (forse da restituire a Manuele Olobolo). Sulla stessa linea si potrebbero collocare le Metamorfosi di Ovidio (ma anche altre opere ovidiane), seguit de alcune traduzioni attribuite a Teodoro Gaza. Tutto lascia pensare che quello queste iniziative risentissero della necessità di arricchire il sistema scolastico bizantino con elementi della tradizione occidentale.

Intenzioni didattiche si possono assegnare anche allo Speculum Doctrinale di Vincenzo di Beauvais, tradotto attorno al 1300 dal monaco Sofonia, collegato in qualche modo al convento dei domenicani*. Se ho ben visto, il periodo non ha prodotto traduzioni agiografiche e quelle liturgiche sono molto scarse*. In questo quadro d’insieme un posto particolare spetta, per la prima volta, ad Agostino, di cui numerose opere vengono tradotte per ragioni diverse. Se il De Trinitate si inserisce chiaramente nel filone polemico, il popolare, ma spurio De duodecim abusiuis saeculi tradisce intenti didattici, quindi un qualche uso scolastico. Meno inquadrabili appaiono le ragioni per cui Demetrio Cidone traduce frammenti dalle Epistulæ, dal Contra Iulianum e dai Tractatus in Iohannem, mentre suo fratello Procoro si cimenta con le Lettere, il De libero arbitrio, il De uera religione, con alcuni Sermoni assieme alle Sententiae ex operibus S. Augustini di Prospero di Aquitania. In definitiva, le traduzioni bizantine dal latino delineano un quadro d’insieme complesso, dalle motivazioni molteplici, sia pure accomunate dal desiderio, non privo di qualche ambiguità, di conoscere meglio il pensiero occidentale mentre l’impero volge al tramonto.
Boethius’ \textit{De Consolatione Philosophiae} in Planudes’ Greek Translation at the Vatican Library

Boethius’ \textit{De consolatione philosophiae}, which Maximus Planudes translated into Greek, combined prose with poetry. This rare literary framework has been more frequently used in Latin literature than in its original Greek language. When choosing this work to translate, Planudes considered both its uniquely rich synthesis of the moral teachings of major philosophical schools as well as its rhetorical values that were equally challenging for a translator and exciting for his prospective readers. For example, Boethius included a virtuous repertory of 39 poems in 18 different metres. When citing or alluding to Latin and Greek literature alike, Boethius addressed his Late Antique learned readers who no longer existed several centuries later when this work gained popularity in the Carolingian period and began its new life. Even in the Latin world, many of his numerous manuscripts include other assistant texts such as the \textit{Life of Boethius}, metrical and analytical commentaries. Greek readers too were no doubt in the need of the latter but they had as well a cultural background different from those of the mediaeval Latin readers of Boethius’ work. Planudes and the redactors of his translation, not necessarily only himself, shaped his translation to suit reader’s needs.

The Vatican Library holds eight manuscripts of Planudes’ Greek translation of the \textit{De consolatione philosophiae}. These manuscripts represent a great variety of forms that demonstrate different means of practical use. Boethius’ work was read in Greek primarily not for its moral teachings but as well as an assistant tool to learn Latin or/and Greek and to study the linguistic and cultural differences between the Greek and Latin realms regarding poetry, word usage and so on. Through these manuscripts, my paper revisits how the \textit{De consolatione philosophiae} in Greek has been adjusted to the varying interests of different readers. Two manuscripts include the Greek translation together with its Latin original (\textit{Vat. gr}. 328–329), another one belonged to Isidore of Kiev who copied together with other texts he used in the Council of Florence (\textit{Vat. gr}. 706), some are furnished with metrical and analytic commentaries (\textit{Vat. gr}. 706, 953), others only include the pure text without commentaries (\textit{Ott. gr}. 322 and \textit{Pal. gr}. 119). Some had small size to assist daily usage, especially those with various commentaries, while others – those without additional assistance – were copied in less handy big volumes. The various texts adjacent to this work in its Vatican manuscripts are valuable too to demonstrate how Planudes’ Greek translation of the \textit{De consolatione philosophiae} was actually used in the Greek and Latin worlds from the 14th to the 16th centuries.
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Introduction

Inscriptions of Greek-Roman Antiquity belong to the main sources for our knowledge about this period. The meaning of inscriptions for the understanding of post-classical civilizations, however, has long been underestimated—as for Byzantium simply due to the fact that many inscriptions are still unedited or (badly) edited in old and scattered publications.

A specific role is played by those inscriptions which are composed in verse form (epigrammata). They are more than mere transmitters of information but claim literary value and intend to interact with their readers / beholders more than simple prose inscriptions do.

Several studies have already been addressed to the role of inscriptions in Byzantium and in the Latin West (as for Byzantium, especially to the role of metrical inscriptions). However, there has been hardly any discussion about common traditions, similarities and differences.

Why did the Byzantines choose the Byzantine dodecasyllable as proper metre for their epigrams, and why did the Latin West stick to the hexameter? The phenomenon of metrical inscriptions can of course also be observed in the Slavonic world. Pars pro toto one can mention the ‘epigrams’ commissioned by the Serbian noblewoman Jefimija (fl. ca. 1400), one embroidered on a curtain in the Mt. Athos Chilandar monastery and one composed for the memory of prince Lazar of Serbia and attached to a pall which is now kept in the Serbian Orthodox Church Museum, Belgrade. Old Church Slavonic epigrams were certainly influenced by the Byzantine tradition; patterns of the Byzantine dodecasyllable for example can be observed (with some variations) in Bulgarian insessional epigrams.

Within the interdisciplinary round table the following further subjects will be discussed:

What was the new domain of the epigraphic habit in Byzantium? A first shift in the production of inscriptions and in their display is already to be observed in Late Antiquity when imperial legislative texts started to be published in the sacred places of churches.

How did Latin and Greek inscriptions interact? The interaction between Latin and Greek inscriptions in the first millennium is perfectly demonstrated by the epigraphic production on the island of Sardinia. It is interesting to see that from the seventh to the tenth centuries there is an increase of Greek inscriptions; this phenomenon provides information about the composition about the island’s (aristocratic) society.

The question of language and identity is also to be discussed in the framework of societies within the Byzantine mainland: due to the intrusion of foreign peoples bilingual inscriptions were produced. As in Sardinia, the deliberate choice to use the Greek language for inscription is also documented by testimonies of non-Greeks.
Which monuments and objects were adorned with metrical inscriptions and which with prose inscriptions? Which metre was found appropriate? Metrical inscriptions play a vital role in the Byzantine epigraphic production, a phenomenon, which is also be observed in the West, perfectly documented by the abundant corpus of verse inscriptions on Romanesque church doors. With regard to the latter inscriptions the choice of verse seems to respond to an aesthetic desire; verse even builds a virtual dialogue between the building and its user. These interesting ideas should also be applied to Byzantine verse inscriptions.

A crucial item to be discussed is also the question of legibility of inscriptions: which inscriptions were meant to be read and which were attached to places where only God, the ‘eternal reader’, was the addressee? A topic which has not been discussed earlier is the question of the function of spolia inscriptions in Byzantine environment. It seems that there was an attitude to respect the written world even though most likely they were not understandable.

The question of the perception of script also refers to the meaning of so-called crypto- and tetragrams which were not only attested in Byzantium but also in the Slavonic world. Were they known ciphers or a universal code to be understood even by an illiterate audience? The same is true for graffiti, for which the Cappadocian cave churches offer abundant material. They are valuable documents to be studied in the framework of literacy of Byzantine society.

Greek inscriptions were not only produced in the Byzantine mainland but also in remote areas (such as the Caucasus). The question to be posed in this context refers to the meaning of Greek as leading language in the Eastern Mediterranean and beyond.
Consecrated to God, Written for the Salvation of His People: The Agency of Normative Epigraphy Across Space and Time

The custom of displaying imperial letters and decrees in a lapidary, inscribed format provides valuable evidence for the interaction between the central government and provincial authorities in the Eastern Roman Empire. Indeed, most imperial letters that have survived as inscriptions were imperial responses to local communities concerning the regulation of local issues or the awarding of privileges. The reasons behind the monumental display of such documents were always specific, even personal. What decided on their epigraphic presentation was the level of their topical relevance: an imperial letter of an immediate interest to a local community or a shrine was likely to become an inscription on the site. Once inscribed, such a document could include only highlights of, or even considerable changes to, the original, and would in this way also reflect specific agenda and some kind ideological self-representation.

As a result of the radical transformation of municipal government after Constantine, municipal institutions were weakened, and the imperial cult was virtually abolished. A new, intermediary level of administration, the praetorian prefecture, was established. One of the causalities of this shift was the production of imperial inscriptions: their number fell precipitously, while the epigraphic proliferation of the decrees of praetorian prefects, to whom emperors probably delegated a significant amount of governmental work, was on the increase.

The recent surveys of late antique imperial inscriptions published by Denis Feissel make it clear that inscribed imperial rescripts became very rare under the Constantinian dynasty, and that they almost disappeared for several decades after the mid-4th century, but they also show that after the virtually complete ‘epigraphic silence’ in correspondence between the emperor and his cities, a vigorous, albeit short-lived, resurgence of epigraphic activity took place under the reigns of Anastasius and Justinian.

The most outstanding example of this renewal is the Anastasian inscription from Korykos in south Anatolia, once proudly exhibited in the city, recording the emperor’s response to an appeal of the locals against the abuses of power by the tax collectors who acted on behalf of the provincial government. Remarkably, the civic community addressing the emperor is no longer defined as the Boule and Demos, but as an ecclesiastical community instead headed by the hosiotatos episkopos, and comprising the euages kleros, the ktetores, and oiketores. Much in line with the tradition of his Roman predecessors, Anastasius replied calling for discipline and order, and sent his detailed instructions as to how to deal with the malpractices of the functionaries of the Praetorian Prefecture.
And, indeed, corruption in the over-inflated administrative apparatus appears to have been among the main reasons for the renewal of imperial interest in the local government. The local government itself had meanwhile undergone a change of its own whereby more power was placed in the hands of bishops, who were seen as an alternative source of authority, which could secure a more efficient government and implementation of the law. This development is clearly reflected in Justinian’s Novel Eight, promulgated in April 535, precisely on the subject of the corruption of imperial officials. Justinian, predictably, declared a strict prohibition of bribing, but, like with any anti-corruption legislation, his main challenge in this case was its execution. How could the emperor be sure that the provincial governors, who were evidently responsible for, or aware of, malpractices would implement the law? The answer to this can be found in the appendix to the same novel, under the heading ‘edictum’, a section of the document addressed directly to local bishops requesting their help with the enforcement of the law, by reporting any transgressions in their provinces of which they might be aware. Thus the bishops became direct recipients, and, alongside the provincial authorities, also the custodians, of imperial legislation.

However, the significance of Novel Eight does not end here. Its introductory paragraph includes a section concerning the promulgation of this legal text. The relevant passage translates as follows:

‘Once the law is publicly displayed and becomes known to all, let it then be kept inside, in the most holy church, together with the sacred vessels, since it is itself consecrated to God, and written for the salvation of the people He has created. And you would do even better, and it would benefit all the people in your area even more, if you attached [this text] on panels or inscribed it in stone, and set it up in the porticoes of the most holy church, rendering the reading and comprehension of the laws ready for all.’

The significance of this paragraph lies in the designation of the space of a church as the most suitable place for the display of the text of imperial legislation. Granted, this practice was not entirely new: already in the early Roman period, imperial documents, however generic their content, were considered both legal and sacral, and, as such, were exhibited in the shrines of the imperial and/or civic cults or on civic buildings, usually in the most prominent place of the agora. Justinian’s instructions to the bishops convey the same idea, albeit in a Christian guise: the law was considered sacred, not because it was promulgated by a divine emperor, but because it was consecrated to God. The Christian church was now to take over the function of the municipal archive, and its narthex was to become the site from which the imperial legislation would be accessible to the general public. Hereby, Justinian sets a further precedent by assigning new administrative responsibilities to the clergy. It is therefore perhaps not a coincidence that it was during his reign that imperial letters concerning ecclesiastical matters were being put up for the first time in Christian basilicas, in whose monumental setting normative epigraphy would henceforth be transmitted reminding and recalling actions stipulated in imperial documents.

The most notable set of inscriptions illustrating this move comes from Ephesos. It contains material that was originally probably displayed in the Basilica of the Virgin Mary and the Shrine of Saint John the Evangelist. One such inscription, found on the Arcadiana Street, by the agora gate, preserves the beginning of an imperial letter concerning privileges awarded to the Church of St John. Another one, thought to have come from the Church of the Virgin Mary, offers valuable evidence of the ecclesiastical administration in the Eastern Roman Empire. It concerns the mutual
relationship of Ephesus as the church of St John the Evangelist and Smyrna as the church of the martyred bishop Polycarp. The antagonism between the two cities, attested already in the Roman imperial period, seems to have evolved into a dispute over the ecclesiastical primacy, only to be resolved, not by an intervention of an ecclesiastical institution, but by the direct involvement of the emperor. All these inscriptions reflect a real shift in imperial government that grants considerable administrative power to ecclesiastical institutions. As a result, inscribed decrees on purely civic matters become extremely rare, while inscriptions recording imperial acts on ecclesiastical, and, more generally, religious matters persist into the following centuries. We know, for example, that St Sophia in Constantinople housed the texts of imperial and conciliar decrees starting from the seventh century: Heraclius’ *Ekthesis Nea* was placed in the narthex, and was subsequently removed from there on the orders of his grandson, Constans II. A decree of Constantine IV, concerning the decisions of the Third Council of Constantinople (680/681) was exhibited in a portico of the atrium, and possibly also several other similar texts, some as lapidary inscriptions, others in the form of documents attached onto the marble revetment on the church. The canons of the Lateran Council of 649, commissioned and inscribed in Rome’s Santa Maria Antiqua by Pope Martin I reflect the same practice, and suggest that the heated religious debates of the seventh century relied on epigraphic means for their authorisation and proliferation.

A further application of Justinian’s guidelines for the epigraphic display of normative epigraphy is attested in the case of the Shrine of Saint Demetrios in Thessaloniki, through a fragmentary inscription of Justinian I and a now lost, but well-documented, donation charter of 688-9 by Justinian II. The latter in particular stands out as a significant witness in the evolution of imperial normative epigraphy from late antiquity into the Byzantine period. The striking similarity that it shows with the style and palaeographic features of the inscription of Justinian I from the same church and the manner in which it emulates the practice of the late antique chancery by integrating the Latin formula ‘*donamus*’ into the Greek text can be seen as traditional, and even antiquated. The edict also attributes imperial victories in the battlefield to the protection of the saint, and describes the imperial benefaction as an expression of Christian fervour and pious gratitude. The religious tone of the document, on the other hand, should not distract from the economic aspect of the donation: the production and trade of a commodity as vital as salt was very lucrative, and such a lavish bequest to the Shrine of St Demetrius signified a major turning point in the prosperity of the church, and of the city itself.

In the context of the general development of the Byzantine epigraphic habit, Justinian II’s inscription stands as an early example of a tradition that gathers momentum only in the middle Byzantine period, when donation documents issued by emperors and prominent members of Byzantine society can be found inscribed on facades and interiors of their religious foundations. The Constantinopolitan examples of the imperial patronage of the Shrine of Zoodochos Pege by Irene and Constantine in the eight century and of the Church of the Panagia Peribleptos by Romanos III Argyros in the eleventh testify to the ever more elaborate verbal and iconographic features of religious architecture, and the role that words, images and symbols combined play in creating the rich vocabulary of benefaction and the complex and carefully thought-out messages of piety, donation and authority in the centuries to follow.
A postscript:

What do texts do? How are text and actions linked? Can texts be understood as agents? Many questions regarding textual agency are still open and, for the most part, they remain contentious. The current contribution argues that normative texts display agency in as much as they can be purposefully produced for specific effect, and can invite their readers/users to action. Moreover, legal and official documents act on behalf or in the name of figures of authority and/or their institution by way of performing (speech) acts such as invoking, certifying, allowing, forbidding, proclaiming and authorizing specific actions. Once inscribed, normative texts gain additional power of agency by virtue of their capacity to last and perpetuate actions they prescribe, to convey complex meaning through their verbal, symbolic and visual language, and to address the widest spectrum of reading audiences as long as they stay intact, and are seen and recognized as legally binding.
Epigraphy and Society in Byzantine Sardinia (7th–10th Century)

The amount of Sardinian epigraphs dating from the early empire until the end of the 6th century totals about 1.400 pieces. Out of them, only a negligible part is written in Greek (no more of the 2,3%). This fact appears to be normal in a Latin-speaking region which, since its Roman conquest, was mainly inserted in a contest of Mediterranean relations with other Latin-speaking areas (Africa, Spain, Gaul, Central Italy). But starting from the 7th century this trend seems to modify. The epigraphic production tends to dramatically decrease, as in the rest of the Byzantine empire; however, in Sardinia not only it decreases, but also undergoes a qualitative transformation, moving from being a form of memory written substantially in Latin to a form of memory written in Greek for more than 60% of the testimonies ranging from the 7th to the 10th centuries. This percentage is even higher if we take in account the sigillographic evidence, where the majority of lead seals discovered in Sardinia has a Greek legend - at least those concerning the laity. If we consider the early medieval inscriptions of Sardinia as the mirror of the literacy of its laic ruling class, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that it was on the whole a Greek-speaking aristocracy.

What reason can explain the turning point of the Sardinian epigraphy from Antiquity to the early Middle Ages? It seems to me that the main reason ought to be sought in an immigration of Greek-speaking groups (related to administration and army) moving from Byzantine Africa into Sardinia throughout the 7th century, and especially after the capture of Carthage by the Muslims in 698. In the context of this evolutionary trend, the present paper aims at re-examining the meagre corpus of Sardinian Greek and Latin inscriptions dating from the 7th to the 10th century. The late date usually accepted for some texts – 10th century or even early 11th century, as in the case of the Greek fragmentary inscription of Torkotorios, Salusios and Nispella – involves a discussion about the historical conditions that allowed such a long preservation of the Greek on the island, as well as about the relationships among Sardinia, southern Italy and Constantinople during the period in question.
In Kendall's Footsteps
The Agency of Verse Inscriptions on Romanesque Doors

The purpose of this short communication is to link two words of the title of the session organized by Andreas Rhoby, namely the words *agency* and *verse*, in the context of epigraphic practices in medieval West. It aims to question the status and role of verses in the inscriptions placed on the doors of churches and sacred buildings. This paper has been prepared as an exploration of these broader issues and intends to create discussions among the different epigraphic cultures of the Middle Ages.

The concept of *agency* applied to medieval inscriptions has only been used for a few years in epigraphic studies about western medieval documentation. In a more general way, the fact that written or artistic objects own specific properties which make them act by themselves is not fully admitted yet by all medievalists; most of them actually prefer (and they are often right on this point) considering whether the artist or patron's intention, whether the social function of artefacts, rather to lending to human productions the capacity to act by themselves in medieval communication or art. In terms of written culture, such reluctance is certainly solved by the special status of Christian writing which ontologically spreads an active value, by analogy with the divine word which can generate, create, and produce everything in the world. According to the Augustinian definition of *littera*, Christian alphabet contains in the sound, name, and form of each letter the entire knowledge, and the written word can thus make visible the object it contains and refers to: the signature becomes the sensitive presence of the signing hand; the charter becomes the juridical act itself; the liturgical book becomes part of the ritual. In the epigraphic domain, the epitaph becomes the deceased's vivid portrait; the mention of a praying act becomes a permanent prayer; the list of monastic properties becomes the indestructible sign of the institution's wealth. In this sense, the *agency* of medieval inscriptions lies in the iconic, visual, or sonorous display of their content. It also participates in the transformation of its support that, through writing, becomes something else (the role of epigraphic writing in the ritual of consecration of the church is the paradigmatic example of such action).

In both cases, the ability of epigraphic writing to act not only bases on lettering and alphabetical devices. The location of the text, its surrounding images, the content of the message, its linguistic form, all these elements allow what is written to exceed its support so that it can act in the ordering of its context. The fundamental book published by C.B. Kendall in 1998, *The Allegory of the Church. Romanesque Portals and Their Verse Inscriptions* is for Western Middle Ages a turning point in such a global understanding of medieval inscriptions. The author does not only indeed produce a valuable catalog of verse inscriptions located at the entrance to Romanesque churches, but he seeks to establish their function in the architectural and iconographic context by relating the texts and images engraved on the tympanum and capitals of the portals. If inscriptions constitute the core of Kendall's work, his book cannot be considered only as a medieval epigraphy one, and it must rather
be read as an attempt of systemic understandings of the church monumental entrance in which inscriptions are only some of the keys of interpretation. They guide the reading of iconographic programs in a particular direction; they invite the faithful to engage in the conversion of his manners; they pray for the saint of the church or its patron. By monumentalizing the church threshold and by making its crossing meaningful in the text, the verse inscriptions collected by C.B. Kendall therefore act on their environment and make a change happen in the place they are displayed, and on their audience. They do not only convey a message; they operate its monumental activation.

All the inscriptions studied by C.B. Kendall are made of verses, and the constancy of this prosodic form should definitely be questioned according to Andreas Rhoby’s presentation of this round table. In the wider context of medieval epigraphic practices, how can one interpret the persistent metric structure in the inscriptions located at the entrance of religious monuments? In order to answer to the first question, C.B. Kendall evokes phenomena of tradition, and circulations of verse expressions on the one hand; on the other hand, he also addresses the fact that these inscriptions are generally associated with images on church portals and that this kind of tituli generally use verses for commentaries and glosses. He traces their origin to the inscriptions of apses in the early Christian basilicas and to Late Antique poetic practices (including Paulinus of Nola’s work). Doing so, the author draws a continuous epigraphic line between the birth of Christian monumentality and Romanesque art in which verses are both obvious in their use and consistent in their presence. C.B. Kendall writes for example: “Why verse? The best answer is perhaps that the hexameter has been the favorite verse for church inscriptions for almost a thousand years during the Romanesque period and nobody considered therefore to change the habit”. Indeed, it is undeniable that such metric texts exist during the central Middle Ages at the entrance of churches from the Iberian Peninsula to Armenia. Verse, regardless the language in which it has been composed, received a special status in the literary practices thanks to the theoretical fixity of its shape and the constructive continuity of its design, both echoing the monumental and symbolic foreground of the church door. For western Middle Ages, C.B. Kendall connects the use of verses to the will to interpret through allegory the meaning of the church and its most significant elements. The constructive density of Latin language and the parallels born from the couplet composition and the play on rhymes produce the necessary shifts in meaning and echo the rhetorical device of allegory. Verse is no longer a matter of style or linguistic ornament; it becomes the rhetoric condition for the fulfillment of meaning.

Yet it is remarkable that the use of verse, although it is more than significant, is never systematic in western epigraphy; and it would be very difficult to find a type of inscriptions for which a linguistic form is used exclusively. If one admits that the use of verse is the artist’s or patron’s choice, one must also admit that this choice is motivated by something different than the force of habit or inertia. Might the verse play a specific part in epigraphic agency? Would its prosodic properties grant it a particular function in epigraphic practices?

Let us begin by saying that the answer to these questions is limited by the fact that verse inscriptions are often collected and edited in separate corpora (it is of course the case for C.B. Kendall’s book, but also for Andreas Rhoby’s collection of Greek epigrams). Despite the quality of these essential publications, verses acquire a documentary monumentality that could be difficult to interpret. However, if one replaces the inscriptions in the specific context of a site or region, the verse seems reserved for special purposes. The dedicatory inscriptions for doors and other
architectural elements of the churches in Southern Italy collected recently by Linda Safran in her superb *The Medieval Salento* are in Greek and in verse, while prose has been mainly used for funerary inscriptions and personal acts of devotion. Among the texts collected by Marialuisa Bottazzi in her very recent *Italia medievale epigrafica*, Latin verses appear only in monumental inscriptions for architectural elements and decoration of buildings, and not, for example, in the great texts of foundation. Put into perspective with the contemporary epigraphic production, one should once again wonder why verse inscriptions have been used so frequently.

On this issue, I would like to briefly evoke two main aspects, more as research ideas than real answers.

From Roman apses to Byzantine mosaics, the use of verse inscriptions seems particularly popular for the texts in connection with the decoration of the building or with its ornamentation. They may mention some of the empirical or symbolic properties of materials used in the works of art, or remember the artist's or patron's name. Regardless of the specific content of the text or the quality of its realization, the choice of verse seems to respond to an aesthetic desire, that to bring coherence or resonance between the literary display, the technical know-how and the preciousness of decoration. The inscription has to reply in its language to the distinctive qualities of the door which, thanks to its form, decoration, and function in the building, constructs a particular place: the door is an image of Christ himself, as mentioned in many inscriptions collected by C.B. Kendall. Verse compositions use the *poesis* power of words, *i.e.* their ability to build vivid images, and they manifest into written words the separate and distinguished features of the door. Regardless of their readability, inscriptions contribute to the ordering of sacred spaces by the ordering of language (this is probably why 90% of the inscriptions in Kendall's catalog show a correspondence between the written line and the extent of the verse). As pictures do, inscriptions then take part in the polarization of the sacred space and make visible the main nodes of its monumental and liturgical articulation. Many verse inscriptions on portals and doors thus quote fragments from the sung liturgy of the Mass.

The second research path I would like to mention concerns precisely the link between the use of metric texts and the willingness to demonstrate the sound dimension of speech. Unlike inscriptions located under the mosaics of Roman apses that C.B. Kendall establishes as the origin of writing on church doors, the texts he published in 1998, as many contemporary epigrams in the Byzantine world, very often transcribe direct words, fragments of dialogue, in any case a voice: the sponsor's or artist's voice presenting his work to God or to the titular saint of the building; the faithful's praying voice; the community's voice warning its members against sins; the teacher's choice revealing the content of painted or sculpted images. Prose can also carry traces of orality or prints of vocal performances that make it alive to readers' ears. Verse, however, by its ability to make visible the structure of language, makes that sound become image. Because it offers an echo or a return (here lies the etymology of *versus*), verse builds a virtual dialogue between the building and its user; the door becomes the place of verbal exchanges that determine the physical and spiritual access to the church. In many cases in western epigraphy, for the texts on doors but also in funerary inscriptions, epigraphic writing seems to lend its voice to its support: the building (or the grave) speaks directly to the reader. The use of verse allows a delegation of speech and its permanence in the church door.
Thus, the agency of medieval inscriptions would base on two fundamental aspects: the ordering of language and the visual display of its sound, namely two of the intrinsic properties of verse, independent of its possible interactions with images or architectural decoration. That is the reason why some of these texts were carved on church doors without further decoration or ornamentation. The inscription is projected on the façade of the building in a more or less elaborated script, but it does not supplement an image, as it was the case in Rome or Mount Athos, nor a liturgical construction, as it was the case in Lecce. Epigraphic writing is displayed alone and the verse is used for its active properties.

I take two examples of that kind of inscriptions which constitute only a small part of Kendall’s catalog. The first of them can still be read today on the lintel of the western portal of the church of Vieu (near Lyon) and can be dated in the early twelfth century. The text is made of very irregular letters that do not follow the guidelines of the *ordinatio* and the third line is left blank. The literary quality of the inscription does not match however the paleographic approximation since the text consists of two perfectly correct leonine hexameters with rich rhymes: HUC SINE MENTE BONA NEQUE VOTA VALENT NEQUE DONA / ERGO MALAS MENTES DEPONANT INGREDIENTES. The tympanum, capitals, and columns of the door in Vieu show no picture at all. The second example is older (it is perhaps dated in the early eleventh century) and is now kept in Sainte-Croix museum in the city of Poitiers. It comes from one of the building in the monastic complex of Sainte-Radegonde, probably from the door leading to the monks’ dormitory. The stone shows no trace of preparation. Irregular letters form approximately two parallel lines: TU QUI ES PRECLARA DIES NOS CHRISTE GUBERNA / NOCTIBUS OMNIBUS INTROIACENTIBUS ESTO LUCERNA. The text constitutes of two perfectly correct hexameters, as in Vieu. No decoration completes the inscription which occupies entirely the length of the lintel.

The inscriptions in Vieu and Poitiers share, beyond the lack of images, another common point: they are original in their formulation and do not to quote nor borrow expressions from others epigraphic or literary texts. The choice of verse has thus been guided by the context and/or the location of the texts. However, the two messages differ quite markedly. The text in Vieu is part of a well-documented group of inscriptions asking the faithful who enters the church to amend its way of life and to pray for his soul (one could see an example of these texts close to Vieu, in Vandeins, and further in Conques, of course). Still, it remains original except for the use of *ingredientes*. The text in Poitiers is quite unusual; it can certainly be compared to some of Alcuinus’ verse compositions for example, but it does not appear as such in western medieval inscriptions, probably because it specifically designates the place of the dormitory for which epigraphic texts are very unusual. Those remarks could lead us to state that the choice of metric texts and the quality of their compositions base in both cases on the fact that, thanks to some intrinsic properties of verse, the inscription transforms the walking space of the door in a space of prayer in Vieu, and the dark space of the stairs in a space of divine light in Poitiers. There is no need for images there: writing in its poetic deployment shows its content and make it act in the epigraphic context.

Verse inscriptions are thus located, in a linguistic and pragmatic point of view, in the interval between *agency* and performativity. They thus share the active status of liturgical words and speech that also reveal, act, and transform. If medieval epigraphy scholarship has frequently observed, for western Middle ages, the omnipresence of verse, it has barely mentioned another constant, namely the use of verse in couplet. Most of the inscriptions found by C.B. Kendall consist of two hexameters,
occasionally a hexameter and a pentameter. In their structure, they are in fact very similar to the antiphon/response pair, and they also share their sound and effective dimension. I therefore argue to conclude this short communication that the systematic use of verse at the church door must be linked to the impact of liturgical performances and its sacramental effect upon architectural spaces, and not exclusively to phenomena of tradition or quoting-borrowing mechanisms. The agency of inscriptions would be that of Christian writing reinforced by the ritual dimension of their liturgical parallels. Therefore, the permanence of such a phenomenon from one end to the other of the Mediterranean world becomes readable beyond all the linguistic and artistic variations.
Jefimija the Nun: A Reappraisal

Few historical personages from medieval Serbia have exerted such enduring fascination as Jelena (died after 1405), wife of the despot Jovan Uglješa Mrnjavčević. Better known by her monastic name Jefimija, this noblewoman is widely considered the first Serbian female poet. Leaving several tentative attributions aside, three objects indubitably associated with her have come down to us, each supplied with an inscription in Serbian Slavonic: an enkolpion in the form of a diptych (ca. 1366–1371) and an embroidered katapetasma, or altar curtain (1398/99), both of which Jefimija sent to the Hilandar monastery on Mount Athos, as well as an embroidered pall for the relics of the newly sainted prince Lazar (1402), which Jefimija donated to the prince’s foundation, the Ravanica monastery in Central Serbia, where the relics were originally housed. Despite the substantial body of scholarship devoted to her, Jefimija and her inscribed objects remain poorly understood. The aim of this brief contribution is to take a fresh look at this intriguing figure. Before proceeding, two points must be stressed. The first is that scholarship to date has tended to approach Jefimija within the narrow framework of Serbian medieval culture. However, to fully assess the inscribed objects associated with her and the role she may have played in their creation, it is imperative to place her activity within the context of the wider Byzantine world. Having spent her youth and the years of her marriage in Eastern Macedonia, where, in the wake of the Serbian conquest, her father, the kaisar Vojihna, was a local governor, and her husband a semi-independent ruler, Jefimija was undoubtedly familiar with Byzantine epigraphic practice. The inscriptions on the Hilandar enkolpion and katapetasma and the pall for the relics of the prince Lazar should thus be examined in relation to comparable epigraphic texts in Greek. The second point is that the coexistence and synergy of text and artifact in Jefimija’s objects have not been sufficiently recognized. That the inscriptions gracing these objects are not autonomous literary compositions seems self-evident enough; even so, how exactly these texts interact with the crafted physical things that bear them has never been systematically explored. In what follows, I will attend to this question by offering some thoughts on the agency and meaning of the Hilandar katapetasma.

Lacking a clear metrical structure, the inscriptions displayed on Jefimija’s objects are best described as rhythmical prose rather than poetry in the strict sense. With regard to their generic features, it has become a convention to classify the inscription on the enkolpion as a lament (tužbalica or plač), the inscription on the katapetasma as a prayer (moljenje), and the inscription on the pall as an encomium (pohvala). Such nomenclature, however, is misleading. The three objects were conceived and served as religious donations, sacred gifts presented to the monastic houses of Hilandar and Ravanica, and accordingly, the texts they bear are first and foremost dedicatory inscriptions. More specifically, these texts may be categorized as Serbian equivalents of Byzantine dedicatory epigrams. Indeed, like their Byzantine counterparts, each of Jefimija’s inscriptions provides the reader with the basic information about the object in question—who donated it and why. They present Jefimija, the donor, indicate the circumstances that prompted her to engage in the
act of giving, and articulate her plea for divine intervention and/or spiritual reward. What is more, each inscription is composed as a prayer spoken in Jefimija’s own voice. This particular format was frequently employed in Byzantine dedicatory epigrams. From the twelfth century onward in particular, it became increasingly common to furnish the donated object with a personal prayer addressed to a holy figure, the object’s recipient. To be sure, such dedicatory prayers were not unknown in medieval Serbia. A good example is the quatrain copied in the manuscripts of the Lenten Triódion and Pentékostarion, which the metropolitan Jakov of Serres—a prelate with whom, incidentally, Jefimija must have been personally acquainted—donated to the monastery of Saint Catherine on Mount Sinai in 1359/60 (Stojanović, Zapis i natpisi I, no. 116). What distinguishes Jefimija’s dedicatory prayers is their length and complexity. The best parallels for these texts are provided by elaborate, rhetorically elevated, and emotionally suffused dedicatory epigrams penned by such poets as Nicholas Kallikles, Theodore Prodromos, and Manuel Philes, among others.

Recognizing the importance of Byzantine epigraphic practice for understanding the inscriptions on the enkolpion, the katapetasma, and the pall prompts us to reconsider their traditional attribution to Jefimija. It is generally assumed that this noblewoman turned nun herself authored the three texts based on the fact that in each of them she is the speaker. Yet the use of the first person singular is by no means an indication, much less a proof, of authorship. In Byzantium, dedicatory epigrams, including those spoken in the donor’s voice, were normally written by professional poets and other intellectuals who had the necessary linguistic and rhetorical training to craft such works of verbal artistry. There is no reason to doubt that the same practice was followed in medieval Serbia. Of course, we can never rule out the possibility that Jefimija may have composed some or all of the texts routinely attributed to her, but without further evidence Jefimija’s authorship must remain, at best, a question mark.

Even if the dedicatory prayers inscribed on Jefimija’s gifts to Hilandar and Ravanica did not come from her pen, it stands to reason that she was closely involved in their ideation as a “patron-concepteur,” to borrow Beat Brenk’s term. Nonetheless, we should resist the temptation to read the three inscriptions as transparent windows onto her personal sentiments, thoughts, and preoccupations. For the Jefimija that we encounter in these literary compositions is not so much an historical person, the “real” Jefimija, but rather a dramatic persona discursively created within the text.

Crucially, the three inscriptions construct and present this persona by working in concert with the physical objects they inhabit. The synergy of text and artifact produces a particularly compelling effect in the case of the katapetasma. Measuring 144 x 118 cm, this sumptuous silk curtain embroidered with gold and silver thread was designed for the royal doors of the iconostasis in the katholikon of the Hilandar monastery. The imagery of the curtain reflects its liturgical function. A towering figure of Christ depicted as an officiating archpriest, his arms raised in blessing, occupies the center. Christ is flanked by two concelebrants, Saints Basil the Great and John Chrysostom, each with an unfurled liturgical scroll in his hands. Two angels-deacons stand in the background. Jefimija’s dedicatory inscription is displayed in the lower section of the katapetasma, between the three principal figures. The inscription consists of two parts. The first contains the donor’s prayer.

From sullied lips, from an abominable heart, from a tongue impure, from a soul defiled, accept <this> prayer, O my Christ, and do not turn me away, your servant, nor rebuke me in your anger, O Lord, at the hour of my departure, nor chastise me in your wrath on the day of your coming, for before your judgment, O Lord, I am condemned by my conscience;
not a single hope in salvation is there in me, unless your mercy conquers the multitude of my transgressions. Therefore, I pray to you, O benign Lord, do not turn aside this small gift, which I offer to the holy church of your most pure mother and my hope, the Virgin of Hilandar, for I have adopted the faith of the widow who offered you two copper coins, O Lord. Thus I, too, have offered this, your unworthy servant, O Mistress, Jefimija the nun, daughter of my lord, the kaisar Vojihna, who is buried here, once a despot's wife.

The second part of the inscription is not spoken in Jefimija's voice. Visually separated from the first part by four dots and, moreover, written in a lower linguistic register, with the inclusion of vernacular forms, this more pedestrian addendum records the date of the donation and also includes a sanction against the curtain's removal.

This katapetasma was donated to the church of the most holy Virgin of Hilandar in the year 6907 [=1398/99], in the eighth indiction. And if someone were to remove it from the church of the most holy Virgin of Hilandar, may he be separated from the consubstantial and indivisible Trinity and may the most pure Virgin of Hilandar be his adversary on the day of the fearsome judgment.

Jefimija's prayer on the katapetasma follows the conventions of Byzantine epigrammatic poetry. As in numerous dedicatory epigrams in Greek, the introductory section of the prayer sets the stage, as it were, for the presentation of the gift—the precious cloth. Casting herself in the role of a repentant sinner, Jefimija appeals to Christ to have pity on her and grant her salvation in the life to come. Attention then shifts to the gift itself. The sinful yet pious donor acknowledges the inadequacy of her offering, which she describes as “small,” but the example of the poor widow from the Gospels, who contributed but two copper coins to the treasury of the Temple in Jerusalem (Mark 12:41–44; Luke 21:1–4), gives her hope that her own humble donation may be met with divine approval. In Byzantine epigrams donors are often associated with biblical figures. The choice of the poor widow, one of the scriptural paragons of sacred giving, as a model for Jefimija was surely motivated by the fact that the latter was a widow herself. The manner in which the prayer is brought to a close, namely, through the speaker's self-identification, is also typical of Byzantine epigrams. In the concluding lines, Jefimija reveals her identity by detailing her current and former status, as well as her ancestry. She further informs the reader that the tomb of her father is to be seen in the katholikon.

Considered on its own, the prayer on the katapetasma projects an image of emphatic humility and self-abasement. The message of the text, however, is significantly inflected by its physical setting. To donate an altar curtain supplied with a dedicatory inscription was unusual in the extreme. No comparable example survives from medieval Serbia or Byzantium, and likewise, the corpus of Byzantine dedicatory epigrams transmitted in manuscripts yields no parallels. One could argue that Jefimija's decision to send a katapetasma bearing her dedicatory prayer to Hilandar was a calculated and even bold gesture. The gift was intended for a signally prominent location—the royal doors of the main church of one of the oldest and most revered Serbian monasteries. Hung in front of the altar, the embroidered curtain would have been seen by anyone attending services in the church. To the extent that religious artifacts inscribed with dedicatory texts served to promote and perpetuate the memory of the donors, the curtain's visibility would have considerably enhanced this object's commemorative potential. The luxury cloth, displayed directly before the eyes of the celebrants and congregated monks, would have encouraged both to remember Jefimija in their prayers.
Yet Jefimija’s “small” offering was concerned with far more than commemoration. The gift, as anthropologists have taught us, has the ability not only to mediate social relations, but also to act as a proxy for the giver and even to render him or her present vicariously. The notion of the gift as a carrier of the giver’s presence is highly relevant in the case of Jefimija’s two donations to Hilandar. The *enklopion* and the *katapetasma* were sent to a place that Jefimija, as a woman, could not visit. Both objects, in a sense, stood in for her, instantiating her presence in the midst of an all-male community, in the monastery where, moreover, the bodies of her father and her son Uglješa were laid to rest. The use of the personal prayer format, with its emphasis on the speaking “I,” in the inscriptions on both objects only underscored their capacity to substitute for and act on behalf of Jefimija.

The *katapetasma* stages Jefimija’s vicarious presence at Hilandar in a distinct fashion. The embroidered letters of the dedicatory prayer and its addendum form a textual block in the lowest section of the curtain that may be construed as a visualization of the ground upon which the figures stand. The assimilation of the inscription with the ground nicely mirrors the self-effacing tone of Jefimija’s appeal to Christ. But implicitly, it also serves to “insert” the praying nun into the image. One could go a step further and liken the embroidered text to a portrait. Indeed, the inscription is laid out at the feet of Christ, that is, at a place occasionally occupied by portraits of mortal devotees kneeling in *proskynēsis*. The arrangement of the text, in other words, takes into account and responds to the curtain’s figural imagery.

The interplay between the text and its physical context, however, does not end here. As Lazar Mirković pointed out long ago, the introductory section of Jefimija’s dedicatory address to Christ is couched in the language of communion prayers. The opening lines quote directly from a prayer variously attributed to Symeon the New Theologian or John of Damascus (PG 96, cols. 853–856), while the remainder paraphrases another prayer ascribed to Symeon Metaphrastes (PG 114, cols. 220–224). These borrowings add specificity and force to Jefimija’s supplication. They imply that Jefimija presents her offering within the framework of the liturgy. She utters the words of communion prayers as though she is about to partake of the Eucharist. Without doubt, this reference to the sacrament reflects the ritual use of the *katapetasma*, an item of the liturgical apparatus in front of which the clergy would administer communion. But the intertextual play between the inscription and the communion prayers also resonates with the imagery of the cloth. Considering the fact that Jefimija’s plea is embroidered next to the figure of Christ the Archpriest, one cannot help but conclude that she is to receive the sacrament from the Lord himself.

A further element that contributes to the complex dynamic between text, artifact, and self-representation in the Hilandar curtain is the textile medium. Several scholars have entertained the possibility that Jefimija was an accomplished embroiderer and that the *katapetasma* and the pall for the relics of the prince Lazar are to be attributed to her hand. This is highly unlikely. While our sources indicate that élite women in medieval Serbia and Byzantium did engage in spinning, weaving, and embroidery, the production of the *katapetasma* and the pall required a level of expertise that few “amateurs” would possess. In any case, the inscriptions on the two cloths make no reference to Jefimija’s involvement in the objects’ manufacture. The same is true of the numerous Byzantine epigrams on religious textiles, most notably icon veils, dedicated by women. A rare exception is a couplet by Christopher Mitylenaios on an *encheirion* presented to the Theotokos in which the donor, a certain Eirene, is said to have woven “this work with her own hands” (ed. De Groote, no. 28). Such personal involvement must have been unusual enough to deserve mention. Instead
of speculating about Jefimija’s needlework, it is more productive to consider the significance of her choice of the textile medium for two of her sacred gifts. One should recall that textiles and textile production carried female connotations in the Byzantine world. Hence it is conceivable that Jefimija opted for precious-metal embroidery to further enhance the strongly personal character of her donations, articulated primarily through the attached dedicatory prayers in the first person singular. The medium, too, is the message, and in this instance it speaks of the donor’s gender. The feminine valence of textile would acquire a particular resonance in the case of the *katapetasma*. Suspended before the sanctuary of the Hilandar *katholikon*, this textile hanging could easily bring to mind that ultimate exemplar of every altar curtain—the *katapetasma* shielding the Holy of Holies in the Jewish Temple. The allusion to the Temple is in fact embedded in Jefimija’s prayer through the reference to the poor widow and her humble offering to the Temple’s treasury. The implicit link between the two *katapetasmata*, one in Hilandar and the other formerly in Jerusalem, would invest Jefimija’s gift with Marian overtones, for according to tradition, the curtain of the Holy of Holies was a fruit of the Virgin’s labor.

As the above brief remarks indicate, the text of Jefimija’s dedicatory inscription on the Hilandar *katapetasma* cannot be read in isolation. The unusual choice of the gifted object, its prominent location within the church, the layout of the text in relation to the depicted figures, the reference to the liturgical rite and communion, and the object’s textile medium with its gender associations—all these elements work together to inflect and amplify the message of the text. What at first blush appears as a profession of self-abasement befitting a devout nun, upon closer scrutiny proves to be an expression of self-assertiveness. By sending an altar curtain embroidered with her prayer to Hilandar, Jefimija did more than seek spiritual rewards. She also claimed a place for herself at the very heart of the monastic house to which she was attached through familial ties, yet from which she was physically excluded.

Jefimija may not have been the first Serbian female poet, but she was surely a sophisticated art patron. Her inscribed objects are prime documents of the adoption of what Paul Magdalino has termed the Byzantine “epigrammatic habit” among members of the Serbian élite. Profoundly personal and in many respects unique, these objects exemplify how inscribed religious artifacts can be mobilized to represent and stand in for the donor. If Jefimija’s authorial agency is anywhere to be located with a degree of confidence, it is in the conceptualization of these multifaceted works.
Language and Identity in Medieval Greece: The Epigraphic Evidence

(no text)
Legible and Illegible Inscriptions in Middle Byzantine Churches of Greece

One of the most crucial questions on the topic of the presence and the function of written word in medieval Byzantium, is the legibility of inscriptions. Modern scholarship tries to clarify this issue focusing on the evidence of literary sources and the epigraphic material from the surviving monuments, especially the church buildings, which formed the place where the public met inscriptions more than anywhere else. Texts exposed on the outer facades and particularly in the interior of the church, consist a basic instrument to study the relationship between the word and the beholder.

Church inscriptions can be approached through various scopes. In this paper we will try to classify them according to their legibility, studying their location, form and contain -three aspects that permit an insight into the perception of the written word. In the same direction, we will also discuss the way in which ancient Greek inscriptions are reused in church buildings, given that in several cases their new placement seems to reveal a certain respect to the written text they bear, even though it was not comprehensible. Our study cases date from the Middle Byzantine era and come from Greece, where a large number of both church architecture monuments and inscriptions has been preserved.

Beginning with the easily accessible and legible texts, what attracts us at most is the epigraphy of mural paintings. The vast majority of church inscriptions consists of names and phrases painted next to the images of individuals and episodes. This practice appears since the Early Christian era, but not in a standard or obligatory form. Yet, after the end of Iconoclasm, it becomes out of question to represent a holy figure or scene without identifying it epigraphically. Written word defines the identity of every saint and every episode or symbolic representation of any other kind, avoiding dangerous in dogmatic terms misinterpretations. Moreover, in combination with the permanent iconographic features of each image, it has the ability to transfer the true nature of the depicted person, sometimes even his miraculous virtues. All these numerous inscriptions, displayed in every corner of the interior of the church, are easily visible and understandable by the faithful who take part in the services or make their prayer surrounded by them.

Apart from the naming inscriptions, there is another group that can be defined as instructive or didactic. It consists of excerpts from holy scripts, hymnography and works of church fathers, as well as of newly composed epigrams, which declare the wisdom of God and his will to save humans, underline the significance of the holy mysteries, indicate the exceptional function and importance of specific spaces in the church, or even direct the congregation's attitude in it. Because of their didactic nature and purposes, they are regularly written in big and clear capital letters and located on prominent parts of the building: over the door lintel, around the circular base-line of the dome, on the face of the sanctuary conch. They are also frequently found on holy vessels and vestments, defining their use and sacred character.

The majority of the dedicatory inscriptions of the Middle Byzantine church, which commemorate the offer and express the demands of the donor to God, can also be categorized
as legible. These texts may refer to the whole building or just to a single object of its equipment. The manifestation of the act varies between intricate epigrams and simple, laconic phrases; in both cases, the demands for holy intersession and remission of the donor’s sins, as a reward for his gifts, predominates. Inscriptions of this category appear on the outer facades of churches, either in monumental form (e.g. on Panagia Skripou at Orchomenos, dated to 873/4, and Areia Moni at Nauplion, of the year 1149), or added on architectural members, usually on the door frames cornices. More frequently they are found in the interior of the church, carved on marble architectural members and structures (door frames, columns, capitals, tie-beams, and especially on the templon screen) or painted on murals, with the inner lintel of the central door as the favorite location. Most of them are straightforwardly legible, as the donor is interested to have the text been read by the faithful, in order to enact and repeat through the mental and oral reproduction the demands which he addresses epigraphically to the God or a certain saint. Not rarely, a donor asks directly through his inscription the chanters and the readers who participate in the services to pray for his salvation -and of course this demand implies that the text must be read. Nevertheless, the concern of the donor to eternalize epigraphically his offer and demands does not comprise just his fear for the life after death: written word forms also a means to declare publicly his act and his personal status, a way to increase his social prestige.

Easily legible are usually the burial inscriptions found on tombs of clerics and other dignitaries, located in the narthex of the church. The texts mention the name of the deceased and give information about his identity and, at times, the date and the circumstances of his death. They are usually written on the sarcophagus slabs or the covering slabs of the burial theke, as well as on paintings above or near the tomb, sometimes accompanying a funerary portrait. The length and the quality of the inscriptions varies again between specially composed, long epigrams and extremely short texts. Burial inscriptions are easily accessible and readable, as the commemoration needs the participation of the beholder, who is able to reenact through reading the written prayers for the salvation of the deceased’s soul. Following a long established topos of ancient epigraphy, several burial texts address immediately the person who stands before the grave and read, asking him to pray and wish for the repose of the dead.

In all the above mentioned groups of inscriptions, the carvers and the painters had in mind that the text should be easily legible. Several factors cooperate on this direction: the placement of the inscription on spots easily accessible by the viewers’ eye, the shape and the size of the usually capital letters, as well as their color, which makes contrast to the ground on which they are placed (e.g. black letters on golden ground for mosaics or white letters on deep blue ground for murals). We cannot of course exclude the possibility of donors’ involvement in the selection of these features.

On the other hand, in many Middle Byzantine churches of Greece appear inscriptions that can be defined on various grounds as illegible. As a result of their location, form, language and content, the texts of this category set obstacles to the probable reader and even deprive him of any possibility to read them.

At first, there is a group of texts incised or carved on locations that were hardly accessible by the viewers, or even totally invisible. At the church of Agios Nikolaos Rangavas in Athens, dated to the second half of 11th c., an inscription was found carved on one of the colonettes of the dome, a spot that nobody could approach and totally unreachable by the eye of a visitor standing on the ground level. The inscription was carved by a certain Leon Rangavas, who is most likely to be
identified with the donor of the church himself -his surname survives till today as the nickname of the venerated in this temple saint. Located on the part of the building that symbolizes the eternal world and practically hidden of the faithful, this inscription was probably addressing only God, without any concern for its reproduction by a reader. Another hidden inscription appears on a 9th c. templon architrave from Corinth. Here, the invocation of a certain Petros has been carved on the underside, in one of the interconnected roundels that decorate this side, orientated in such a way that it could be read only by the priests who were acting in the sanctuary. The rich relief with floral and animal patterns that covers the other roundels and the remaining surface, makes it rather difficult to distinguish the inscription. In this case, the carver, maybe following the instructions of the donor, excluded the faithful from the reading of the text and restricted it to the clergy, to whom he entrusted the reproduction of the invocation.

The legibility of an inscription depends also on its form. Texts written in small size or badly carved letters could not be easily understandable. The inverted inscription of a 10th-11th c. templon architrave at Lechonia, Thessaly, belongs to this case. In the same way, inscriptions in the form of initials that need to be deciphered put obstacles to the reader. The popular in Byzantine culture and society tetragrams consist of initials combined with a cross, acquiring a supernatural apotropaic power. As Andreas Rhoby has stated, tetragrams were well known ciphers, regardless if every viewer could decode their exact contain. In this case, the inscription was more a symbol than a representation of word.

Language is another crucial factor for the legibility of an inscription. The reader of a low or an average educational level can find it rather difficult to decipher a text full of intricate expressions or written in an ancient dialect. This is the case of the 9th c. epigram that is still incorporated in the north-west outer corner of Panagia Skripou at Orchomenos, Boeotia, composed in elaborate hexameter verses with allusions to Homer and other works of classical literature.

Furthermore, legibility is out of question for non-Greek texts. The main foreign language in epigraphic display in southern Greece is the Arabic, which appears in the form of the so-called kufesque decorative letters, isolated or in small groups, after the middle of 10th c. This practice was introduced with the church of Panagia at the monastery of Hosios Loukas, Boeotia, and it was then widely spread in the church architecture of the region, either on marble or on clay decorative elements. The interpretation of the use of kufesque letters has been discussed for long, with many scholars agreeing that these characters do not form proper inscriptions. Recently, Lara Tohme and Chryssanthos Kanellopoulos proposed that a real Arabic inscription in kufesque letters can be read on the Kapnikarea church in Athens, which is dated to mid-11th c. According to their reading, the short text contains the phrase power [belongs] to God. If this explanation is right, the Kapnikarea inscription should be illegible by the Greek population of the city, but clear to the Arab minority that was living there since 10th c.

There is also one more category of texts exposed through church architecture in public view and defined as illegible: ancient Greek inscriptions incorporated in the outer facades of Middle Byzantine churches. Their remarkable amount in Greek peninsula poses intriguing questions. Up to which extent were the ancient texts readable by medieval viewers? Were they simply treated as decorative elements or rectangular blocks useful in building? Does their new location on the edifice shows a certain respect to the written word they bear?
As a result of the variety of the existing cases, it is difficult to give replies of general value to
the above questions. For example, at the church of Gorgoepikoos in Athens, a marble structure of
the late 12th c., we find ancient inscriptions of different kinds, embedded in the masonry regularly,
obliquely or inverted. What seems to be sure in this selection, is that the inscribed side of the stone
was chosen to be visible by the viewer. In other monuments, as for example Taxiarches at Mesaria,
Andros, dated to 1158, the inscriptions are found properly placed. Of great interest are the cases of
crosses added on reused ancient texts: for example, on the imperial letter IG VII 2870a of 155 A.D.,
which has been incorporated in the chapel of Agios Georgios at the village Agios Demetrios, Boetia,
a Maltese type cross with expanding ends, of distinctive Middle Byzantine taste, has been carefully
carved in a separate roundel.

It is much probable that the contain of these inscriptions was incomprehensible at the time
when they were embedded in the masonry of the churches. An average medieval reader could not
understand the meaning of an ancient honorary decree or even a simple funerary text. However, we
believe that the masons who reused them as building material were able to realize that these stones
bear letters and so they did not treat them like simple rectangular blocks with smooth surfaces
useful in the process of construction. So, it seems that there was an attitude to respect the written
word, in his ancient representations too, even though they were not understandable. In the case of
the inscription from Boeotia, the addition of the cross can be interpreted as a measure to secure that
the illegible text did not contain anything dangerous in spiritual matters. And it is also remarkable
that the cross was not carved on the text, but on the empty space next to it.

In conclusion, the epigraphic display in Middle Byzantine churches of Greece confirms that in
this period written word acquired a sacred character and a supernatural power, either in the form
of clearly and easily legible inscriptions, or even in the case of less or more incomprehensible texts.
The sanctity was enforced by the blessed environment of the church, which held the epigraphic
display, as well as by the inscriptions themselves, naming holy figures, reproducing quotations from
holy scripts, directing the prayers of the faithful and eternalizing their demands. It seems that the
illegible texts shared many of these qualities as well, although they were often representing a “foreign
language”, real or metaphorical.
Translating Encrypted Messages: Greek and Slavonic Tetragrams as a Mixture of Languages or as Universal Code

Medieval Greek and Old-Church-Slavonic inscriptions play an important and somewhat underestimated role in reconstructing Byzantine everyday life and spirituality. Scholarship has long had knowledge of combinations of Greek, Old-Church-Slavonic or Latin letters found on different objects intended mostly for cult purposes, such combinations being conditionally and generally called tetragrams or cryptograms (consisting of four letters or sometimes of four or more pairs of letters). They have been deciphered, analysed and published sporadically, because they have remained outside the specific scope of research interest, that is to say they are somewhere in-between philology, art and the medieval para-ecclesiastic culture.

It may be said in summary that there is a wide variety of cryptograms/tetragrams around crosses in oil lamps, manuscripts or books in general, on personal effects, icons, mural decorations, walls, tomb stones, fabrics, etc., predominantly of the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries; there are cryptograms, mostly in Greek language, even in Slavdom; their readings are hypothetical in most cases; publications of them do not always contain a reference to medieval written sources, etc. Cryptograms were most widely used in mural decorations in the Palaeologian art and were linked to the Ohrid archbishopric. In the Balkans in the Ottoman period, and particularly after the late fifteenth century, their use was rare until they were eventually forgotten in the times of the local Enlightenment, when a struggle for national liberation and an autonomous church began.

It is important to note, however, that the earliest occurrence of crosses with tetragrams in manuscripts was in the eleventh century in Sinai; they were widely used in the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries at the end or the beginning of texts; they were combined with the names of scribes, who were mostly clergymen; in the earlier tradition they replicated the famous cryptograms on mural paintings and personal effects; from the seventeenth century onwards many new Old-Church-Slavonic acronyms came in and they were related to the early printed books/incunabula produced in Russian environment; the reading of the late tetragrams was mostly intuitive, because they had no analogues in the older tradition; they are found in late prayer books, service books, amulets and compendia of apocryphal or apotropaic nature. That is why most of these late and copious abbreviations related to the Russian tradition of the azbukovniks (abecedarian reference books/glossaries) have probably been part of an independent and somewhat autotelic tradition, derived from medieval Greek tetragrams, evolving though into a play on words or messages, where the apotropaic or protective function as such is lost.

As a matter of principle, it would be incorrect in methodological and factual terms all inscriptions around cross images to be called cryptograms or acronyms prior to the occurrence of the tetragrams in the Byzantine visual poetry, the Slavonic tradition of the fifteenth century or especially, prior to the early seventeenth century. In my view, before that era one can speak predominantly about acrolexa and abbreviations, which came into iconography and monumental
art from the small size of objects related to the individual worshiping of holy relics and marking the christening of the worshiper. Andreas Rhoby though chooses to define them as ‘tetragrams’, which changes neither their function nor their role in the medieval Orthodox culture.

It seems to me, further on, that the apotropaic function of the images of crosses with inscriptions is a bit hyperbolised, because in terms of their content prior to the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries, there are only a few examples of content warding off evil or enemies. Leading among the early examples are those performing marking, christening, soteriological and invocatory functions, because according to the canonical Christianity, it is faith and prayer that endues the worshiper with strength, rather than any symbols averting evil. There are also inscriptions around crosses, which have completely neutral meaning, such as “Hello”, “(the Cross) dominates” or “Light – life”. In the most recent German literature apotropaism is disputed also in terms of the symbols of cryptograms on the built-in bricks on the fronts of the Orthodox temples of the twelfth through the fourteenth century.

In my work with the abovementioned abbreviations so far I have developed the following reading methodology: I use as a starting point some of the cryptograms familiar thus far, written down in the nineteenth century on Mt Athos, because they are the earliest readings, and I take for granted that they bear religious meaning and have been created mainly by monks, i.e. people knowledgeable about liturgy. I assume, further on, that all combinations of letters should constitute a meaningful sentence, corresponding to the respective rules of syntax and grammar, i.e. these are not merely disjointed words. I take into consideration the place of an image with letters with a view to its potential function and presumable source, i.e. crosses and tetragrams in borderline areas such as windows, doors, etc., which are supposed to form a sentence of apotropaic meaning, while those on altars are supposed to contain an Eucharistic or soteriological message; then for crosses worn on necklaces I assume an invocatory meaning, etc. For example, if the letters K and E are present in a combination, I first try to find their connection to St. Constantine and St. Elena, and also to find parallels of acrolexa in the service in the Menologium (a liturgical book containing the lives of the saints arranged by month) on the day of these two saints, May 21st. I’d also make sure to cross-check my reading in Greek by looking for parallels in the Slavonic tradition, because it is the most recent and it is translated, that is, starting from medieval translations I try to recover the original. Working with such monuments of Slavdom I look again for parallels in the tradition in Greek language. In Bulgaria, for instance, until the eighteenth century Greek models of cryptic messages were copied, and from the fifteenth century onwards Slavonic tetragrams were also added, because the upper clergy, if not Greek-speaking, was at least bilingual. Often I find also bilingual encrypted inscriptions, because the original idea of the apotropaic meaning implies a more complicated message, which is supposed to confound evil and neutralize it, or, if we use the childish metaphor, to put good cheese to trap a mouse. This idea has been known ever since the antiquity. On the other hand, I assume a priori that any encrypted message always suggests more than one reading. Miodrag Marković’s article on the iconographic scheme of the Church of the Virgin Peribleptos at Ohrid is a contemporary case in point of the latter claim, where the esteemed colleague provides different readings of some of the tetragrams putting forward the sole argument that he deems my decipherment to be unacceptable. Cryptograms worked in the same way in the medieval period either. Readings depended on the reader, on the reader’s degree of faith, on their personal intentions of the moment. For the quite frequently used tetragram EEEE, six possibilities for resolving are offered by Gordana Babić, but we already know that two slightly different versions are extant in
manuscripts of the tenth and the eleventh centuries, which indeed have to be preferred to the other possibilities proposed by Babić. In other words, there are readings closer to the original tradition, which are preferable without rendering the rest of the decipherments incorrect.

Deciphering has not even required any special literacy, as it is all about codes universal to all Christians necessitating not fluency either in Greek or Old-Church-Slavonic. A. Rhoby has already observed that 'it seems clear that the traditional tetragrams were and are not “secret messages” but rather known ciphers, regardless of whether they could be clearly identified by the readers or not’. Furthermore, the language of abbreviations is the same even in the West, where the Greek acronym IXC/IHC, for example, is not a mystery either and does not suppose fluency in Greek. Trilingual apotropaic codes have been attested such as 'σταύρος δαμόνων ἡ πτώσις – крестъ бесомъ язвавъ', which in all three main languages of Christendom mean almost the same. In other words, the major messages in the tradition of abbreviations in the East and in the West have possibly been rendered first of all in the domain of monastic folklore to be then admixed within the languages and conveyed to all the strata of Christian societies. In a Slavonic-speaking environment, Greek cryptograms looked quite authoritatively and mystically, especially to the illiterates, and an admixture of Greek and Slavonic letters, as it has happened, say, at the Church of St Nicholas Orphanos, Thessalonica, was even more confounding to the evil spirits. This adds yet another detail to the already made assumption that 'tetragrams functioned like signal words in not easily understandable inscriptions which sometimes opened the meaning of a text even for those who were not fully literate'. Tetragrams are a universal code, identical, for instance, to the gesture of crossing oneself or to iconography. Abbreviations are meant to confound the devil, enticing the devil into becoming engrossed into reading them and lingering in these borderline areas of the church or before reaching, for example, the chest of the worshiper. That was why the code had at least several reading versions, of which the author alone was aware which was the correct one and as a rule, each worshiper comprehended the message correctly, as to them it a priori was not secret. The message was secret only when it came to evil, to non-Christian.

In this context, the assumption made recently that inscriptions have been read aloud and interpreted to the uneducated believers by the doorkeepers (θυρωροί) of Byzantine churches seems highly unlikely. If this were true, at medieval churches there would have been cryptologists besides the readers of standard epigraphic material, who would interpret to the worshipers the tetragrams circumscribing the representations of crosses near the entrance and the windows of a church. There is no such information in the sources and it is highly unlikely that it would be found in the future. So, if the services could have performed an educational or promotional task, reading aloud messages encrypted so that to avert the devil and the unfaithful would have rendered the sacral space vulnerable, that is to say intelligible to the evil. Of course, the universality of the codes, contained in the tetragrams, the multitude of the versions of their reading and the predominance of the sense of apotropaism over literacy, should not at all mean that the inscriptions in Eastern ecclesiastical art have been made to not be read. Each inscription, even the most intricate, reverse, encrypted or inaccessible has had their addressee in Byzantium and its cultural adepts.
Graffiti in Medieval Times: A Case Study from Byzantine Cappadocia

About 150 medieval graffiti, mostly unpublished, still survive in the so-called church of Stylite Nicetas in Cappadocia. Considering the rather small size of the church, this significant body of epigraphic material is a rare, although not an isolated case among monuments preserving graffiti from medieval times. Most of the texts are incised on the upper parts of the walls of the church, a location that reinforces their visibility.

A rather small group of graffiti, incised with care in elegant uncial letters, is the work of a single yet anonymous author; these texts – quotations from biblical or liturgical sources – are direct commentaries on images depicted on the walls of the church. Commenting *a posteriori* on existing images brings us to mind the well-known habit of intellectual hands to add commentaries on texts and images of codices. A similar attitude into the church space is unusual, at least according to the surviving material, but gives us a slight idea about a probably more widespread phenomenon.

As expected, the largest body of the surviving graffiti belongs to the category of invocations addressed to the divine, where suppliants express their need for help, salvation, mercy on the day of judgment, protection against evil and enemy forces, chance or even fear. In some cases, graffiti are related to the images depicted on the walls of the church, with a prominent role given to the Theotokos – the prayers addressed to her are the longest and most elaborated texts – and to saint Panteleimon. In another worth noting case, invocations are addressed not only to the divine (and to the Theotokos), but also to a group of saints, a practice, which, at least to my knowledge, has no parallel in Cappadocia and elsewhere. Among the numerous invocations preserving the wish for divine and saintly protection, a significant number has an ending formula inciting the beholder to read and pray on behalf of the supplicant, an attitude that points out their explicit need to be remembered in perpetuity, which presupposes access to a certain level of literacy. Although this series of graffiti invocations has parallels basically in monumental painted inscriptions, the frequency and repetition of the same formula suggest that, behind the evident need for protection, suppliants are addressing to the literate viewer their wish for perpetual commemoration through the written word.
Toward a Corpus of Greek Christian Inscriptions from the Northern Caucasus

The Greek inscriptions of the Northern Caucasus from Christian times were first collected by I.-A. Güldenstädt, P.-S. Pallas and other early explorers of the Caucasus. In the 19th century, notable contributions were made by scholars who visited the Caucasus, officers serving in the Russian army, both of Russian and local origin, as well as local antiquarians. The result of this spontaneous exploration was “A Collection of Greek and Latin inscriptions of the Caucasus,” published in 1881 by I. Pomyalovsky on the occasion of the 5th archaeological Congress in Tbilisi (И. В. Помяловский, Сборник греческих и латинских надписей Кавказа, Санкт-Петербург 1881). There he only compiled scattered information about the inscriptions, mainly chance finds by various different people.

Later a number of inscriptions from the Taman Peninsula were included by V. V. Latyshev in his collection of the Byzantine inscription from the Northern Black Sea (В. В. Латышев, Сборник греческих надписей христианских времен из Южной России, Санкт-Петербург 1896); the latter also studied some other Caucasian inscriptions. Scientific journals of the Russian Empire, regional publications, as well as provincial and religious periodicals also contain some information about the Greek inscriptions from the Caucasus.

In Soviet times, some other monuments with Greek inscriptions were identified. At the same time, many inscriptions were lost. Often due to lack of interest and expertise, newly discovered inscriptions were recorded imperfectly, if at all, and many of them were also subsequently lost.

In recent years, we have made a number of publications dedicated to the identification and study of the Greek inscriptions of the Northern Caucasus. A. Vinogradov is the author of volume V of the third edition of “Inscriptiones orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini,” dedicated to the Byzantine inscriptions: it includes among other 19 inscriptions, found on the “Asian” shore of the Bosporos (IOSPE 3 324-343, excl. V 341; see: http://iospe.kcl.ac.uk/index.html). He also published the inscriptions from Senty church in Karachay and from Anakopia in Abkhazia. D. Kashtanov with co-authors collected new information and corrected misconceptions about previously discovered monuments.

In general, it would be fair to say that the Greek inscriptions of the Northern Caucasus have not been studied systematically since 1881, when the Pomyalovsky collection was published. Since that time, a great deal of new material has been accumulated. The readings of many published inscriptions need to be corrected. The problem is compounded by the fact that the location of many inscriptions, known in the 19th century, and even discovered in the 20th century, has not been established. Some of them are known only from photographs and sketches of varying quality, others only by verbal descriptions of bystanders. Thus, a new edition of the Greek inscriptions of the Northern Caucasus is very urgent. These inscriptions are an invaluable, and often unique, written source on the history of the region. We intend to publish it in the form of a digital corpus according to the standards of “Inscriptiones orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini”.

---
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At the moment we know – by autopsy (in museums and in situ) and different reports – more than 50 lapidary inscriptions, some dipinti and fresco inscriptions, about 20 graffiti and three inscription on bronze objects, originating from the territory of the Northern Caucasus and the Lower Don. Some inscriptions contain important historical information, for example, the inscription of 965 AD about the consecration of Senty church mentioning the Byzantine emperors, two Alan rulers, the Metropolitan and other people.

The Greek inscriptions of the Northern Caucasus contain also many names from different indigenous languages (Adyghean, Alanic, etc.), important for the reconstruction of the ethnic history of this region. Moreover, at least one of them partially use Greek letters for the texts probably in Adyghean, and two of them (including the famous Zelenchuk inscription; see: L. ZGUSTA, Old Ossetic inscription from the river Zelenčuk, Wien 1987) – in Alanic. The latter fact corresponds to the newly discovered Alanic glosses written in Greek (A. LUBOTSKY, Alanic Marginal Notes in a Greek Liturgical Manuscript, Wien 2015).

The corpus will be built on a regional basis. Preliminarily we can distinguish four regions (and a number of sub-regions): 1) the steppes of the Lower Don; 2) the Black sea coast, consisting of “Tamataarcha” sub-region (Taman Peninsula up to Anapa), “New Zichia” (from Anapa up to Novomikhailovka) and “Old Zichia – Abasgia” (from Novomikhailovka up to the river Psou); 3) “Western Alania” (sub-regions of the Lower and Upper Kuban, Urup, Kyafar, and Zelenchuk); 4) “Eastern Alania” (Rim-gora, sub-regions of the Chegem and Baksan). Each of them has special characteristics. So, graffiti and dipinti are known only on the Upper Kuban, and the Chegem and Baksan sub-region has inscriptions on steles with reliefs. The chronology of epigraphic monuments, from the Early Byzantine period up to 17th century, also varies greatly from region to region.

The work on the corpus will involve the identification and study of the inscriptions preserved in the museums of Russia (Moscow, St. Petersburg, Northern Caucasus) and other countries (Georgia, Poland), as well as in situ. Equally important will be the collection of all previous publications and especially archival materials. This particularly applies to the inscriptions which are damaged or even lost. The importance of a full edition of the Greek inscriptions of Christian times from the Northern Caucasus should be clear, since they give us important and under-utilized information about onomastics, beliefs, literacy and other cultural elements of Caucasian peoples and their connections with other regions of the Christian world (Abkhazia, Byzantium, etc.).
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Introduction

The aim of this round table is to bring scholars from different areas together in order to discuss directions and approaches to gesture and performance in the Byzantine world. In comparison to Western medieval studies investigating body language and nonverbal communication still remains a neglected field of research in Byzantine studies, although pictorial and written sources provide a variety of descriptions and patterns of interaction from all strata of Byzantine society.

Aspects of representing power (e.g. the appearance of high officials, the emperor and the patriarch in public), performances at court, the aurality of Byzantine culture (including aspects of voice and music), performing rhetoric in public (including the question of public space and auditorium), normative texts on gesture, the setting of performances (including architectural constructions), depictions of gesture (in manuscripts and objects of daily life, especially ceramics) and last not least issues of gender will be taken into consideration.
Imperial Coronation in the Empire of Trebizond (1204-1461)

The Empire of Trebizond was one of the three successor states, called 'empires in exile' (in conjunction with the Empire of Nicaea and the Despotate of Epirus), after the fragmentation of the Byzantine Empire as a consequence of the Fourth Crusade in 1204. The emperors of Trebizond were from the family of the Grand Komnenoi, who traced their lineage directly back to the famed Komnenian dynasty and who, amid the increasingly dynastic nature of imperial authority throughout the Byzantine world, saw themselves as the only legitimate heirs to the Byzantine Empire. Trapezuntine rulers used an official title of the Byzantine emperors and called themselves 'Emperor and Autocrat of the Romans'. Only in 1282, when the emperor of Trebizond John II married Theodora Palaiologina, daughter of Michael VIII Palaiologos, the Trapezuntine rulers officially relinquished their rights to the throne of Constantinople and the title of 'Emperor of the Romans.' However, they adopted the title of emperor in a modified form—'Emperor and Autocrat of all the East, the Iberians, and the Perateia'—although, according to the official ideology of Byzantium, only a ruler whose permanent place of residence was in Constantinople could possess the title of emperor. Therefore, the act of coronation most likely had a special significance for Trapezuntine rulers as a confirmation of their legitimacy as emperors and a demonstration of their power.

There are only limited sources that provide information on imperial coronations in Trebizond. The available evidence showing that coronation did not take place in Hagia Sophia of Trebizond, a church symbolically associated with the Hagia Sophia of Constantinople, which was the coronation church in Byzantium, but instead was carried out in two other churches in Trebizond that had a particular significance: the Church of Panagia Chrysokephalos and the Church of Saint Eugenios.

The Church of Panagia Chrysokephalos or 'Golden-Headed' today known as the Fatih Mosque and is located in the center of the historic Middle City of Trebizond. The Church of Chrysokephalos was originally built as a basilica. It was the cathedral of the city, which was converted also into a court church with coronation and funerary functions during the Grand Komnenoi Dynasty. Anthony Bryer states that the adaptation can probably be dated to the period between 1223 and 1235. There were all the necessary elements needed for the liturgical part of a coronation performance: a metatorion chamber for the robing of the emperor, an ambo in the center of the naos for the coronation performance itself and galleries for the display of the newly crowned emperor.

Michael Panaretos, a court official of the Emperor of Trebizond Alexios III, recorded in his 'Chronicle' that the coronation of Emperor John III took place in the Church of Chrysokephalos. He informs us that John III was crowned "on the 9th of September (1342) in the Chrysokephalos on the ambo" (Michael Panaretos, ed. Lampsides, 67.10-11), a platform standing directly in front of the altar in a church. It is worth noting the special significance of the ambo for the ceremony of imperial coronation in Byzantine Empire, as the point where the culminating actions of the coronation performance (such as the Eucharist, the ritual placement of a crown on the head of a new emperor by the Patriarch (or by the Metropolitan in Trebizond), the anointing ritual, and etc.) took place.
The other coronation church in Trebizond was the Church of Saint Eugenios, the patron and primary protector of Trebizond. Today, this church stands as the Yeni Cuma Mosque and is located about 200 meters east of the citadel on Boztepe Hill, separated from the citadel by a low ravine. In all likelihood, the basilica was rebuilt in 1291, as is stated in two lost inscriptions on the marble floor, and at least twice after this date. Because of its location outside the walls, it was often taken into possession by enemies of Trebizond. As a result, the church was damaged and rebuilt. It is thus unclear whether these renovations installed new coronation functions in the church or whether the functions were connected with the restoration of the church after considerable damage.

We know from Panaretos that Emperor Alexios III “was crowned in the Church of Saint Eugenios, on the 21st of January (1350), that is, Saint Eugenios’s feast day” (Panaretos, ed. Lampsides, 69.13-14) but did not give any more details about the coronation performance in the church. Concerning this subject, we know that Alexios III arrived in Trebizond from Constantinople on the 13th of December (1349). This means that his coronation took place more than a month after his arrival. The delay may have been due to the power struggle for the Trebizond throne or merely Alexios III’s desire to be crowned on Saint Eugenios’ feast day in the Church of Saint Eugenios and thereby acquire the symbolic blessing and sacred favor for his government from the primary saint in Trebizond.

Therefore, we have two locations for the coronation in Trebizond. Consequently, we can ask whether there was any competition between the Chrysokephalos and Saint Eugenios churches. It can be assumed that the personal preferences of each emperor may have played a central role in the determination of the coronation church. In my opinion, most imperial coronations took place in the Church of Chrysokephalos. I believe that the cathedral and court church were the preferred venues during the period of the Grand Komnenoi. Moreover, the Church of Saint Eugenios was smaller and topographically more difficult to access than the Church of Chrysokephalos.

Unfortunately, we do not have historical sources that detail the processional routes from the palace to any of the two coronation churches in Trebizond. Therefore, we can only hypothetically reconstruct the procession by studying the later literary descriptions of the city and analyzing the topography of modern Trebizond and materials of early studies and archeological excavations.

We can reconstruct the procession route to the Chrysokephalos in the following way. The emperor left the palace on the west side of the citadel and went to the Chrysokephalos with his followers on a street that, according to John Eugenikos, was long and uneven (Eugenikos, ed. Lampside, 28.50-53). We do not know for certain the location of this street. Most likely, it does not correspond to the existing modern street. Conceivably, an original Byzantine street could lead from the gate of Saint George of the Limnians in the northeast corner of the citadel to the Chrysokephalos and the square located by the church. In this square (as well as probably in the square in front of the palace which was called Epiphania) the emperor could have been greeted by the Metropolitan, nobles and other people from Trebizond.

The reconstruction of the processional route to the Church of Saint Eugenios is more problematic today. Presumably, from the beginning of their way to the Church of Saint Eugenios, the emperors of Trebizond used the above-mentioned street, which led from the citadel to the Chrysokephalos. When the procession arrived at the cathedral, it could turn to the right and leave the Middle City across a bridge. After that, the emperor and his followers had to climb Boztepe Hill,
where the Church of Saint Eugenios is located. We can imagine that this way was long and not easy to walk (probably, the emperor and his followers rode on horseback). Today, we can see one more gate on the east wall of the Middle City, which is closed to the gateway from the citadel (gate of Saint George of the Limnians). We could suppose that the emperors used this gate for their arrival to the Church of Saint Eugenios, however this gate can, with high probability, be dated to Ottoman times. In this case, it was not contemporaneous with Trapezuntine emperors and it could not have been used by them.

As we know, emperors in Constantinople were commonly crowned in Hagia Sophia from the seventh century onwards. The coronation route always proceeded from the Great Palace, which was extremely close to Hagia Sophia. We presume that during the rule of the Komnenian and Palaiologian Dynasties, either the main imperial residence was moved to the Palace of Blachernae (S. Runciman, F. Tinnefeld, A. Berger), or, in the opinion of others, the Palace of Blachernae was used as a ceremonial space in addition to the Great Palace (P. Magdalino, R. Macrides). Sources indicate that Byzantine emperors spent the night in the Great Palace before their coronation. This means that their way to the place of coronation was simple and very close compared to the route of the emperors of Trebizond.

It is important to discuss is whether the Trapezuntine emperors were blessed and anointed in the liturgical part of the coronation ritual in a church. The written sources do not mention this matter. However, we can surmise that if the Eucharist was a necessary part of the coronation at the time of the Komnenian Dynasty, it may have also been the case in Trebizond. Concerning the anointing, we do not know whether it was one component of the coronation performance in the Middle Byzantine period. If we accept that the anointing ritual was introduced during the Komnenian Dynasty, perhaps we can suppose that the Grand Komnenoi Dynasty could were also anointed. A copy of a portrait of the Trapezuntine emperor Manuel I was originally painted on one of the walls of the interior of the church of Hagia Sophia in Trebizond, but is now lost. The copy was made by Russian artist Grigorii Gagarin and published in a Russian issue at the end of the 19th century. On the image, we can see Emperor Manuel I holding a scepter in his left hand and something that Antony Eastmond has interpreted as a horn of anointing in his right hand. The portrait is very close to a description that was given by George Finlay in the middle of the 19th century. However, Finlay has not made references to a horn of anointing in the emperor’s hand. Therefore, we need to be cautious in trusting Gagarin’s picture completely and interpret it.

One important issue is whether the rulers of the Grand Komnenoi were raised on a shield during the coronation ceremony. It can be assumed that this act of coronation was not accepted in Trebizond. First, written sources do not describe it; however, they probably would refer to an emperor being raised on a shield if it had happened because of the particularity of this rite. Second, in all probability, the famous ancestors from the Komnenian Dynasty did not have this kind of performance during coronation. As we know, the ceremony of raising the emperor on a shield was renewed in the Empire of Nicaea by Emperor Theodoros Laskaris and was accepted by Palaiologen after the recapture of Constantinople in 1261; however, it is possible that this rite did not become a permanent part of the coronation performance in Byzantium.

There is an interesting account of the coronation of an empress in Trebizond. Panaretos wrote that an Iberian princess, the daughter of Georgian King David IX, was crowned as the Empress of Trebizond on the 5th of September 1377, and married Manuel III, the son of a co-emperor of
Alexios III, the next day, that is, on the 6th of September (Panaretos, ed. Lampsides, 78.27-33). The ceremonies of both the coronation and the wedding were held on the prokypsis, a richly decorated platform, which was always constructed for an emperor and his family specifically for different ceremonies on the squares. Panaretos did not elaborate on the exact placement of this prokypsis. Therefore, the square in front of the Church of Chrysokephalos, that in front of the Church of Saint Eugenios, the Epiphania square in front of the palace, or the main commercial square in Trebizond, known as the Meydan, are all possible locations for the prokypsis. In my opinion, the prokypsis for the coronation of the empress could have been constructed in the square in front of the main coronation church in Trebizond, Chrysokephalos, or, on certain occasions, in the square in front of the Church of Saint Eugenios, where, as we know, the coronation of Emperor Alexios III and probably the coronation of his wife Theodora Kantakouzena (we have information only about the wedding ceremony in the church) took place.

The Dossier of Pseudo-Kodinos, for instance, reports on the coronation of empresses in Byzantium. It asserts that “the crowned emperor does crown also his wife. If it should happen that the emperor is crowned already, the empress is crowned by her own husband, the emperor, in a similar fashion when he celebrates the wedding ritual, taking her as his wife” (Pseudo-Kodinos, ed. Macrides, 226.1-4, 227.1-4). It must be noted that we do not see any examples of the coronation of a Byzantine empress on a prokypsis as in Trebizond in the available sources. In the early period of Byzantine history, a coronation performance was in the hall of the Great Palace, Augusteus, whereas in the middle and late Byzantine periods, the coronation of an empress took place in Hagia Sophia. Empresses were not crowned directly on the ambo (as the Byzantine emperors or co-emperors were) but near the ambo and altar in front of the Solea.

Thus, we can note not only similarities to Byzantium, such as the coronation of a Trapezuntine emperor on an ambo, but also some differences between the imperial coronations in Trebizond and Constantinople. We saw that the Trapezuntine emperors were not crowned in Hagia Sophia in Trebizond, but in one of two churches with particular significance: Chrysokephalos or Saint Eugenios. There were no straight, short, and even routes between the places of coronation, and we inferred that the route for the coronation of the emperor in Constantinople from the Great Palace to Hagia Sophia was not long, uneven, or especially difficult. Therefore, it is difficult to imagine grandiose ceremonial processions for the coronation places, similar to the ones in Constantinople, from the palace to one of the two coronation churches in Trebizond. Furthermore, we can assume that possible meeting places between the emperors of Trebizond and the people were limited and that the major formalities of the coronation performance took place in one of the two churches and its square. It is also clear that it would have been almost impossible for the emperors of Trebizond to copy Byzantine ceremonies completely, in particular the imperial coronations. They could re-enact only some parts of it. The main difficulty in copying was the vastly different topographies of Trebizond and Constantinople.
Gender and Gesture

The Byzantines expressed hierarchies of status visually, and gesture was an important component of how hierarchies were articulated both in daily life and in images. Gender also played a role in the construction of hierarchies, though this role was inflected by social status. The relationship between gender and gesture is not, however, well understood. What follows is the result of an evaluation of a sequence of Byzantine images to explore the correlation between gender and gesture in the middle Byzantine period, and to consider how visual representation insects with social construction, as viewed through the twin lenses of gender and gesture.

The first thing to note is that a third factor is critically important: status. In imperial portraiture the rules are modulated by imperial ideals that are distinctly different from the rules that apply to ordinary people. It is the imperial masculine ideal to appear in public like an immobile statue, an ideal famously expressed by Ammianus Marcellinus, talking about the emperor Constantius visiting Rome in 357, and that this ideal continued is clear from Michael Psellos’s admiring words about Isaak Komnenos. In formal imperial portraiture, the emperor is pictured as static, usually frontal, and self-enclosed; the empress, in contrast, shows relatively more movement, is often shown in three-quarter view, and is rarely self-enclosed.

Non-imperial representations of men and women are also inflected by gender conventions, but in different ways. Women are normally segregated, and secondary; they are passive rather than active participants in the scene. Men gesture in speech; women are self-enclosed and their lack of gesticulation indicates their silence. This is not the frontal passivity that suggests statuesque authority in imperial males; this is the obliquely turned, with bowed head, passivity that suggests subservience.

And then there is the dance of Miriam, which often accompanies images celebrating the Israelites’ safe passage across the Red Sea. Miriam is a whirl of activity, with arms thrown high as she plays her castanets. As Mati Meyer has demonstrated, this motif was borrowed early on more or less verbatim from maenad figures on pre-Christian sarcophagi, and then repeated ad infinitum, with little variation across the entire Middle Byzantine period. It cannot be assumed to bear any resemblance to actual Byzantine women (who were expressly forbidden to dance, in any case, by various church councils, beginning with the Council in Trullo of 691/2). But the motif persists, and provides one of the few examples of active female gesturing in Byzantine imagery. It functions as a kind of transgressive ‘other,’ rather like the women who dress as men to enter male monasteries so beloved of early Byzantine hagiographers: i.e. women were actually not permitted to do this, but this is the visual story that one woman is allowed to perform to ensure that no one else does.

In sum: There is a set of imperial gestures that are heavily gendered, and that are different from the gestures visualised for ordinary people: status is an important component of the gesture/gender interface.
For ordinary people, the gestures visualised in Early and Middle Byzantine imagery (Late Byzantine material is more varied) reinforce, and are reinforced by, literary conventions portraying women as secondary, passive and, occasionally, publically emotional. There are some exceptional women visually, just as there are textually, and these have the effect of emphasising how women should behave by visualising how they should not. The gendered rhetoric of gesture in images is, rather surprisingly to me, remarkably similar to the gendered rhetoric of words. What the images do is add the dimension of gesture – of corporeality – to the conventions expressed in words. They literally embody the social construction of Byzantine gender.
The Hand is Word: 
The Gesture of the Sign of the Cross in Byzantine Iconography

One of the most widespread gestures in the Christian world is the sign of the cross. There are two forms of this gesture that differ significantly: first, the act of “crossing oneself,” which is when individuals make the sign of the cross upon themselves as a form of prayer and/or protection; and second, the act of “blessing,” which the clergy make toward others or over objects. Both gestures surely have a common origin and are related to the Cross as a symbol representing Christ’s victory over sin and death and His salvation of humankind.

While the cross as a symbol is widely represented in Byzantine art, the gesture of “crossing oneself” was never depicted. The act of “blessing,” on the other hand, was shown by using the gesture for speaking known from the Roman tradition. Taking into consideration the theological and symbolic meanings of the sign of the cross as conveyed in written sources, the present paper aims to investigate the evidence from visual sources in order to explain the peculiarities of the imagery.
Performances of Humiliation: Mock Parades in Byzantium

Historians of Byzantine law have always (and correctly) stressed its Roman roots and its codified character. However, when it comes to the execution of judgments, both statements need some revision. For example, although Byzantine historiographical and hagiographical sources frequently mention mock parades that aimed at humiliating the wrongdoer, this kind of (often additional) punishment has been overlooked so far, an exception being two meticulous collections of incidences by Phaidon Koukoules which lack any analytical approach, though. Progress in ritual studies in the last two decades have shown that it is worth looking at such performances (despite the danger of being distorted by the written sources we have at our disposal) in order to get a better understanding of the culture that produces them.

Byzantine mock parades featured rough music, wild dancing and exposing the wrongdoer to the public in conditions as humiliating as possible. Their origins are not clear but their main features seem to have precedents in forms of vigilantism that can be traced back to Classical Greece. There, rough music and dancing had been part of traditional ran-tans (Charivaris) by which rural communities sanctioned social or sexual misbehavior like adultery. Independently from codified law, the youth of the village moved to the deviant’s house, making rude gestures and noise to express their mockery. This apparent display of anarchy could also include some physical punishment but usually it ended with the reintegration of the wrongdoer. Also the other elements of Byzantine mock parades have antecedents in Greek Antiquity: the perversion of gender and social status by means of placing the deviant in a public space with improper clothing or leading them around on inappropriate mounts had been well-known in the Greek poleis too. The processional character of humiliation, finally, seems to have been inspired by the tradition of Roman triumphal parades which comprised also the display of booty and captives (although not being ridiculed by means of disguise).

It is not clear at what point in history official court ruling took over these customs since they find their way into codified law only in the 10th century and only in typical cases of codified customary law (book of the eparch, military law). In historiographical sources, first incidences can be seen in the 6th century when under the rule of Justinian I for example some pedophiles were paraded through Constantinople. The accentuation of public exposure of the wrongdoer would indeed correlate well with the noticeable shift from death penalty to various forms of mutilations which should make the wrongdoer’s misdemeanor obvious to the public. A systematic analysis of earlier sources, however, might trace the application of mock parades by imperial courts even further back in time.

It is hard to establish what kind of crime exactly was sanctioned by mock parades. Among the examples we find pedophiles, adulterers and adulteresses, arsonists and prisoners of war, but most of all unsuccessful usurpers of the throne. In any case, the reported cases concern almost exclusively men. The outcome of the parades is individually different too. Sometimes the very humiliation was considered sufficiently satisfactory, whereas in other cases it was only an additional punishment before or after a penalty of mutilation or (very seldom) death.
Humiliation itself works almost exclusively on a level of symbolic communication, comprising in most cases visual signals. Identities could be perverted by means of dress: the convicted man or woman could be put on display nude or clad in rags to imply dissolution of their social status. Men, especially with military background, sometimes were forced to wear female clothing as a symbol of their effeminacy. Also an inappropriate mount could play on the loss of social status and prestige. Donkeys were the first choice. Having once been used to humiliate adulteresses in ancient Greece, it seems that donkeys initially were chosen for their phallic connotations (they also serve as mounts of Silen and other sartys). At some point, they must have lost their explicit sexual allusion and only kept their humiliating message. When clergymen or monks should be the aim of mockery, however, the use of a donkey as a mount could backfire, being understood as a kind of mimesis of Christ. Especially in these cases the perversion does not concern the mount itself but the position of the rider who was forced to sit backwards on the animal (a penalty which is, however, not confined to clerics).

Also the bodies of the convicts could be altered in order to make it the aim of ridicule. The most frequent strategy was to shave their heads and crop their beards, depriving them of important features of their male identity and annihilating their personality (at least for the moment). In more severe cases the humiliation was increased by physical mutilations (amputation of nose, ears or hands), although these were not performed during the parade but before.

The staging of the punishment as a whole, therefore, followed principles that are known from carnivalesque rituals of turning the world (with all its implications on gender and social status) upside-down for some time span recognized by both the community itself and political authorities. During the ritual of the mock parade the mob (as most Byzantine authors would say) was allowed and encouraged to deride the convicts regardless of their standing, even if they were usurpers from aristocratic houses.

In this context it is interesting to see, that emperors usually avoided to attend the parades personally. On the one hand, the emperor should not give himself to coarse mockery for reasons of dignity and on the other hand, any participation in this ritual of an inverted world could bear dangers to his office too. Therefore, the execution of the penalty was deliberately (but only apparently) ceded to the audience. That is why the staging took place exclusively in spaces traditionally dominated by the common people (hippodrome, mese) and did not include symbols or architecture of religious or imperial connotation.

The community itself should punish the wrongdoer who had put in danger the public order. To some extent, gestures and performances of disapproval and disdain can be obtained from written sources and depictions (of the mocking of Christ, e.g.).

Yet, the ancient customs of public reproachment were only exploited by official law and control was never given completely to the people. Only once, it seems, a parade resulted in lynch law: after being deposed, Andronikos I was tortured, deprived of one hand and one eye, shorn and led on a camel from the Blachernae-Palace to the Hippodrome. People did not only participate actively in his punishment during the parade by beating him but also carried out the execution themselves.

Usually, however, the organized staging of the event prevented an unexpected outcome. In this sense one could say that even the temporary state of apparent anarchy was nothing else than another proof of the functioning hierarchy of the state with the emperor at its head. From this point
of view, the audience simply served as an instrument for the execution of imperial will. More than that, the ritual of expelling a common enemy may have reinforced the bonds between the emperor and his people. The execution of Andronikos I is nothing but another piece of evidence for the lack of imperial authority in Constantinople after the death of Manuel Komnenos in 1180.
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Abstract

In *The Danger of Ritual Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton, 2001), Philippe Buc argues that ritual as it is known from texts does not constitute the study of ritual itself. He insists that the ephemerality of ritual actions is not consolidated in texts in a self-evident or unbiased manner—that texts, in other words, always deploy ritual descriptions for their own textual agendas. Accordingly, Buc urges scholars to refrain from treating such textual descriptions as secondary traces of lost originary actions but instead as forceful articulations of their own textual politics. Buc’s polemical work serves as inspiration for my paper, which extends his premise from ritual to gesture more broadly (although the contours between the two are far from distinct) and from textual discourse to a politics of the image. The reading of pictorial imagery in a documentary manner—that is, as straightforward evidence of ephemeral ritual gestures—risks nullifying the specificity of the imagery itself and its varied contexts. In recognizing this potential risk, my paper explores the relationship between the historical performance of ritual gestures as recounted textually and ritual gestures as representational strategies.

The body of the Palaiologan emperor serves as the analytic corpus for this endeavour. Taking as my point of departure the ceremonial gestures surrounding the first Palaiologan emperor’s restoration of imperial authority to Constantinople in 1261, I wish to consider the relationship between gestures described in textual accounts and their later inflection in visual representations. Texts associate Michael VIII’s staged entrance to the imperial city as a series of carefully orchestrated ritual gestures including the hallowed performance of the *adventus* combined with imperial *proskynesis*. George Akropolites’ text (with a new edition and commentary by Ruth Macrides, Oxford, 2007), paints an especially vivid picture of the gestures of piety performed at this moment. While there are no corresponding visual representations of this historical performance, its gestural language is refracted in the altogether new imperial imagery of *proskynesis* in the early Palaiologan period. In addition to monumental imagery of imperial piety in Constantinople, new gold coinage disseminated the innovative gesture of imperial keeling far and wide.

Many scholars have explored the symbolism and political motivation of the emperor’s public gesture of piety. Alongside the *adventus*, *proskynesis* ranks among the most discussed ritual gestures in Byzantium. It constitutes the ultimate gestural performance of piety, whether directed to the emperor by vanquished barbarians or to sacred figures by the emperor. Texts of an impressively diverse range of genres—from those associated with ceremonial protocol to historical narratives—help us contextualize this ritualized prostration. The imagery of such a symbolically pregnant gesture has been understood in ideological terms as an essential part of the construction of the imperial ideal (akin to how Gilbert Dagron, 1996/2003, read imperial ritual more generally). Building on the recent interest in gesture and performance, notably Leslie Brubaker as well as the other contributors to the 2009 volume of *Past & Present* dedicated to the politic of gesture, I wish to turn to the visual
language of this gesture in order to historicize more deeply the visual idiom of imperial *proskynesis* in relation to the ritual actions associated with the first Palaiologan emperor. To be clear, while *proskynesis* developed much earlier, in the later Byzantine period it became an integral part of the official imperial visual register for the first time. The earlier celebrated mosaic image of an emperor in *proskynesis* in the narthex of Hagia Sophia constitutes an isolated and idiosyncratic instance, whereas Palaiologan coinage disseminated the new kneeling imperial image serially. My paper focuses on the recalibration of the performance of this gesture and its mobilization in the visual sphere of the early Palaiologoi.

Another gestural performance that emerges in the later Byzantine period as an integral part of the imperial ritual repertoire is the *prokypsis*. This imperial *tableau vivant*, described in detail in Pseudo-Kodinos (ed. Macrides, Munitiz, and Angelov, 2013), hinges on performed immobility rather than gestural motion. It is understood by Michael Jeffreys (1987), Henry Maguire (2009), Maria Parani (2013) and others to have developed earlier in the Komnenian period, but our sources are principally Palaiologan. As a coda to the discussion of *proskynesis*, the final part of my paper will consider how later Byzantine imperial portraits might be inflected by this Palaiologan codification of *prokypsis*. 
Le langage du corps dans la narration de l'histoire par Jean Kinnamos

Ces vingt dernières années, la recherche des plusieurs byzantinologues a mis en lumière le caractère littéraire des textes historiographiques des auteurs byzantins et elle a montré que l'écriture de nombreux historiographes byzantins – y compris ceux du XIIe siècle – présente une variété de traits qui permettraient de qualifier la narration de romancée (humour, ironie, satire, traits d'auto-parodie, hétéroglossie, etc.). De fait, les plus grands historiens du XIIe siècle, Anna Comnène, Jean Kinnamos, Nicétas Chionatès, avaient reçu, on le sait, une éducation classique poussée qu’implique une excellente formation rhétorique; d’où le grand art avec lequel ils intègrent à la narration historique des divers genres et figures de rhétorique, afin de conférer à leur récit la vraisemblance/crédibilité (πιθανότητα). Celle-ci, selon Aphthonios, est la qualité par excellence de la narration qui peut être obtenue, selon le commentaire de Jean de Sardes, entre autres, par l’impression morale (ἠθος), l’émotion (πάθος) et l’évidence (ἐνάρεια), qui met directement sous les yeux de l'auditeur ou du lecteur l'objet dont parle l'auteur. Et l’un des procédés qui contribue à donner au texte l'évidence et, partant, la « πιθανότητα », consiste à évoquer un certain nombre de détails corporels des personnages entrant dans le récit, en d’autres termes, de faire référence à la « langue du corps ».

Par langue du corps nous entendons, globalement l’ensemble des caractéristiques permanentes de l’apparence physique ainsi que les manifestations extérieures passagères du comportement d’un individu, susceptibles, que celui-ci en ait conscience ou non, de nous aider à mieux cerner son caractère, ses dispositions morales (ἠθος) ou ses sentiments (πάθος) et de s’ajouter à la communication verbale, voire de s’y substituer. Dans la communication orale bien sûr, la langue du corps en tant que vecteur de messages, peut ne revêtir qu’une importance marginale, voire ne jouer aucun rôle. Mais, s’agissant de la communication écrite, littéraire de surcroît, dans laquelle le texte sert d’intermédiaire pour permettre au lecteur d’accéder au sens et aux impressions, même si la langue du corps n’apparaît que de façon sporadique, jamais les références à des détails corporels ne sont « insignifiantes » ni fortuites. Il peut s’agir : 1. De traits physionomiques permanents, comme par exemple, la stature, la forme du visage, la couleur de la peau ou des cheveux ; 2. De descriptions des mouvements du corps et des réactions, spontanées ou contrôlées à un stimulus, comme par exemple des gestes, des regards, des sourires, des crispations, et en général des mimiques du visage, des altérations de la carnation, du timbre de la voix ; 3. De références à un contact physique, comme par exemple, accolades, embrassades, rapprochement fatal ; 4. De comportements dans l’espace ; par exemple, la façon dont l’empereur est assis, dont il paraît dans un lieu public. Autant d’éléments qui constituent un sous-ensemble du système de fonctionnement séméiologique d’un texte. La présence de ces signes corporels apparaît à des degrés divers et présente, bien sûr, des variations sensibles selon le genre dont relève le texte littéraire, mais procède d’un choix délibéré de l’auteur qui décide de les inclure dans sa narration et, dans de nombreux cas, de les imaginer ou carrément de les inventer.

Chaque époque, chaque lieu se forge son propre code de conduite sociale qui comporte des gestes codifiés, aussi bien dans le rituel de la vie quotidienne que dans le cérémonial officiel. Or,
dans les sociétés médiévales, la gestuelle a une importance si grande que Jacques Le Goff définit très justement la période du Moyen Âge occidental comme une « civilisation du geste ». Une définition qui, sans nul doute, s'applique également à l'Empire byzantin. Recenser des références à la langue du corps dans les textes de la littérature médiévale permet indubitablement de réunir un matériau précieux pour des observations sociologiques et politiques. Toutefois, cet aspect particulièrement intéressant ne nous a occupée que de façon marginale, lorsque l'auteur décrit des conduites codifiées de son temps qui, souvent, émettent un message politique. Ainsi, Kinnamos évoque la scène dans laquelle Manuel exhorte le chef turc Kilitz Arslan à s'asseoir en face de lui ; ce dernier commence par décliner son offre mais prend ensuite place sur un siège plus bas. À deux ou trois reprises, il décrit la scène où un chef étranger, seul ou accompagné de ses sujets, s'attache une corde au cou et se présente, tête nue et à pied, devant l'empereur byzantin, pour déclarer sa soumission. Ou encore il dépeint l'impressionnant cortège triomphal et l'allure imposante de l'empereur. Ce qui nous intéresse davantage, c'est d'étudier à quels moments l'historien, Kinnamos en l'occurrence, quand il relate un événement historique, insiste sur la description de la conduite du corps de ses héros. Choisit-il consciemment seulement certains personnages ? Sur quels éléments focalise-t-il plus systématiquement son attention, leur conférant ainsi une charge sémiologique plus grande dans le texte ? Une problématique qui devient plus intéressante encore lorsque notre auteur n'a pas été toujours le témoin oculaire de l'épisode. Ainsi, en partant des informations qu'il a à sa disposition, il reconstitue des scènes dans tous les détails, invente des mouvements et des comportements, en faisant plus ou moins appel à son imagination. Bref, il opère à la façon d'un auteur de fiction.

Ce n'est pas un hasard si nous avons choisi de nous attacher ici au texte de Kinnamos. Récemment, une de nos étudiantes, Eugénia Kontaxi, dans son mémoire de DEA déposé à l'université d'Athènes en 2013, s'est intéressée à la langue du corps dans l'Alexiade d'Anne Comnène, et en a recensé systématiquement toutes les occurrences dans le texte. Elle a rassemblé un matériau considérable. Une des conclusions qui s'est imposée d'elle-même est que la conduite non verbale des héros constitue un élément constitutif du programme d'Anne Comnène. Elle se rencontre dans une foule de situations, concerne indistinctement des hommes et des femmes, des amis et des adversaires de son père. L'historienne y recourt systématiquement quand elle veut décrire des caractères, des sentiments, des relations interpersonnelles. L'étude plus approfondie de ce matériel est actuellement en cours.

Le cas de Kinnamos est nettement différent. Quelques rares fois seulement, l'historien étoffe son récit de références à l'apparence extérieure, à la gestuelle, aux sentiments et aux humeurs des héros qui prennent part aux événements dont il fait le récit. On observe généralement que :

1. C'est Manuel qui se taille la part du lion dans plus de cinquante pour cent des cas.

1. Parmi les autres personnages byzantins dont il est question se détache une autre figure : celle d'Andronic Comnène. Exception faite peut-être de l'empereur Jean Comnène ; les autres personnages, dont des soldats anonymes, ne représentent que deux ou trois cas isolés.

1. Il y est fait allusion à des détails relatifs au comportement physique de princes étrangers : Raymond de Poitiers, Richard d'Andria, Roger II, Renaud de Châtillon, Baudouin III.

1. La présence de la figure de femme est minime.

Plus précisément :

Manuel, principalement au combat : monte à l'assaut, pointe sa lance et tue de nombreux ennemis (τὸ δόρυ ἰδώνας κατ' αὐτῶν ἱετὸ πολλοὺς τε δορατίσας εἰς γῆν ἔβαλεν οὐ μιᾷ δόρατος
prosbytes penteukideka tois polemion ein yin eballein); il degaine son epée (spasameunos to xifos); il brandit le drapeau royal (tinh basileikhn anelomenein simeian); par son armure et sa præstanc imposante, il manifeste sa presence aux adversaires et ceux-ci, epouvantés, battent en retraite (ek tis opileous aiton katanomasteneis xerouvo gar katakorfous alhlipyto pása) kai tis tou swmatos de anadromhes te kai eufyia te tekemriwsamenein malista ... vnota didonai oudami mythynontai); d'une main, il tient un énorme et pesant bouclier et, de l'autre, manie les armes, en repoussant les voëles de flèches; il attache lui-même le bateau avec une corde et le tire (bathéra men xehi áspida elipto, ou ton synthison deis touxan oude xin swma fragnyttai eu, eferrén de malista kai hou oude koufisai andri pédion gînetai, bathéra de to epis tis basileikhs synthisis tesaménon dhírous kheirisamenein épipolen eu te xynagagwn ...; epis tin vana xeféretos, kalwðiois te oux xinndhias elxisa te ekeíthen autín ischvi); il entre à pied dans le cours d'eau impétueux et plein de vase et, d'un coup d'épalema, remet d'aplomb le bateau qui risquait de couler, corps et biens (basileus epis ùdher álomenein epipleíston ton pezí proelathnos, kaiitoi ton peúmatos sun rhoimis sofða katakferoménon kai témia ti enntautha doudiékdeton ergaíoménon, to òmws te òplesche tì vèpi); il tire de son sein la liste de ses soldats (épikállon elxe tous xenegekôn); il désigne de la main le difficile chemin à ses soldats (tînh asynithè ekeíven, ùpodeýeza tì xehi, kai ðsteipton lénavai); son adversaire le frappe violemment au menton et, bien que les maillons de fer de son heaume s’enfoncent dans sa chair et le blessent, il tranche la main de son ennemi (Bakchinos men to basilei tisis sapgonos to xifos kateveghikôn épilheven, oú mûn kai dieulase to ek ton kranous epis tas òphesis khrismenos n Sphinxos parapétaisma. Oûn ménonti ischura ó pléghe gégoenon, ws tous krikous ikavos tê parake iniche eizestatas epis pleistos ekputwthnai. o de basileus xeghros ton bárbaron afelomenein tì xefei). Il chasse, ou il joue au polo; renversé et accablé sous le corps de son cheval, il est grièvement blessé; il est blessé aussi à la main lorsqu’il essaie de désarmer Andronic qui attaque son frère; il soigne les blessures des autres, pratique des saignées. Il prend la parole en public à maintes reprises. Habituellement, le contenu de ses discours est retranscrit par Kinnamos sans la moindre allusion au timbre de sa voix, à son expression, à son attitude, ni à l’impression produite par ses paroles. D’une manière générale, les manifestations de ses sentiments, tout en étant évoquées, restent tout à fait marginales. L’empereur se réjouit, se met en colère, mais l’auteur ne nous décrit pas la façon dont se traduisent ces sentiments. À une exception près: lors de la mort de son père, l’empereur Jean Comnène; Manuel incline la tête contre sa poitrine et verse d’abondantes larmes qui se répandent sur le sol (katous tosineus basileus kai epis stéran tînh kefali<n rûptos dákrosis to dáspedon épilhne). À noter que Kinnamos n’avait pas assisté à la scène. Apprenant que sa femme a accouché avant terme d’un enfant mâle mort-né, Manuel, si l’on en croit Kinnamos, maîtrise ses sentiments jusqu’à ce que la discussion sur le dogme prenne fin. Ensuite, il se met debout, s’agenouille devant les prêtres, leur parle – l’historien rapporte les paroles de l’empereur à la première personne – les implorant d’intercéder auprès de Dieu puis il se relève tandis que les prêtres, à genoux et les yeux pleins de larmes, adressent des supplications à Dieu, obéissant ainsi bien sûr à l’empereur. Bref, il ressort clairement de tous les passages cités que, s’agissant de Manuel, les manifestations du corps sont mentionnées et décrites de façon à renforcer son image héroïque et à le présenter comme un surhomme.

Aux antipodes de ce qui vaut pour Manuel, concernant la figure qui arrive en deuxième position après l’empereur sous la plume de Kinnamos, celle d’Andronic Comnène, les allusions aux manifestations corporelles contribuent essentiellement à donner de lui une image négative. Il injurie le sébastocrator Isaac, s’élance, épée en main, pour le décapiter, blesse l’empereur par erreur.
Lorsqu’il tente d’assassiner l’empereur, il abandonne son cheval, se déguise, enfourche une mule, met pied à terre et s’approche de la tente impériale, un couteau à la main. Mais il est repéré ; alors, il fléchit les genoux, faisant mine de déféquer ! (ἔπι γόνι κλίθεις τὸν τής γαστρὸς δῆθεν ἀποκρίνειν προσεποιεῖτο σκυβαλισμόν). C’est surtout sa malignité que souligne Kinnamos, en décrivant par le menu ses mouvements et ses gestes, lors de son évation très cinématographique des prisons de Constantinople (ἐνταῦθα ἐκδραμὼν ἄλογως ἐκρύπτατο τὸ σῶμα αυτοῦ ἐπὶ βραχὺ, οὐ «εἰ γε ἀφήσεις με» ἔφη «ἀπίέναι, αὐτῇ δὲ σοι παρ’ ἐμοῦ χάρις ἔσται» καὶ ἀμα λέγων τὸ ἐπικόλπιον αὐτῷ ἐξαγαγῷν ἐδείκνυ φυλακτήριον).

Princes étrangers, surtout latins.

Toutes les références à l’apparence des personnages contribuent à donner d’eux une image dépréciative. Bel homme à la prestance imposante (κάλλους τε καὶ μεγέθους), Raymond de Poitiers reçoit sur le crâne un rude coup frappé par un soldat byzantin ; il ne tombe pas par terre à la renverse, parce qu’il se cramponne des deux mains à la nuque de son cheval et que les gens de sa suite le soutiennent (εἰ μὴ ἀμφοτέρας τοῦ ἱππείου ἐπιλαβόμενος αὐχένας ἐπέσχε τὸν ὀλισθὸν πλεῖστοι τε ἢδε τῶν ἐπομένων συνέσθησαν, ὑπίτοις ἀν παρ’ αὐτὰ ἐξεκυλίσθη). En 1134, Roger II, qui auparavant avait humilié le pape, le fait asseoir, tombe à genoux et se dirige vers lui en rampant à quatre pattes, pour lui demander soi-disant pardon et en même temps la dignité de roi (καθίζει ἐπὶ ταύτης τὸν ἄρχιερὰ, ἐς ἔδαφος ταῖς ἐπαβαλὼν ἐκατον προς φοίνικας τε καὶ πολλὰ ἐρειδόμενος προσέπιτο, τὸ μὲν τὴν ἀμαρτάδα δῆθεν ἐξιλασκόμενος τὸ δὲ καὶ ρῆς προβεβλήσθαι ἄξιων). La mort de Richard d’Andria à Trani en Apulie est hideuse. Un prêtre le frappe à la jambe avec une pierre. Il se tord de douleur. Deuxième coup, à la gorge cette fois. Il implore pitié. Son adversaire lui perfore le ventre d’un coup de couteau et le force à avaler ses viscères (τις τῶν ἐκ Τράνεως εἰς τοὺς ἱερέας τελῶν μέγα τι χρήμα λίθου ἐς ὑπερδεξιῶν ἀφεὶς κνήμης τα θανάτως τυχήσας αὐτῷ, εἰς γην ἀναχθῆναι ἐποίησε. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐκεῖτο σπαράττων ὑπὸ ὀδόννης ἐκατον, ὁ δὲ καὶ δευτέραν κατῆρε τῇν ἐκρύψατο μὲν τὸν τῆς ἱερείας καθίζει, ἐγκατα δὲ πάντα ἐκχέις ὑπὸ τῆς ἀκίδας ἀνακλίσθη καὶ ἔτι ὑπετέθη ἐκ γείνου καὶ εἰς ὑπωπιάς καὶ ἀκίδας ἐκχέων ἐπὶ τοῦ στόματος παρέβητο). Impitoyable mais hypocrite, Renaud de Châtillon, après avoir fait torturer l’archevêque de Chypre pour lui extorquer ses biens, l’exhibe sur son cheval, en vêtements d’apparat à travers toute la ville, tandis que lui-même marche à ses côtés, en tenant la brde. Beaudouin III, plein de morgue, descend de cheval à l’endroit où seul l’empereur peut mettre pied à terre.

Les allusions à l’apparence physique de personnages féminins sont quasiment inexistantes. De toute évidence, la présence des femmes en général ne retient guère l’intérêt de Kinnamos. Il évoque brièvement les symptômes de la maladie de Mélissanthé, promise à Manuel, qui fanent sa beauté (κατακλιθείσα ἔφητε τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἐκλόγευτο ἐξαίσια, πυρετὸι τα αὐτὴν μετεξέχοντο, καὶ ὑποπασιμός ἦδη καὶ τηχεδὼν ἐπικολοῦθη. καὶ τὸ τῆς ὀδους άνθος χάριν τι βραχύομεν τὰ πρότερα ἥλλοιούτο κατὰ βραχὺ καὶ ἐστυγνοῦτο). Il décrit également la conduite et la mort de deux prostituées. Au siège de Brindisi, une demi-folle qui erre dans les rues est frappée de paralysie quand une pierre lui brise le crâne. (γυναῖον τι ἀνὰ τὴν πόλιν σοβοῦν κατὰ κορυφήν δεξάμενον τὴν βολὴν τὴν τε κεφαλῆν διεσπαράκχη καὶ πάσαν ἀλλὰν τὸν παρελύθη τὴν ὑδραῖν). Au siège de Zeugma, une femme grimpée sur les remparts, adresse des propos orduriers aux soldats romains, leur lance des cendres, relève ses jupes dans un geste obscène, et leur montre son derrière. Un soldat décoche contre elle une flèche qui la frappe à ses fesses. Telle est la pitoyable image de la femme que voient les soldats en entrant dans la ville (γυναῖον τι εὑρετο δύστην ἐξαγαγόντων ἔκις τῆς ἐδρας ἔχον. .. αὐτῇ, ὑπηνίκα ἔτι
Pour conclure, nous voyons que Jean Kinnamos recourt entre autres à la sémiologie du corps pour mieux mettre en lumière la grandeur de l'empereur Manuel I, son objectif principal, de toute évidence, lorsqu'il entreprend de rédiger son histoire. L'impression extrêmement négative que suscite chez le lecteur la conduite corporelle des princes latins contribue encore à sublimer davantage Manuel. C'est du reste l'unique raison, il me semble, pour laquelle elle figure dans le récit. En fait, cela n'intéresse pas vraiment Kinnamos de décrire les caractères, de rendre compte de sentiments, d'expliquer des conduites pour interpréter le cours de l'histoire. Ce qui explique que nous ne rencontrions pas chez lui de références à la physionomie des personnes faisant plus ou moins écho à des traités physiognomoniques de l'Antiquité, comme celles que l'on rencontre dans l'Alexiade d'Anna Comnène – allure physique d'Alexis I, d'Irène Doukas, de Marie d'Alanie, de Jean Italikos et de bien d'autres encore. Kinnamos n'est assurément pas un observateur perspicace du comportement humain comme Nicétas Choniatès qui, très souvent avec une grande justesse et un souci du détail, décrit les gestes de chacun des héros principaux de son récit, surtout quand il veut ironiser sur les défauts d'un personnage, voire les tourner en ridicule (par exemple de Jean Poutzès [p. 57] ou de Jean Camatéros [p. 113-115]).
The Victorious Emperor and the Vanquished Barbarian: Gestures of Triumph from Roman to Early Christian and Byzantine Art

As a part of the conception and the content of a work of art, the gestures through which the dominance of the victor is visually rendered can serve to lay bare both his own triumph and the humiliation of his defeated enemy. The aim of the artistic product is of utmost importance, as it dictates the wider iconographical framework and other elements of the composition through which the viewer, by means of association, can admire the victor’s authority or feel pity for the vanquished.

In depictions of victory and triumph in Roman imperial art, gestures always aim to project the grandeur of the conqueror. When Christian art adopts these scenes, it transforms them accordingly, as has already been shown by André Grabar, so they render the triumph of Christ and the new religion. A new content is given to representations of an imperial or a generally public nature, which Christian art utilized in order to signify the ultimate victory of a seemingly defeated person, usually of a martyr.

Representations in which the Roman emperor drags a captive by the hair are also included in the context of the visual rendering of his triumph. The subject, already known with variations from Egyptian and ancient Greek art, is introduced in official imperial iconography beginning with medallions of Constantine the Great. Either the emperor or a personification of Nike, are seen carrying out this action, as we can observe on coins dated up to the end of the 5th century. Subsequently, when Nike is substituted by angels, they are now seen dragging not the defeated barbarian, but the enemy of God, the impious.

The topic is found in four marginal psalters dated from the 2nd half of the 9th up to the late 11th century for the illustration of the Ode of Isaiah (26; 10). Later, from the 13th century onwards, it is used in the illumination of gospel books and in monumental art, as one of the scenes which visually render the parable of the Royal Wedding (Mt 22; 1-14). In the images mentioned above, the impious, who is depicted in various positions and can assume a different identity and insignia, is dragged by the hair by an angel. In depictions of the parable, an extra scene is often included which is also drawn from imperial triumphal iconography: one or more angels binding the impious’ limbs.

The study of the relationship between text and image allows us to better understand the way a secular iconographical subject, a secular gesture, adopted by early Christian art, was transformed and further evolved later in Byzantium. Gestures of victory and imperial triumph, combined with gestures which serve to magnify the humiliation of the vanquished enemy, assume a different character in Christian art. Now, the idea of the victorious Christ or the triumphant Church, although in the background, is the necessary requirement for the creation not only of the works of art under examination, but also of others with a similar subject. However, the punishment of the enemy, who is now the impious, the unbeliever or the adversary of the right doctrine, and therefore the enemy of the Church, is now carried out by the angels, as, according to Christian vocabulary, God charges them with the punishment of His foes. In this way, the same or similar gestures, retaining their old symbolism and their old dynamics, are now placed in a new context within which the agents and the ideas have shifted.
How to Rule with Undefiled Hands: The Performance of Imperial Repentance

This paper will take a look on the performance of imperial penance during the middle and late Byzantine period. I will focus on cases of individual repentance and not on actions that the emperor performed together with the citizens for collective sins, as it was the case during public processions of penance. In these, the monarchs presented themselves as part of a community pleading for forgiveness, as ideal rulers who initiated the necessary actions and led them on personally. These performances served to create communal identity and affirmed visibly the authority of the emperors over this very community (Diefenbach 1996, Meier 2002). In contrast, personal transgressions against prevailing norms could turn out quite problematic, as they separated the monarch from the community that was defined by its commitment to these norms. Accusations of individual sins could therefore disunite the emperor from those groups of society that were indispensible for the acceptance of his claim to rule. How, then, could he achieve purification – and, perhaps, under what circumstances might an emperor fail to achieve it? What did the emperors do, and whom did they address (the audience being a very important part of any performance)?

The well known penance of Leon VI is described in great detail by the anonymous author of the Vita Euthymii. Therefore it is convenient to use this description as a starting point of possible actions that the emperor could perform to demonstrate his sincere repentance. The Vita makes it clear that Leon was very aware that penance for his fourth marriage was unavoidable, and was ready to accept any penal obligations that might be imposed upon him by the Church. But the patriarch Nikolaos Mystikos changed his mind and did not receive him into the Hagia Sophia, what he had promised, and so prevented the emperor from starting his penance proper. The second time this happened, Leon cast himself on the ground in front of the Patriarch in the Narthex of the Hagia Sophia, and confessed his sin in public. The author of the Vita describes this performances expressly as royally, following a pattern established already by Ambrosius in his dealings with Theodosios I. Leon clearly intended not only to imitate Theodosios, but also the biblical model of David, typus of the humble, penitent ruler (Dagron 1996). By acting thus the emperor did not merely plead meekly for forgiveness – his act was a strong request to receive what David had from Nathan, and Theodosios from Ambrosius: Leon demanded to be treated like these royal examples. Nor did he only address the patriarch: The strongest obstacles to his request for penance were prominent members of the synod, who were probably present at the occasion. All the time during the conflict, Leon was constantly in touch with the synod, trying to convince as many of its members as possible to grant him penance (Karlin-Hayter 1970). During a reception after his prostration he showed to them his little son Constantine, lamented his martial misfortunes, shed tears, and uttered penitential verses, thereby moving the hearers themselves to tears. According to the Vita Euthymii, he succeeded to convince at least some of the metropolitans to change sides and to support him against the patriarch. The last opponents were then exiled for a while, Nikolaos removed – and the elected
new patriarch Euthymios could himself be seen as part of the imperial performance of repentance: as *pater pneumatikos* of the emperor, he had special authority and responsibility concerning the spiritual welfare of his protégé. By choosing him as patriarch, Leon ensured that penance could not be denied to him again (though Euthymios objected the fourth marriage strongly). Moreover, the special authority of Euthymios in this matter would strengthen the potential acceptance of Leon's repentance especially in the clergy. After his elevation, Euthymios and the synod (minus its exiled members, plus some legates of the Pope) granted the emperor's wish, imposed penal obligations and admitted him again into the Church. Leon had achieved his goal.

This narration of the *Vita Euthymii* illustrates very well the political dimensions of imperial penance. These were even more crucial when the emperor's sin was connected with his accession to the throne, especially in cases of usurpation, when the new ruler's acceptance was not yet firmly established. After Leon, most examples of imperial penance entail the purification of sins which were directly related to the seizure of power, especially to violent crimes in the course of usurpations; that is, to serious violations of legal or moral standards in the sensitive moment of a non-consensual change of ruler that could weaken the authority of the new emperor at the very beginning of his reign.

The first case in question is already the usurpation of Basil I, who in 867 became sole ruler of the Empire after Michael III had been violently murdered. Numerous sources attest the accusation that Basil had killed his mentor personally. The violent removal of an emperor in itself was neither unique nor spectacular; but his alleged assassination by the hand of his successor was. While there was never any official confession of Basil – in my opinion, the written statement about his sins read out at the council of 869/70 had nothing to do with it – there soon circulated stories that interpreted the foundation of the Nea Ekklesia as an act of penance. I don't want to dwell to deep on this here, as it doesn't provide much information about performance; but its is important to note that in the discourse regarding the homicide charge against Basil a view prevailed gradually that it had to be responded to not by denial, but by a sign of repentance. This view was even alluded to, although only very carefully, by the historian known as Genesios, who had been commissioned by Constantine VII. He maintains that Basil had no share in the bloody deed, but continues that he had built the Nea Ekklesia to thank God for the personal benefit he had drawn from it, and was only crowned after the Church had been completed. Doing this, so Genesios, he gave a new and fresh start to his government (Genes. hist. IV 29). The false chronology of this report is evident because the Nea was consecrated only in 881. It seems to me that Genesios refers to the interpretation of the foundation of the church as an act of repentance, which preceded the coronation of Basil as sole ruler and thus the actual start of his autocracy: Basil begins his reign pure. It is probably no coincidence that the next case triggered an outright demand for purification before the coronation.

That case concerns John I Tzimiskes, who came to power in the year 969 by a conspiracy that he instigated with Theophano, empress and wife of the previous emperor Nikephoros Phokas (see Lilie 2007, 2011). Tzimiskes also was confronted with the charge that he had killed his predecessor with his own hands. As he hurried to the Hagia Sophia the morning after the coup, in order to obtain the imperial crown by patriarch Polyeuctus, he was denied entrance to the church: Only after he had shown repentance for the murder he would be allowed back into the house of the lord (Scylitzes, Ioh. Tzim. 2). But Tzimiskes did not repent: He only agreed to execute two other alleged murderers he had named and to exile Theophano, on whom he shifted all the blame. Polyeuktos relented and crowned Tzimiskes at Christmas Eve. But while the Patriarch showed himself satisfied, the synod
was not. It demanded a justification why Tzimiskes had been crowned without having repented. Polyeuctos answered with the famous quotation, found in the works of Theodoros Balsamon, that when Tzimiskes was anointed emperor, his sin had been erased completely, just as baptism washes away all previous transgressions (Rhalles – Potles III, S. 44). We observe that the synod was obviously not content with a mere protestation of innocence. It expected more, a credible demonstration of remorse, that is, a public performance of repentance. Without it, the reign of Tzmiskes would start tainted. Accordingly, the Patriarch stressed in his statement that the opposite was true: the imperial coronation itself had already ensured the purification of the new emperor. While it seems to have been accepted then, this view did not prevail in the future.

After the death of Constantine VIII, the last male representatives of the Macedonian dynasty in 1028, a number of questionable imperial marriages took place that were highly criticized by contemporaries (Kalavrezou 1994, 1997; Laiou 1992). Probably the worst of these was the marriage of the empress Zoe with Michael (IV) Paphlagon. It was scandalized by rumors of an illegitimate affair while Zoe was still married to Romanos III, rumors that Michael tried to silence by an oath that was generally regarded as false. Added to that came suspicion that the death of Romanos in 1034 had been effected by the adulterous couple. But the patriarch Alexios Studites crowned Michael without demur and married him to Zoe. Therefore several suspicions were left unanswered: adultery, perjury and plotting murder, each in itself enough to dispute Michael’s marriage and his claim to power. That Michael suffered from public seizures of epilepsy was also not helpful. His critics interpreted the disease as a demonic possession that God had inflicted upon him to execute his wrath (reminiscent of David’s adversary and predecessor, King Saul). So what did Michael do to purify himself? If we believe Michael Psellos, the new basileus was well aware of his serious misconduct. He started to refrain from any debauchery and of marital intercourse in order to atone for what he had done for the sake of power. When his epilepsy was joined by dropsy, he reacted with fastings and purifications and donated a monastery to the holy physicians Kosmas and Damian (the Hagioi Anargyroi). He practiced asceticism, invited lepers and washed their feet with his own hands, gave charitable contributions to other monasteries, and so on. Several times he went to the shrine of Demetrios in Thessaloniki to benefit from the healing power of its effluent myron; the fight against sin and the disease, understood as corporal punishment, went hand in hand. Furthermore, he asked holy men to pronounce penal obligations that would assure divine forgiveness. They refused to do so as long as Michael had not repented his sins in public. In the history by John Skylitzes it is even postulated that Michael could only be forgiven if he renounced the purple, repudiated the adulteress Zoe and mourned his sins all by himself. This extreme view is certainly related to the fact that Michael finally did exactly that: Shortly before he died he entered the convent he had founded, refused to receive Zoe and eventually died “doing penance and confessing his sin against Romanos, weeping”. The final judgment of Skylitzes is relatively mild: Apart from the crimes against Romanos Michael had been a decent, good and pious man.

As Tzimiskes, Michael for obvious reasons did not confess or perform public repentance for his alleged sins. He was not demanded to so by the patriarch, and later tried only indirectly, though quite desperately, to purify himself by pious acts. He might have considered to follow the example of Tzimiskes, blame Zoe as the culprit and banish her. Personal feelings aside, this approach was not at all feasible because of the extraordinary position Zoe held, together with her popularity. This assumption is confirmed by the fate of his successor Michael V. Kalaphates. When he exiled Zoe
he provoked unrest in the population, which defied the expulsion of the legitimate empress. By cutting his dynastic bonds, Michael V. became an ordinary usurper and was thus violently removed from power. Michael IV was more prudent, but that restricted himself to very limited options to cleanse himself from sin. The only alternative left were public demonstrations of humble piety that did entail neither confession nor absolution. In this way he succeeded indeed, it seems, to convince the audience of his personal piety, but not to achieve the forgiveness of his sins and full acceptance as emperor. Only his abdication from office was perceived as a sufficient sign of remorse. It is of course unquestionable that this rather harsh judgment was to a very high degree influenced by his stigmatizing epilepsy.

In 1081 Alexios Komnenos rebelled against the reigning emperor Nikephoros III Botaneiates. On the first of April his army captured Constantinople after a short siege and the city was plundered extensively, even churches were not spared. The daughter of the new ruler, Anna Komnene, does not deny the consequences of the violent conquest in the history of her fathers reign. But according to her, he immediately repented: Alexios feared that the sufferings of the City inflicted by his soldiers could have caused God’s wrath so that he might share the fate of Saul, who lost rule and life because of his transgressions. Although Anna makes it clear that Alexios was not to blame personally for what had happened, he humbly confessed before the patriarch and the synod shortly after his coronation. They imposed on him and his relatives to fast for forty days, during which they had to sleep on the bare floor, which was accepted. Anna commends the subsequent actions of the imperial family in highest terms, explaining to her audience that the tears shed and the wailing in the palace were not blameworthy or signs of inner weakness, but praiseworthy und producing eternal joy. Her father even went beyond what was imposed by wearing a sackcloth beneath the purple during these forty days and nights. She glorifies him as an exemplary Christian who surpasses even his relatives, and stresses that Alexios himself recognized the need for repentance, which he regarded as a prerequisite for a successful reign. After the time of penance had passed, Anna assures her audience, Alexios seized the management of the imperial affairs with undefiled hands (Alexias III 5.1-6).

Undoubtedly the sack of Constantinople by the ragtag army of Alexios, for the most part consisting of foreign mercenaries, left a mark on its population: It was the very first pillage that is recorded in the history of the city. That the reputation of the usurper suffered accordingly is certain, as well that he perceived this as a potential threat to his claim to power. The importance that he assigned to his public repentance is evident: Anna claims that his proper rule started only when his penance was fulfilled, his previous acclamation and coronation are thereby marginalized. The key message of her story is that her father’s reign began undefiled: Only when he’s purified he allows his skin to touch the purple robe. Although there are indications that the patriarch and the synod had more influence in the matter than Anna suggests, it is important to note that she claimed the initiative to act for Alexios alone. She presents him as a conscientious monarch who is very well aware of his responsibilities and submits to the judgment of spiritual authorities. Anna’s presentation thus reflects an embellished, official version of events issued by the imperial household. Even though the penance took place in the palace, we can be sure that the emperor ensured that its audience – in this case mainly the population of Constantinople – would learn about it and get its message: Alexios appeared as a pious man who aspired to set right the wrongs caused by his army only afterwards took the reins with immaculate hands.

Last in line is Michael VIII Palaiologos, whose attempts to achieve purification, together with the accompanying political power struggle, are even better documented than Leons, in the history
of Georgios Pachymeres. He had been excommunicated by the patriarch Arsenios for breaking his many oaths of loyalty to the imperial house of Laskaris after he blinded and exiled the legitimate child-emperor John IV Laskaris, whose guardian he was and by whom he had been elevated to co-emperorship. The reports of Pachymeres allow us to discern different phases of the conflict between emperor and patriarch. These were characterized by the different approaches Michael undertook in order to persuade the church to lift the ban. Again, Pachymeres makes it clear that Michael knew he had to make amends, that indeed he judged penance as a rather convenient instrument to cleanse himself: He apparently expected from the patriarch to pronounce penal obligations whose fulfillment would guarantee his eventual rehabilitation. But to his surprise and dismay, Arsenios refused to do so. The patriarch strove to preserve the rights of John Laskaris, and indicated to Michael that he would only lift the ban if Michael abdicated from the power he had usurped illegally. First, the emperor tried to persuade Arsenios by sending envoys and mediators; after that did not do, he visited him in person several times and pleaded for forgiveness by throwing himself on the ground, doing this, as Pachymeres stresses, in front of many witnesses. As in the case of Leon we might presume that by showing his remorse he also intended to communicate that it was his right to be granted penance. Michael repeated his visits to Arsenios several times probably not because he really hoped that he could change his mind, but rather because he wanted to demonstrate that he had done all what could be expected of a sinner, whereas the patriarch refused to do what was his duty: to help a remorseful transgressor back into the church by granting him penance. The addressees of this message were not only the patriarch, but also the synod and the population of the capital (of course, Michael might also hope to reconcile the adherents of the Laskarids). When the patriarch did not budge, Michael did not pursue the matter further for some time – though Pachymeres tells us that he conferred with bishops of the synod about his case, showing that he, like Leon, was working hard to win the support of its members, which was crucial if he wanted to act against Arsenios. The final straw was a public confrontation at the entrance to the Hagia Sophia after Michael had returned from a military campaign and wanted to offer thanksgivings to god. When he approached the church, Arsenios denied him the entrance to the building and sent him away, while the senate, the synod (as well as the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antiochia) and a crowd of people were witnessing the scene. As Michael would have known that he could not enter the Church in the ceremonial way he intended (though he was allowed to venerate the icons before the start of the liturgy), I think it likely that he acted thus to provoke the patriarch to demonstrate yet again in public that he was uncompromising. Now Michael felt secure enough to put formal charges against the patriarch: transgression of his competences, subverting the empire, breach of ecclesiastical rules, disregard of the divine will. The emperor presented the patriarch as a dangerous deviant who flouted not only valid law, but also disrespected the limits his office and acted in an unacceptable, alien manner that endangered the stability and welfare of the empire. The synod consented to dispose Arsenios, and he was finally removed. After his successor Germanos III proved himself ineffectual, Michael installed his pater pneumatikos as patriarch, another parallel with Leon VI. The ban was finally lifted in a sumptuous ritual in the Church of Blachernae on the feastday of Hypapante that left nothing to chance (the time of preparation had been used to present Michael as a New David on several occasions, explicitly also regarding his penance, see Angelov 2006). Present were, according to Pachymeres (IV 25), the synod, the senate, citizens of Constantinople and an imperial entourage of palace dignitaries and (probably) military officers. The ritual took place after the liturgy and was carefully staged: The bishops arranged themselves inside the sanctuary along its railing, while the patriarch (Josephos Galesiotes) placed himself in front of the holy doors. Michael
then removed his diadem, prostrated himself at the feet of the patriarch and confessed his crime against John Laskaris with a loud voice (something that neither Basileios nor John Tzimiskes, nor Michael IV had dared). Josephos read out a written statement that mentioned the sin again, but also its forgiveness. Michael repeated the act of repentance in front of every bishop, each of whom read out the same statement. The senate and the citizens participated by shedding tears and imploring god to be merciful. At the end, the emperor was allowed to partake in the eucharist, which signaled his rehabilitation into the community of the church.

Most interesting is the fact that Michael obviously began the ritual with the diadem (κάλυπτρα here means the diadem, see Reinsch 1996) on his head, which he then removed. Both De cerimoniis and De officiis agree that the monarch took off his diadem before moving into the nave; only when he was crowned did he actually wear it in church. The ritual described by Pachymeres actually resembles an (inverse) imperial coronation: Present were representatives of all the relevant power groups of the capital that also were witnesses of the investiture of a new ruler. The basileus removed the diadem personally; in this way it became clear that no formal deinvestiture, but a voluntary act of humility took place, which nonetheless pointed out that the emperor owed his crown to god. The decisive action of the ritual was the repeated, loudly proclaimed statement of forgiveness; as a new monarch was acclaimed as “worthy” (ἀξιός), the bishops proclaimed Michael Palaiologos purified from sin and thus worthy to rule. It is most unfortunate that Pachymeres doesn’t include information wether or whence Michael received back his diadem.

The core of the ritual included a scenic imitation of the Davidic penance. The exhortations of the prophet Nathan, and especially the confession before Nathan in proskynesis are known to be the dominant motifs that were used in Byzantine manuscripts to illustrate this story. Exactly these motifs were staged here: The prostrate Emperor confesses as a humble penitent his misconduct, and asks for forgiveness, the Patriarch exhorts and proclaims what is asked for. But it did not end here, the Emperor renewed the humble act in front of each of the bishops present, which in turn announced the forgiveness of his offense. By transforming the bishops from passive recipients into actors of the ritual, the emperor obligated them to demonstrate their unequivocal approval to the remission of his sin; probably the written document that specified the committed and forgiven transgression should also ensure greater liability (for some time, the lifting of the ban was commemorated regularly at the day of Hypapante, which also served to ensure that no one would forget it). A reference to the “record of debt” mentioned in the letter to the Colossians (Col. 2.14), which was torn through the sacrifice of Christ on the cross and is frequently referred to in penitent prayers, is also conceivable.

The presentation will consist of a summary and conclusions about the outlined events and acts, which will also be supplied in a second draft of this paper.

Abbreviations
DAGRON 1996 = Gilbert DAGRON, Empereur et prêtre. Etude sur le “césaropapisme” byzantin (Bibliothèque des Histoires), Paris 1996


Gesture and Performance in Late Byzantium through the Eyes of George Pachymeres: Michael VIII Palaiologos’ Post-Coronation Procession of 1258 in Nicaea and Its Political and Ideological Ramifications

Although over the years Byzantinists have showed strong interest in the study of court ceremonies and their relation with Byzantine imperial ideology, the functional aspects of imperial ceremonies in the context of Byzantine political life are still widely unexplored. An even less explored topic is that of gesture and performance in Late Byzantium.

Drawing an example from the very early years of Michael VIII Palaiologos reign (r. 1258–1282) I will explore how gestures and symbols were employed in order to display authority and power within the context of his first public ritual procession that took place in Nicaea right after his coronation in 1258. The imperial procession that was staged and performed by Michael VIII Palaiologos will be analyzed through the point of view of a contemporary historiographer, George Pachymeres, who is the only author that records the event. The aim is not only to shed light on a neglected aspect of Michael VIII Palaiologos’ rise to power and his attempts to undermine the underage heir of the throne, John IV Laskaris (r. August 1258), but also to examine this imperial procession within the historical, political and ideological framework to which it belonged. Moreover, I intend to highlight the functional and symbolic connotations attributed to this post-coronation ceremony by the late Byzantine author, George Pachymeres, and examine the typology of his narrative style in relation to his authorial aims.

Overall, the above-examined episode of Michael VIII Palaiologos’ ceremonial procession in 1258 reflects the changing realities of his time and provides considerable insights about the late Byzantine political thought and the way the Greek historiographical narratives perceived it.
Depictions of Human Figures and Bodily Postures on Medieval Ceramics

It is interesting to observe that suddenly human figures were depicted on Medieval ceramic bowls and dishes, which were recovered until now in Cyprus, Greece, western Turkey and the Crimea. The majority of these vessels can be approximately dated between the late 12th/13th and the early 16th centuries. In this presentation it is my aim to explore depictions of human figures on Medieval pottery in relation to bodily communication, gender representation and distinction, as well differences in appearance through the use of clothes and objects in this period of time.

In Cyprus, for instance, these images of human figures were well executed in the 13th and 14th centuries with Byzantine elements and decoration techniques (imitating ‘Incised Sgraffito Ware’ and ‘Slip-painted Ware’ from the Peloponese and Central Greece under Latin control; see Vroom 2014, 90-91 and 124-125), but they became more stylistic and abstract towards the 16th century - when we start to see a sort of Picasso-like though quite uninspired human depictions (Papanikola-Bakirtzi 1989; Vroom forthcoming, fig. 20). Before and after this period human figures are quite unknown on the Cypriot pottery.

It is clear that some iconographical elements on these ceramic vessels with human depictions are still unknown to us and need further study. More fundamentally, the gestures on the bowls from Cyprus - if they are real gestures - remain problematic. Leslie Brubaker rightly observed in her article on gestures in Byzantium that visual expressions of gestures ‘had meanings to the Byzantines that are no longer blatantly obvious to us’ (Brubaker 2009, 55). The same could be the case with the gesticulations on the Cypriot vessels; perhaps they had a totally different significance than our modern gestures. Indeed, the question is whether we are really dealing with gestures as we understand them. In fact, we do not see many distinguishable hand or finger gestures on the bowls, but perhaps rather changes in bodily postures which change over the centuries (Vroom 2014, fig. 7; idem 2015, fig. 25).

The use of a new ambiguous iconography on these portable ceramic objects remains intriguing. Surely, the vessels had not only utilitarian but also decorative purposes. We see a mixture, a melting of Byzantine Orthodox, Western European, Armenian, Eastern Christian and Islamic decorative motives from various parts of the Mediterranean and the Near East. These range from heraldic symbols and Western and Eastern elements of chivalry to Byzantine and Western romantic epic traditions, astrological and mythological images, symbols of Christian faith and scenes of a privileged courtly life (including hunting, drinking and dancing; see Wartburg 2001; Vroom 2014, figs. 9-17).

After the 13th century the Cypriots came in contact with a new visual style for pottery decoration, which included the depiction of human figures in various body postures unknown to them. This new visual language (imitating examples from Port Saint Symeon Ware, a pottery type mostly made in northern Syria and south-eastern Turkey; cf. Redford 2015) was probably introduced by the
influx of a heterogeneous groups of immigrants (including artisans) who came to Cyprus since the late 13th century from the Syrian and Cilician mainland (Jacoby 1989, 173-174; Weyl Carr 2007, 105-106; idem 2009, 129 and note 10). This influx of immigrants with their Levantine expertise was mainly situated in the coastal areas, and Famagusta in particular (enhancing thus the closer commercial contact of this port to Armenian Cilicia) (Jacoby 1989, 146; Böhlendorf-Arslan 2004, 273-274, pls. 160-162, nos. 861, 862, 864, 874, 878; idem 2014, figs. 3, 7 and 12).

The archetypical - even stereotyped - human depictions surely transmitted new messages through their various bodily postures, which may very well be related to social interaction and new social configurations, to shifts in economic and political power, to the growth of a new shared taste, as well as to a cultural transformation and diversification of Late Medieval society in general (Schmitt 1991, 67).

This pottery seems to reflect a sort of supra-regional identity, representing a shared ideology and a common artistic ground based on the exchange of motives, styles and ideas. In this cross-cultural iconographical koinê, the Cypriot potters were easily copying, borrowing and merging elements from surrounding cultures. In doing so they developed a complex imagery on portable objects as a kind of non-verbal communication, the exact content of which we are only beginning to comprehend (Vroom 2011, 410-412). Major influences in this process were apparently the Italian-dominated maritime trade (through cabotage) and traveling craftsmen.

In addition, the objects, added attributes and clothes connected to the human figures on the Cypriot vessels tell - as social markers - an interesting story. Jugs and goblets made in glass, metal and earthenware of this period from Syria and Cyprus can be distinguished in similar shapes on the Cypriot ceramics (Vroom 2015, fig. 26). It is thus interesting to see how realistic the Late Medieval objects, added objects and garments are depicted on the Cypriot ceramics. It is interesting to explore this further, for instance in combination with related archaeological and art-historical evidence (Vroom forthcoming). When looking at a previously presented overview, we may distinguish in the Cypriot ceramics a gender distinction in objects, with differences between male and female associated objects throughout the centuries (Vroom 2015, fig. 27).

The bodily postures on the Cypriot vessels may thus help us to understand gender roles (whether or not unconsciously accepted by them – and us), which were emphasized by clothes and attributes associated to traditional male and female behaviour. The female way of dancing on the pottery seems to be a way of distinguishing oneself as feminine by ways of movement, with pleasure-bearing women spreading their arms out in a graceful manner (Burke 1991, 77 and note 21). In addition, the presence of ‘elite’ attributes, such as harmful weapons for the man versus harmless goblets for the women, seem to influence the way the figures perform certain bodily movements. However, it remains doubtful whether these images represent the realities of Cypriot society as they were. Perhaps the depictions show Cypriot realities rather ‘as they were supposed to be’. In this perspective, the pottery would reflect the aspirations for new social values by the target group, that is to say, the customers who bought and used these vessels, and perhaps rather dreamed of knighthly life than actually lived the courtly life.

It has been suggested that the human figures on the ceramic vessels stem from the literary or the oral epic or both (e.g., Frantz 1940-41, 9-13; Notopoulos 1964, 118-133). They could have as their prototypes epic illustrations or miniatures from illuminated manuscripts, going back to the
11th century, as has been mentioned above (Notopoulos 1964). From the 12th century onwards, there starts to appear in Byzantine literature some romance novels, dealing with love stories between young couples according to the conventions of the western *amour courtois* (among these are Belthandros and Chrysantza, Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe or Libistros and Rodamni) (Jeffreys and Mango 2002, 297; cf. Beaton 1996 and Jeffreys 2012).

In fact, these narratives undoubtedly belong to the era of the Crusades, reflecting the culture, customs and beliefs of that period of time. They show a knightly culture in a multicultural society with a blend of French, Italian, Greek and Islamic elements, with an emphasis on personal relations and with a growing interest in an individual's own feelings. In addition, they focus on regional history, especially on areas where the Franks were living.

According to the historian David Jacoby, by AD 1200 chivalry in the eastern Mediterranean 'had become an 'order' with its own specific rituals, morals and obligations shaped by custom, as well as by courtly literature' - this last one originating especially from Northern France. He suggests that from the 12th to the 15th century 'social contacts, the use of French as a common language and the circulation of books provided them with an intimate knowledge of social and institutional developments in the West and the eastern Mediterranean, leading ultimately to the renewal of knightly values in the East expressed visually through book illustrations and wall paintings (Jacoby 1986, 159; see also Jacoby 1984). The role of French Medieval literature in the diffusion of knightly values (such as jousting, dancing, hunting and hawking) is a subject that has already been picked up by Véronique François in combination with the human images on the Cypriot ceramics (François 1999). Nevertheless, we should not exclude the Byzantine literature (mentioned above) in this respect.

In assessing the artistic value of the human figures, we have to keep in mind that we are dealing with daily-life objects which permitted only a restricted repertoire. The potters and decorators were limited to a small area in the interior of open vessels (such as footed bowls with a small rim diameter) for cutting and painting the designs (Vroom 2014, fig. 1; idem 2015, fig. 4). In addition, these vessels were local products for a local market, so it was also the task of the potter or a middleman to relate to local customers who were using these bowls. Now, one can imagine that the local customer preferred to drink from a cup with the depiction of an image you like, or perhaps from a bowl that was given to you as a present.

In short, the mechanisms of taste and demand, of fashions in design and manners of consumption, were functioning on these ceramic objects. It is therefore very well possible that the potters were carefully copying images from incised depictions in silver ware (as in the case of the depiction of Saint George), from wall paintings, from coins or from illustrations in epic literature (Notopoulos 1964; Jacoby 1986, 169-172). In the case of some images (such as the portrayal of couples), for instance, it seems that these depictions were inspired by episodes in French Medieval literature and in Byzantine poetry.

Furthermore, we must not forget that these vessels were often found in archaeological contexts connected to graves. So, these bowls could have been used as religious gifts for important occasions during one’s life time and later placed in graves as an accessory for the afterlife. Or perhaps they were used for burial and libation ceremonies and then placed in or around the graves (Vroom 2014, 182-184). It would be interesting to see what the connection was of these bowl burials in combination to the age and gender of the skeletons found.
My research on this group of pottery with human depictions is still on-going. In particular, I hope to be able to present more ideas about these human representations on ceramics in combination with funerary practices in the future. In fact, more study should be done on the relation of these bowls to the individuals found with them in the graves, and more study should be carried out to put these bowls in a wider ceramic repertoire using material from other parts in the Mediterranean and from the Islamic world (see Vroom 2014, figs. 9-17 for a first approach). This is probably not the last word said about these vessels, as they are truly cross-cultural objects full with rich enigmatic iconographical elements – including gestures or perhaps rather bodily postures.
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Art as Gesture: Performing the Miracle in the Burial Shrines of Byzantine Saints

In 2013, the National Gallery in London hosted an exhibition under the title Saints Alive. Contemporary artist, Michel Landy, produced a series of kinetic sculptures inspired by Old Masters paintings of Medieval saints, miracles and martyrdoms from the NG Collections. Operated by the visitor, the three-dimensional lifelike saint-figures performed a series of gestures ranging from blessing to anarchy or even auto-destruction, addressed to the viewer, or even themselves. Challenging the conventional ways in which the religious beholder and the saints are expected to interact, the National Gallery project, tried to emphasize the role of physical vocabulary, the religious gesture in particular, questioning its impact on contemporary culture.

The purpose of this communication is to address this issue in relation to miraculous performances in Byzantium. Specifically, I intend to examine human gesticulation, the movement of the body resulting to specific actions, in a particular type of religious building in Byzantium: the burial shrine of the Byzantine saint.

Burial shrines provided more intensely than any other religious building in Byzantium the ideal stage for miraculous healings. In order to achieve the spiritual, prompt divine intercession, religious rituals with strong performative components took place inside these shrines. Gestures, both natural movements and gestures based on deliberate cultural and religious conventions, traditionally formed an integral part of this process. Here, I intend to discuss art, the creation of artistic artifacts, as an essential, though much sophisticated, ‘gesture’, that appears to have been established as a vital component to miracle performances in the burial shrines of Byzantine saints. What kind of art was more actively involved in this procedure? What were its principal characteristics? To what extent did this process challenge the conventional language of religious gestures and performances in Byzantium?

For the examination of this issue here I will rely mainly on hagiographical sources. How far do the Saints' Lives, reveal the complexity of the role of art, in relation to the nature, intensity and ideological significance of religious gestures and performances in Byzantium?
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Introduction

This Table Ronde explores the extent to which paganism survived and the nature and manifestation of that paganism across the Late Roman Empire in the fifth and sixth centuries. We highlight a number of inter-related issues from key cities between whose communities we know close links existed, focusing especially on Caesarea, Gaza, Alexandria and Athens.

We begin with the imperial perspective from Constantinople: Simon Corcoran investigates the dating and significance of some constitutions ‘de paganis, sacrificiis et templis’, in title 11 of Book 1 of the 529 Code of Justinian, missing from the surviving 534 version but preserved in a papyrus (P. Oxy. 1814). We then move to the provinces, beginning with a paper exploring life in Caesarea, a city where the evidence is generally elusive, but here Geoffrey Greatrex successfully illustrates the prosperity of the city, its religious life, administration, and cultural life. The richness of our source material for Gaza, especially from members of its “School”, is overwhelming and has been much mined, but Eugenio Amato looks at some of the lesser studied works to bring fresh perspectives, including the Epithalamium for Meles and Antonina, descriptions, and the panegyrics for the Stratelates Asiaticos, and the Emperor Anastasius. Michael Champion explores the philosophy and rhetoric of the monasteries near Gaza, while Gianluca Ventrella re-examines the dating of the panegyrics of Procopius of Gaza and Priscian and finds links with the celebration of the vicennalia of Anastasius in Constantinople and in Gaza. From here we move to Alexandria where Edward Watts draws a compelling picture of the influence of Hypatia on the development of intellectual life in Alexandria in her own life time and beyond, via the interplay of mathematics and philosophy. The last paper by Mihail-George Hâncu in its study of the pagan cosmogonies of Damascius and John Lydus ties together a number of themes including the state of intellectual life in the philosophical schools, and brings us full circle to the imperial control exercised by Justinian.
Imperial Legislation: The View from the Imperial Capital

The purpose of this piece is to suggest approaches for giving a balanced assessment of the genesis and application of legislation, as we consider the interaction of imperial power with pagan festivals and Hellenic culture. I therefore offer here general observations about the interpretation of imperial texts, especially in the light of the forms in which they survive, illustrated by an examination of one particular title “On Pagans, Sacrifices and Temples”, present in all three imperial codes of the V/VI centuries.

General Comments on Laws and Legislation

It is important not to take a purely positivist view of legislative acts, which may be prompted or generated for varied motives by a range of actors even far from the court, and whose later effect may also depend upon distant actors removed in time and space, and may have a life quite different from that envisaged at their original promulgation.

To start with there are problems intrinsic to the manner in which imperial legislation has survived. The bulk of such material, certainly as relevant for the topic under discussion, derives from the great imperial codes. Of the three codes issued, there survive the Theodosian Code (CTh) of 437 and the Codex repetitae praelectionis or 2nd revised Code of Justinian (CJ²) from 534. Justinian's original 529 Code (CJ¹) is lost. Thus we have a snap-shot of what was regarded in Constantinople as the most important and authoritative legal material at one point in the 430s and another in the 530s. However, neither of the two codes is preserved entire and complete, even if very substantially. Further, the codes were created by processes of selection and editing (sometimes severe). This means that we rarely possess intact texts of the original laws. In particular, there is heavy pruning of contextualizing and justificatory preambles, and contents can even be altered retrospectively. Thus trying to understand why and how a particular measure came to be issued may be occluded. However, even where we have full(er) texts (e.g. Theodosius, Novel 3, later cut up for CJ¹), we do not always learn all we would like, but at least we have a more secure starting point.

Much imperial legislation has in recent times been interpreted on the pattern of “petition and response”, in that busy emperors usually only have time to issue rulings or pronouncements because of requests put to them. These may be queries from distant officials, requests from bishops, or petitions from private persons (e.g. teachers, athletes). Even within the administration, much law was generated by suggestions from holders of office (which may in turn be generated by other requests or pressures). Thus even the most ambitious and general of legislation issued by emperors may have had a quite specific or localized cause. This is not to deny emperors a more personal agenda, especially when made in response to events right under their noses in Constantinople (effectively their sole residence in the V/VI centuries), or the creation and pursuit of wider policies, but we must be wary in supposing all imperial laws were based upon coherent and planned initiatives, let alone that these would easily morph into concerted official action or social reality.
Further, anything with the emperor's subscription on it was a dangerous weapon, which might be used in ways and by persons far beyond or even contrary to the intentions of the issuer. It is notable that emperors themselves often try in their general enactments to deny validity to individual grants or specific rescripts that might contradict them; e.g. Justinian in his ban on "Hellenes" teaching (CJ\(^1\) 1.11.10.2) commanded that even the holder of a post under a pragmatic sanction should not be protected. However, the fact that the emperor could always try to derogate from strict law, given his effectively unbounded constitutional power, meant that an imperial document, especially when flourished by a powerful individual, might seem an unanswerable argument. It could be far from certain in cases of conflict between imperial documents which would prevail. Even where emperors claim that imperial rescripts have been surreptitiously impetrated (e.g. CTh 16.10.8 re Edessa), one wonders if this is less a matter of the improper issuing of documents (although that surely did often happen), than that emperors may simply have issued so many documents that these were inconsistent, or were trying to please too many different constituencies at once. Procopius even accuses Justinian of changing the law back and forth for a price. Thus even the emperor might not be sure which of the documents he had subscribed was the most authoritative. Further, until the creation of the codes, it would be hard for anyone to know quite what laws existed, and especially whether old laws were really to be applied. Yet even the creation of the codes did not remove the possibilities of uncertainty or conflict and it remained common for emperors to be asked for clarification or resolution.

The First Justinian Code

The commission to edit CJ\(^1\) was set up in Feb. 528. The finished product was promulgated in April 529. It had been produced relatively quickly, although unlike CTh much of its material existed ready at hand in the three earlier codes, while the material for the immediately previous 100 years should have been easily available in the archives at Constantinople, where the court had long been settled. The new Code became the one-stop-shop for authoritative versions of imperial constitutions, superseding all that went before. In one sense this made it easy for contemporaries to know what the official line was on any legal topic (including pagans or festivals or education), as was indeed Justinian's intention - that the law should be clear and consistent and accessible. Furthermore, this was effectively a repromulgation for often quite old laws, if sometimes now updated or revised. Imperial laws often seem to have a "use-by" date, often overlooked or ignored, with officials preferring to seek fresh rulings, so that the Code itself provided revivification. Yet this was not the same as the individual public posting of individual measures, where new laws might come to the attention of many in numerous cities across the empire. With the Code, each law was buried inside a long and difficult compendious work. It would take time for copies of the Code to be made and circulated and for its contents to be assimilated or digested by the various groups who would have access to it and would have reason to wish to use it: holders of office, practising lawyers, even bishops. Nonetheless, once established as part of a fixed and stable corpus with which every law-student was supposed to become familiar, the potential for the laws in the Code to become effective or at least usable was quite high.

The 529 Code, of course, did not survive, quickly superseded by the revised version of 534, whose contents have endured. While we can infer much about CJ\(^1\) from what is present in CJ\(^2\), we can seldom be sure of what is missing. It is here that P. Oxy. XV 1814 is a flash, lighting up the dark and providing rare positive evidence for CJ\(^1\). Although it comprises a single lacunose leaf, its
summary listing of title rubrics (plus the headings to individual constitutions naming emperors and recipients) means that it covers a good deal of ground. There is no actual text or subscript date for any constitution, which limits what we can know, but this loss of detail is compensated by the rapid overview of several titles. We can see, for instance, from the title numeration that already in CJ¹ religious topics were placed at the front, unlike CTh, where these were in the final book.

**P. Oxy. 1814 and “De Paganis, Sacrificiis et Templis”**

The papyrus usefully provides the list of constitutions present in title 11 of Book 1. This means that we have a snapshot of the relevant approved laws in 529, which can be compared to the equivalent in 437 and 534 [although there are mentions of pagans elsewhere in connection with other “non-Orthodox” persons].

What can the state of the title in the two CJ editions tell us about developing official policy in Justinian’s first decade? First, in CJ¹ 1.11 about half the material (2-7 = CJ¹ 1-6) was drawn from CTh 16.10, although this meant that only 6 out of a long series of 25 constitutions (themselves already edited from varied texts collected in east and west) were taken over (4, 9, 15, 17, 20, 24). A relatively small number of key points are made, enough to clarify that: sacrifice of all types in every place is banned, but festivals free of cult activity are allowed; temples are confiscated, but their fabric is to be preserved; violence against pagans by Christians invoking false religious justification is to be punished. Although we rely for detailed texts upon CJ², it appears that the CTh texts are generally shortened and specificities removed, but with few other substantive changes. The level of the fine levied upon violent Christians is reduced, but it is impossible to say if this was a CJ¹ or CJ² change. The broad thrust of the Theodosian provisions is kept, although the culling of so many texts, while aiding clarity and brevity, also (no doubt intentionally) removed many nuances and caveats; e.g. the loss of Theodosius I’s protections originally issued for Edessa (CTh 16.10.8).

Three post-CTh laws are present, but the degree of editing is uncertain because there are no earlier surviving versions for comparison. Following on from constitutions of Marcian and then Leo against sacrifice (8-9 = CJ² 7-8), the last of these three (10 = CJ² 9), a Greek constitution, which is unattributed in the Byzantine sources used for reconstructing the text of CJ², is assigned in the papyrus to Anastasius, addressed to a praetorian prefect. This Anastasian text is also the last of the title. The logical assumption is that a second Greek text in the revised edition (CJ² 1.11.10) must be a later constitution of Justinian.

**The Law of Anastasius**

As I have demonstrated on earlier occasions (*JLA* 2, *JJP* 38), mistaken assumptions have in the past been made about these two Greek constitutions. It was the late lamented Frank Trombley, who, although often making astute observations in interpreting imperial constitutions, showed how cleverly one could read acephalous texts and yet reach quite wrong conclusions. While these were authoritative texts in CJ² and so part of Justinian’s legal framework, he argued that originally they were measures of Zeno. He spent more than 10 pages weaving a plausible context, making them part of a concerted attack on pagan supporters of Ilus and associated also with the closure of the Parthenon. Trombley’s inadvertence was two-fold. First, he found the lack of headings and subscripts to these texts suspicious, attributing this to Justinianic eliding an unwelcome Zenonian connection. Unfortunately, this is to misunderstand the extent to which the modern Code edition
is an incomplete recreation of a text not preserved intact. Missing headings and subscripts are accidents in transmission, not Justinianic policy. The second mis-step was overlooking P. Oxy. 1814, in which Anastasian authorship is clear. Again, this error is a function of reliance upon the standard Code edition, which does not reflect some more recent discoveries of manuscript evidence.

While the papyrus enables us to avoid attributing CJ¹ 1.11.10/CJ² 1.11.9 to Zeno (or indeed Justinian), it still leaves interpretation difficult. The papyrus does not give dates. The praetorian prefect's name is lost. Further, the Greek text transmitted is not very informative. It refers clearly to both the imperial city and the provinces, and was presumably authorized in Constantinople, but it does not explain in detail what has prompted the measure. In 2009, following our best evidence for anti-pagan action by Anastasius, in his suppression of the pantomime dancers after disturbances at the Brytæ festival in the capital in 502, where this can be seen to have had an effect in Edessa also, I suggested that this was the context for the law, whether it was an immediate response or later consequence. While still arguable, certainty is impossible. The surviving law does not talk about violent disturbances or lewd dancing. It focusses upon 'Hellenic' cult. It talks of officials taking action when they see impious cult activity or if this is reported by the bishops. But it does not say that bishops have been instrumental in complaining about such things already to the emperor (likely though that might otherwise be). It bans future bequests and gifts for the maintaining of improper cult, which might include many traditional festivals, although it is not clear if existing endowments are also to be confiscated. In any case, such monies are to be under the control of the cities, so might be expended upon public festivals anyway (although emperors expected cities to prioritize repairs of walls over celebrations). We are thus left uncertain about the genesis and purpose of the law, quite aside from the question of what effect, if any, it had once promulgated outside the capital.

The Law of Justinian

However, even more difficult is interpreting the first law of the title (CJ¹ 1.11.1), whose fragmentary heading gives us only part of an addressees' name (not an office-holder). It does not match any known CTh law, and might instead come from the pre-Christian Gregorian Code. Because there is no trace of it in CJ², it is most logical to assume that it was excised in response to the newly added law of Justinian (CJ² 1.11.10). This latter law, like that of Anastasius, has lost its date. It opens by describing its background in the discovery of pagans or crypto-pagan apostates who have already been punished (by compulsory baptism). Henceforth, pagans, while they can refuse baptism, will in that case be deprived of all property or rights and their children will be forcibly baptised. Further, Hellenes are to be banned from teaching, even if they hold imperial documents of appointment. The law is to be applied in the imperial city and the provinces (as with Anastasius's law).

Unlike the law of Anastasius, where we struggle to find a clear context, this law would seem to fit much more easily into what we know (especially from Malalas) of events in 529, in the summer after the promulgation of CJ¹. There was a purge of high-ranking pagans, or at least of persons accused of being such, since we need to be cautious of supposing accusations necessarily true, especially as many engagements with the classical past in art and literature could not doubt be spun as improper 'Hellenism' by one's enemies. It is notable, however, that a prominent victim was the quaestor, Thomas, a key figure in the CJ¹ commission. Was he in any real sense a "Hellene"? Possibly, if an ideological connection with the Praetorian Prefect Menas, a Platonist who also left office in the summer of 529 (although in unknown circumstances), is faintly echoed by their joint presence in
the late Justinianic dialogue on political science. However, while authorship of some constitutions of 528-9 can be plausibly assigned to him, his exact role in the selecting and editing for the Code is impossible to discern. It would be difficult, however, to argue he was a crypto-pagan manipulating content on “Hellenes” in the Code to their (his) benefit. He may already have been quaestor when Justinian in his short joint reign with Justin issued a large and comprehensive anti-Orthodox law (CJ\(^2\) 1.5.18), excoriating and penalizing virtually every type of improper belief (only Arian Goths were spared). We may, of course, wonder what the mysterious law CJ\(^1\) 1.11.1 actually was. Perhaps the rescript of a pre-Christian emperor interpreted as safeguarding pagan enjoyment of certain privileges (e.g. teaching chairs) in a way not otherwise rendered illegal elsewhere in the Code? Or alternatively might it have been some statement of Constantine, as we find in his letter to the Eastern Provincials, protecting the right to hold wrong belief and disapproving of forced conversion? Was it Thomas who kept this text in CJ\(^1\)? We cannot know. Thomas should be one of those referred to as punished (but not executed) in the preamble to the new law, which was presumably written at Constantinople in Greek by the new quaestor Tribonian soon after assuming office in the autumn of 529. When the new anti-Hellene law of 529 was edited into CJ\(^2\) in 534, it was surely some aspect of it which required the suppression of CJ\(^1\) 1.11.1. Either of the suggestions above could have been read as inconsistent with the new law.

The association of Justinian’s law with the closure of the philosophical schools in Athens has long been maintained by scholars (if not universally), and I think this is correct. Of course, we do not know if our text of the law is complete. But we need not suppose that it specified any particular schools or chairs that were to be suppressed. The law can be seen solely in the context of events in the palace and the capital and that it was Justinian’s personal reaction to what he himself had been involved in directly, rather than a response to distant complaints, episcopal or otherwise, from the provinces. It is not necessary to suppose that the emperor or his quaestor were thinking about Athens (or indeed Alexandria) in promulgating this measure. The fact that teaching at Athens quickly came under pressure, while that at Alexandria seems not have done so, suggests that an imperial measure might only come alive, when local circumstances favoured it. If it was under the terms of this law that the schools in Athens closed, this was perhaps more likely resulting from a local response to a general measure. In addition, it could be also that Anastasius’s law gained a new lease of life around the same time, becoming known (or known again) via CJ\(^1\), and that it was interpreted so as to destroy the financial basis of the endowed schools. As noted earlier, imperial law is a weapon, whose use (or lack of use) may have little to do with the view of emperor or jurist in Constantinople.

In conclusion, it is true that emperors, especially Justinian, could be highly dogmatic. But this should not lead us to think that the genesis, promulgation and afterlife of imperial laws issued from Constantinople are easily understood, since the manner in which such texts survive should encourage caution in any analysis.
L'historien Procope et la vie à Césarée au VIᵉ s.

Le but de notre contribution à cette table ronde est de mieux comprendre le milieu d'où Procope tirait ses origines, de le situer dans son contexte palestinien. Une version plus élaborée de notre conférence, munie de notes et d'illustrations, se trouve sur academia.edu.

(1) L'état de la ville de Césarée vers 500 : une prospérité renouvelée?

Vers le tournant du VIᵉ s., lors de la naissance de Procope, la ville de Césarée se portait plutôt bien. L'empereur Anastase était en train d'effectuer des travaux importants pour renouveler l'infrastructure portuaire, comme nous le raconte Procope de Gaza dans son panégyrique. Les nombreux entrepôts découverts dans quelques quartiers, notamment aux alentours du prétoire « byzantin », témoignent d'une activité mercantile importante.

D'une part la ville fonctionnait comme centre de redistribution de produits importés pour la province entière ; d'autre part, l'arrière-pays de Césarée, cultivé pour la plupart par la population samaritaine, assurait une production agricole importante. Les villas fastueuses du quartier sud-ouest, dotées de leurs propres entrepôts, appartenaient vraisemblablement à ces grands propriétaires ; le rhéteur Évangelus de Césarée, un grand propriétaire qui s'acheta un village entier sur la côte dont l'empereur Justinien s'empessa de le déposséder, en serait un exemple, en plus d'être un ami de l'historien Procope, on peut supposer, qui se sert de l'épisode pour étroffer son dossier de reproches à l'égard de l'empereur. Comme le souligne Joseph Patrich, les grands propriétaires et leurs résidences imposantes éclipsaient même le gouverneur impérial, dont le siège au Vᵉ s. ne put les concurrencer. Rappelons que depuis le IVᵉ s. le prétoire se trouvait au quartier sud-ouest, entouré de ces villas et des entrepôts qui y sont associés ; des voûtes attestent la présence d'entrepôts au-dessous du prétoire lui-même.

En somme, tout comme une proportion importante de villes de l'Orient au VIᵉ s., Césarée fleurissait au début du VIᵉ s. Au cours des années 530 le gouverneur Stéphanus, par exemple, s’occupa d’assurer un ravitaillement suffisant en eau ; Choricius le loue pour ses efforts. Même si à Césarée on manquait de monuments aussi remarquables que l’horloge décrite par Procope de Gaza, les fouilles ont révélé des quartiers prospères tel celui au nord-ouest de la ville, où (par exemple) on trouva un dépôt de 99 solidi de la fin du IVᵉ s. À l'est de l'église octogonale on a mis au jour un espace public dont la nature précise demeure incertaine et qu'on qualifie normalement d’esplanade ; bordée de statues monumentales, la place aurait pu servir de marché.

(2) Population et religion à Césarée vers 500 : tensions et insurrections

Les samaritains représentaient un élément important du peuple césarien : Joseph Patrich affirme qu'ils composaient peut-être le tiers de la ville, dont on évalue la population entre 35 000 et 110 000 âmes. Aux alentours de la ville ils étaient nombreux à cultiver les champs, comme Procope le note en soulignant les dégâts provoqués par l'étouffement de la révolte de 529 ; le rhéteur
Choricius évoque la même population de façon indirecte lorsqu’il parle d’un « peuple impie » près de Césarée qui fut réprimé par le duc de Palestine Aratius. Il convient de rappeler cependant que cette population s’était relativement bien intégrée dans la province romaine, du moins jusqu’à la fin du Vᵉ s. Des sources juives constatent, non sans amertume, leur implication dans l’administration de la province, et même au VIᵉ s. Procope insiste sur l’influence exercée à la cour impériale par un samaritain Arséniius, qui s’était converti, du moins en apparence, au christianisme.

Il n’est pas nécessaire de relater l’histoire des soulèvements samaritains qui se produisirent en 484, en 529 et en 555-6. Ils furent progressivement frappés de restrictions légales d’une rigueur croissante, ce qui paraît avoir engendré, du moins chez certains, des notions apocalyptiques, d’où la féroce de la révolte de 529. Leurs relations avec les juifs de Palestine n’étaient pas cordiales aux Vᵉ – VIᵉ s., même s’ils finirent par collaborer en 555. Ils furent en outre victimes de railleries fréquentes, voire coutumières, par exemple à Scythopolis – ce qui finit par mettre le feu au poudre en 529.

Malgré ce bilan sombre, on peut relever des traces d’une attitude plus conciliante chez les instances régionales : les gouverneurs n’avaient aucun intérêt, après tout, à provoquer un soulèvement d’une partie importante de la population. Choricius semble relever la façon pacifique dont Aratius vainquit les samaritains ; le rhéteur, comme la population de Gaza, sans doute préférait une approche plus douce, tant il insiste sur les efforts déployés par l’évêque Marcien pour atténuer l’impact de la présence des soldats déployés contre les insurgés en 529. L’historien Procope, bien qu’il soit très peu probable qu’il ait été lui-même samaritain, reflète cette attitude sceptique face à l’ingérence impériale. En soulignant les effets néfastes de l’attitude intolérante de Justinien, il dégage deux réactions divergentes du peuple samaritain : d’une part, les citadins adoptèrent une attitude plus souple, se ralliant au christianisme, tandis que d’autres se penchèrent plutôt vers le manichéisme ou le paganisme. À prime abord, son attitude à l’égard de ses concitoyens semble plutôt favorable –

Tous ceux qui habitaient dans ma ville natale de Césarée et dans les autres villes, jugeant qu’il était vain de subir des maux pour une doctrine insensée, échangèrent leur nom présent contre celui des chrétiens et réussirent, par ce faux-semblant, à écarter d’eux les dangers dont les menaçait la loi.

Cependant, lorsqu’il raconte en détail les méfaits de certains prétendus convertis, tel Arséniius et Faustinus, il en ressort clairement qu’il ne plait pas leur sort.

La Césarée de Procope, tout comme les provinces palestiniennes, vivait ainsi une période de tensions religieuses importantes au tournant du VIᵉ s. Nous nous sommes concentrés sur la place des samaritains dans ce contexte puisqu’ils ont subi une dégradation plus nette de leur statut au cours des Vᵉ et VIᵉ s., ce qui à son tour a déclenché des soulèvements sanglants. Dans ce climat général d’insécurité, on ne s’étonne pas d’entendre parler de la construction d’un mur à Gaza ou de trouver les traces d’une nouvelle enceinte à Césarée ; l’église installée sur Mont Gérizim, le lieu saint des samaritains, fut elle aussi dotée de fortifications importantes. Malgré ces tendances, la présence de modérés transparaît dans nos sources : on constate une volonté de collaborer tant de la part des samaritains que de celle de certains agents de l’administration. Il revenait après tout aux gouverneurs, et notamment à celui de Palestine I à Césarée, de calmer les tensions et d’éviter un embrasement général de la région. Les éloges que fait Choricius du gouverneur Stéphanus prennent leur sens dans ce contexte, celui qui a pu prévenir une émeute lors d’un incendie (délibéré) qui avait éclaté dans la ville et qui menaçait de provoquer un débordement. Cette volonté de calmer
les esprits et de maintenir la paix n'est pas sans lien avec le fait que Stéphanus était originaire de la région : comme nous le verrons dans la section (4) plus bas, les auteurs gazéens, tout comme Procope de Césarée, partagent une culture générale et une ouverture, qui fait qu'il s'avère difficile parfois de cerner leurs propres sentiments religieux ou doctrinaux.

(3) L’administration de la ville : les fonctionnaires impériaux et les conseillers

La mention de Stéphanus nous amène à discuter de l'administration de la ville et de la province. L'empereur Justinien, lorsqu'il légiféra pour resserrer la gestion de la province en 536, souligna la grande responsabilité de son gouverneur, dorénavant proconsul. Il évoque notamment l'importance des revenus perçus ainsi que les tensions religieuses que nous avons déjà relevées : il fallait que le gouverneur assure qu'il n'y ait aucun tumulte public. Stéphanus, il ressort de la Novelle de Justinien et du discours de Choricius, s'est avéré capable de prendre en main la situation. Il a su prévenir une disette au cours des années 530, probablement la conséquence de l'écrasement du soulèvement samaritain ; il a restauré l'aqueduc de la ville ; il a rétabli l'ordre près de la frontière égyptienne ; il a assuré la sécurité des routes ; et il a agi rapidement pour éteindre l'incendie qui risquait de déclencher une émeute.

Avant de passer à une discussion plus générale de l'administration impériale et urbaine de Césarée il convient de mettre en exergue une autre caractéristique fondamentale de Stéphanus – sa culture. Originaire de Gaza, il y a reçu sa formation avant d'être nommé à la tête de Palestine I ; on ignore les autres étapes de sa carrière. Une fois gouverneur, il se montra généreux à l'égard de sa ville natale en y effectuant des travaux de restauration des murs de la ville et en y construisant une nouvelle église ; au temps du discours de Choricius (535/6) il envisagea d'autres projets, telle la restauration du théâtre et de l'aqueduc. Aux yeux du rhéteur de Gaza, Stéphanus conjugua une piété chrétienne et une culture littéraire, voire païenne, qui lui valait les plus hautes louanges ; Choricius, selon sa coutume, n'hésite pas à le comparer à Persée ou au général thébain Epaminondas. On se souviendra du jugement de Photius qui croit à l'orthodoxie chrétienne du rhéteur tout en admettant sa perplexité devant ses allusions fréquentes aux mythes grecs. Cette culture ouverte au christianisme et à au moins certains aspects de la culture païenne, notamment sa littérature et ses festivals, constitue un trait marquant de l'école de Gaza. La présence de Stéphanus à Césarée en tant que gouverneur nous fournit donc un indice du rayonnement de cette approche tolérante prônée par les Gazéens. Quoiqu'il n'y ait aucun moyen d'établir avec certitude si l'historien Procope a étudié à Gaza, on constate que les chercheurs éprouvent autant de mal à cerner ses attitudes religieuses que celles de Choricius. Nous tenons donc à insister sur le courant plus tolérant qu'on peut observer à Césarée tant qu'à Gaza et dont on trouve les traces dans les œuvres de Choricius et de l'historien Procope.

Le prétoire du gouverneur a déjà été mentionné. Situé au cœur de la ville, près de la mer, il abritait (au VIe s.) une salle d'audience, les bureaux du fisc provincial, des archives et des thermes ; une inscription du Ve s. signale la présence d'une cour de justice, à identifier probablement avec la salle d'audience. Des mosaïques témoignent de la présence de fonctionnaires tel le magistrianus Marinus, des cohortales qui appartenaient au scrinium du gouverneur ; ils faisaient partie d'une équipe dont les effectifs s'élevaient à peut-être quelques centaines de personnes.

Les tensions qui prévalaient dans la région exigeaient une collaboration étroite entre gouverneur et dux, comme ce fut le cas de Stéphanus et d'Aratius. Or, la Novelle de Justinien prévoit une compétence militaire pour le proconsul, afin qu'il assure la tranquillité de la province ; il détient
également le droit d'intervenir en Palestine II en cas de besoin. Il est probable qu'au moins une unité ait été cantonnée à Césarée, mais on ignore à quel endroit : le théâtre au quartier sud de la ville fut transformé en camp militaire au VIe s., mais pas forcément avant la seconde moitié du siècle. Malalas rapporte l'existence d'une unité d'Arcadiaci sous les ordres d'un lêstodiôktês qui intervint durant la révolte samaritaine de 484 ; on rappelle que Procope qualifie le chef des insurgés en 529 de lêstês.

Il reste à traiter du conseil – la boulê – de la ville avant de passer à une discussion des festivals et spectacles. Le sort des curiales, la classe bouleutique, a fait l'objet d'une vive discussion depuis des années ; il en ressort qu'elle se trouvait largement éclipsée au VIe s. Il ne faut pas exagérer l'ampleur de son déclin, cependant, comme le souligne à raison Kenneth Holium dans son article consacré à la boulê de Césarée. Certains indices permettent de percevoir même une certaine prospérité. Procope, par exemple, raconte le cas d'un certain conseiller d'Ascalon, Anatolius, dont la fille épousa un conseiller riche de Césarée ; lorsque le mari décéda, l'épouse fut obligée de céder trois quarts de son héritage au conseil. Malgré les plaintes de Procope, l'épisode témoigne du souci de l'empereur pour les finances du conseil et indique la survivance du registre des membres du conseil. Or, une inscription du VIe s. confirme ce portrait plus positif des curiales brossé par Holium ; elle prépare d'ailleurs le terrain pour notre prochaine section. L'inscription, trouvée non loin de l'hippodrome dans le quartier est de la ville, rapporte un montant de 5 629½ solidi versé aux hippotrophoi, les responsables des écuries, ceux des conseillers qui assuraient les coûts des courses ; une partie de la somme fut prélevée par un impôt sur les propriétés foncières des membres du conseil. Il s'ensuit qu'il existait toujours au moins un certain nombre de conseillers bien nantis – peut-être ceux auxquels appartenaient les maisons fastueuses près du prétoire – qui étaient prêts à assumer leurs responsabilités municipales traditionnelles.

(4) La vie culturelle à Césarée : les spectacles et festivals

Césarée offrait à ses citoyens toute la gamme de divertissements connus dans l'Antiquité tardive. Sans doute celui qui attirait les plus grandes foules fut les courses de char à l'hippodrome ; la popularité de ce genre de spectacle est bien attestée. Le nouvel hippodrome de la ville, construit dans l'Antiquité tardive, est attesté dans l'Expositio totius mundi et gentium au IVe s. Les rivalités habituelles entre les factions furent exacerbées à Césarée, comme ailleurs dans la région, par exemple à Néapolis, par les divisions religieuses. Normalement il reviendrait au gouverneur de présider aux jeux, à l'instar de l'empereur à Constantinople. Mais lorsque le contrôle lui échappait, lors d'un soulèvement, un autre pouvait usurper son rôle, comme le fit le chef samaritain Justasas en 484, signalant ainsi ses prétentions impériales ; le roi perse Chosroès agit de la même manière à Apamée en 540. Le jeune historien aurait inévitablement assisté aux courses ; les étudiants raffolaient de tels spectacles, Choricius le note. Si on se fie à sa description des parents des factions dans les Guerres perses il néprouva aucune sympathie pour la foule qui affluait aux courses : peut-être a-t-il été témoin de trop de violence dans le cadre des jeux au cours de sa jeunesse.

Pour ce qui est d'autres spectacles et festivals, nous disposons de moins de renseignements que dans le cas de Gaza, dont traitera la contribution d'Eugenio Amato. Choricius fait allusion pourtant à un festival qui se tenait à l'extérieur de la ville et jouissait d'une grande popularité. L'Expositio totius mundi et gentium en outre nous livre le détail que les Césaréens appréciaient particulièrement les pantomimes ; une inscription de Magnésie sur le Méandre confirme peut-être la présence d'un
pantomime à Césarée. Au théâtre de Césarée – et ailleurs aux alentours de la ville – furent présentés d'autres spectacles, sans doute pour la plupart de nature vulgaire ; il est possible, cependant, que les rhéteurs s'y rendaient pour déclamer et ainsi attirer les jeunes aux études, comme le faisait Procopé de Gaza dans sa ville natale. L'église opposa une résistance farouche aux distractions du théâtre, mais elles ont survécu au moins au VIᵉ s. ; Procopé, cependant, indique que Justinien mit fin à la plupart d'entre elles. Les fouilles à Césarée confirment l'affirmation de Procopé : les lieux de divertissement furent abandonnés ou transformés au cours du VIᵉ s.

Une tradition culturelle bien enracinée à Césarée se maintenait toujours à l'aube du VIᵉ s. Même si on perd la trace de la bibliothèque d'Origène et d'Eusèbe, il est évident que la ville déployait des efforts pour recruter des rhéteurs de talent, tel Acace au IVᵉ s. ou Procopé de Gaza au Vᵉ s. En tant que métropole fleurissante, dotée de tous les aménagements urbains dont on vient de discuter, ainsi que d'une école de droit (du moins jusqu'aux réformes de Justinien), il n'est pas surprenant qu'elle exerçât une attraction sur les rhéteurs du Moyen Orient et qu'elle a produit à son tour des auteurs importants, tel Procopé ou Jean de Césarée.

Conclusion

Il est difficile de dresser un portrait général de Césarée aux Vᵉ – VIᵉ s. Alors que les nombreux représentants de « l'école de Gaza » permettent une évaluation plus ou moins détaillée de la vie culturelle de cette ville dans la période, Césarée n'a pas produit d'étudiants aussi bien ancrés dans leur milieu. Ce bilan n'a rien de surprenant : en tant que métropole de la province, Césarée était sans doute très cosmopolite et bien branchée aux réseaux liés à l'administration impériale. Ses fils qui suivirent une formation littéraire et juridique étaient bien conscients qu'ils pourraient s'en prévaloir pour intégrer la bureaucratie impériale et ainsi élever leur statut. Tel fut le sort de Procopé l'historien, qui ne retourna peut-être jamais dans sa ville natale, même si, grâce à ses contacts, il restait sans doute bien informé sur son sort. La vie à Gaza était plus douce et moins occupée qu'à Césarée ; de surcroît, on pouvait jouir des festivals agréables et de l'atmosphère peut-être moins tendue qu'ailleurs dans la province. En contrepartie, l'archéologie et l'épigraphie permettent de pallier le manque relatif de renseignements sur l'évolution de Césarée, mais, comme on l'a constaté, il reste encore du travail à accomplir dans ce domaine. Nous espérons toutefois avoir jeté les bases pour une évaluation plus approfondie de la vie dans la métropole provinciale vers la période de la naissance de l'historien Procopé.
L’œuvre sophistique de Procope de Gaza comme source documentaire pour la cite de Gaza dans l’antiquité tardive*


La valeur documentaire de l’œuvre de Chorikios ne se réduit cependant pas à ces descriptions, si fascinantes soient-elles. Dans un article fondateur justement célèbre, [ Voir F.-M. Abel, Gaza au VIe siècle d’après le rhéteur Chorikios, RBl 40, 1931, 5-31.] intitulé de façon significative Gaza au VIe siècle d’après le rhéteur Chorikios, le Père Félix-Marie Abel soulignait en effet la richesse en général du témoignage des écrits de cet orateur pour ce qui est aussi da la vie quotidienne et intellectuelle de Gaza dans l’Antiquité Tardive, ainsi que pour plusieurs aspects de l’histoire, des rites et des coutumes de la cité tout comme de la vie studentine en Palestine durant les premières siècles du millénaire byzantin, avant l’invasion par les Perses de Chosroès II de 618/619 e la prise définitive en 637. [Voir A. Guillou, Prise de Gaza par les Arabes au VIIe siècle, BCH 81, 1957, 396-404.]

C’est au fond l’une des tâches des sophistes à l’époque impériale et tardive de s’acquitter de différentes missions politiques et sociales au nom et pour le compte de leur cité : « [l]oin d’être gratuite ou arbitraire, l’éloquence épidictique apparaît comme une parole autorisée, qui tire sa légitimité d’une forme ou une autre de mandat confié à l’orateur ». [L. Pernot, L’éloge de la rhétorique dans le monde gréco-romain, Paris 1993, II, 607 (de 607 à 657 pour les missions de


C'est donc précisément à Procope qu'on voudrait consacrer la présente étude, pour montrer jusqu'à quel point son œuvre sophistique constitue une source de tout premier ordre pour la connaissance de l'histoire, de la prosopographie et de la société de sa cité (mais aussi, dans quelques cas, de l'histoire de l'Empire romain d'Orient sous l'empereur Anastase), et cela à la lumière en particulier d'un nouveau texte récemment découvert ainsi que, pour ce qui est des autres textes déjà connus, sur la base des résultats auxquels nous sommes aboutis en prédisposant un commentaire détaillé de toutes les œuvres de Procope, en vue d'une édition d'ensemble dans la série grecque de la Collection des Universités de France.

On exclura, donc, de notre dossier, d'une part, les commentaires exégétiques aux livres bibliques, qui ne relèvent guère du genre épistidique, ainsi que les dialexeis et les éthopées, qui n'ont aucune valeur documentaire ; de l'autre, le corpus épistolaire – 174 lettres, y compris cinq de la plume de l'un des destinataires de Procope (le rhéteur/avocat Mégéthios) – dont la richesse et l'importance pour la connaissance tant du network de l'auteur tant de certains aspects de la vie quotidienne de la cité de Palestine ont été souvent soulignées et étudiées. [Voir en dernier lieu F. Ciccolella, Le Epistole, in Amato, Rose di Gaza, cit., 120-150, praes. 134-142 et le commentaire aux lettres procuré par la même Ciccolella (avec la collaboration d'E. Amato pour les lettres 166, 169-174), ibid., 438-503 ; en particulier, pour l'intérêt documentaire de l'échange entre Procope et Mégéthios, voir E. Amato, 'Ρητωρ vs. σοφιστὴς in un inedito scambio epistolare del V/VI secolo, dans P. Laurence – F. Guillaumont (Éds.), Epistulae antiques, Actes du IVe colloque international “L'Épistolaire et ses prolongements...
européens" (Université François-Rabelais, Tours, 1er-2-3 décembre 2004), Louvain 2006, 269-281.)


The remainder of this paper, considering the texts below, will be available here :
http://lamo.univ-nantes.fr/

1. Épithalame pour Mélès et Antonina
2. Descriptions
3. Panégyrique pour le stratélate Asiaticos
4. Panégyrique pour l’empereur Anastase
Philosophy and Rhetoric in the Monasteries Near Gaza

In this paper, I aim to (1) sketch a brief overview of the monasteries surrounding Gaza and sources for their study; (2) make some suggestions about the sort of monastic paideia that the sixth-century monk Dorotheus of Gaza attempted to transmit in his writings; and (3) consider case studies for use of rhetoric and philosophy within this monastic paideia to elucidate how classical rhetoric and philosophy helped to shape his thought. The paper is exploratory, and I look forward to discussion at the Congress to expand and modify points sketched here.

1. Monasteries near Gaza

Several monastic communities surrounded the late-antique city of Gaza (Bitton-Ashkelony and Kofsky 2000, 2004). Monastic foundations of varying types grew up during the fourth to seventh centuries in rings of approximately 15-25 kilometre radius from the city, beginning around 340-390 AD (Hirshfeld 2004). Thus to speak of a ‘Monastic School’ (e.g. Perrone 2004; Bitton-Ashkelony and Kofsky 2006), is to point to a high concentration of monastic activity rather than a unified or centrally organised collective, somewhat analogously to the classical ‘schools’. The monasteries were typically organised around a mixture of eremitic and cenobitic living, and there may have been a shift between the fifth and seventh centuries from anchoritic to cenobitic monastic life. The monastery at Thawatha had a central complex, including a church, library and dining hall, surrounded by caves for individual monks (Hevelone-Harper 2005, 34-5; Hirshfeld 2004, 87-8). We are blessed with a wide range of literary source material for the monasteries, beginning from Jerome’s Life of Hilarion. The sources for the fifth and sixth centuries are especially promising, with nearly 850 letters setting out questions and responses from two holy men in Gaza, Barsanuphius and John (SC 426-7, 450-1, 468: 1997-2002), and various examples of ascetic instructional literature, including from Dorotheus (SC 92 rev. and corr. edn 2001) and works attributed to Isaiah the Egyptian and Abba Zosimas (critical editions still needed; translations by Chryssavgis and Chyrssavgis and Penkett). Gaza is also a plausible location for the collection of the Apophthegmata (see now research tools at http://monastica.ht.lu.se/monastica.php).

The first large influx of monks to the Gaza region seems to have been related to the suppression of the Origenist controversy in Egypt in the fourth century. Monks who were sympathetic to Origenist ideas fled from Scetis and settled near Gaza. Some Origenist ideas are explored in the correspondence of Barsanuphius and John (Ep. 600-8). These links between Gazan monasticism and Egyptian monasticism, including connections with Alexandria, directly parallel the links between the Gazan schools and the Alexandrian rhetorical and philosophical schools. This shared dependence on Alexandria and Egypt assisted in the transmission of ideas between the schools and the monasteries. Direct interaction between school members and monks remained possible after the monks had entered their monasteries (Hevelone-Harper 2005, 5). Barsanuphius and John
provide a picture of strong interaction between monks and urban laity. Lay clients could visit the monastery, host monks who were away from home, and perform services, including legal advice, for the monks (see e.g. *Ep.* 620-25, 667-73, 681-2, 712-18, 727-9, 736-42, 749-56, 764-74; see further Hevelone-Harper 2005, 89-100). Interaction between monks and outsiders caused some tension with monastic ideals and there are strictures against socialising (*Ep.* 173). While monastic travel was often related to ecclesial politics or pilgrimage, travel was one mechanism by which monks kept in contact with other member of elite late-antique society.

Interaction between the monasteries and elite literary culture is clear. Abba Isaiah, despite professing no formal education, was apparently consulted by the local Christian sophist Aeneas on matters of Neoplatonic philosophy. For the late fifth century, we can identify monks who had been educated in rhetoric or law in Alexandria and Berytus (Zacharias, *Life of Severus*; John Rufus *Life of Peter the Iberian, Plerophories*; Watts 2007). Barsanuphius expressed amazement that some students seemed stuck on learning rhetoric forever, long after they should have become teachers themselves (*Ep.* 98). Zosimas recorded the case of one monk sneakily buying a book commissioned by another from a brilliant calligrapher, and another of a monk stealing a book from a hermit (*Reflections* XIII; XV). Isaiah warned monks that if they bought books for themselves, they should not have them too sumptuously decorated (*Asceticon* 3). Thus markers of education were valued in the monasteries no less than in the rhetorical schools, where Aeneas, for example, complained about a correspondent who was keeping one of his books merely as a status symbol (*Ep.* 1). Dorotheus, a disciple of the two old men, quotes Evagrius and other church fathers. In the sixth century, Barsanuphius and John developed a Christian form of question and answer literature, and Dorotheus displayed rhetorical and philosophical learning in his own writings (despite some misgivings of his teachers: Barsanuphius and John, *Ep.* 308). These overlaps between the members of the monasteries and the classically-oriented schools makes it highly plausible that the ideas current in the monastic communities may also have influenced thinkers in the rhetorical schools and *vice versa*.

Watts has helpfully argued that interchange between the two groups created an ‘ascetic/sophistic mélange’ (Watts 2007). This entangled discourse meant that rhetorical and philosophical ideas and practices could shape life in the monasteries, and that the concerns of the monasteries could inflect debates in the classical schools. For example, I have argued elsewhere that when Aeneas of Gaza (d. 518) treats questions about the pre-existence of the soul, the origin of matter in the cosmos and the possibility of bodily resurrection (in his dialogue the *Theophrastus*), he is partly motivated by a long-running debate about the creation and eternity of the world initiated by the Neoplatonic philosopher Proclus (412-485), and partly responding to Origenist debates that were current in the local monasteries. I now turn to consider how one monk, Dorotheus of Gaza, thought about the relationship between monastic and classical *paideia*.

2. *Monastic paideia* constructed by Dorotheus

Dorotheus’ vivid account of his time as a student of rhetoric illumines his understanding of the relationship between monastic and classical education (10.105) (for illuminating studies of monasticism and classical *paideia*, see Rubenson and Vinzent 2013; Rubenson 2012; Schwartz 2013). He admits to exhaustion: he needed to take a bath to recover from his studies. Lost in his books, he forgot eating, drinking, sleeping and friends. He kept the Evening Vigil (τὸ λυχνικόν), but brought his lamp back with him to continue reading to midnight. He admits (or boasts) that he ‘took no notice of, or pleasure in, anything except what [he] was reading’ (10.105.23-24). Classical education could be compared to rigorous monastic studies:
When, therefore, I came into the monastery, I kept saying to myself: ‘If in the case of outside speech (ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐξω λόγου) there is such great desire (τοιοῦτος πόθος) and heat from devoting oneself to something in one’s reading and developing its habitual disposition (ἐν ἐξει αὐτῆς), how much more in the case of virtue (ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς)?’ (10.105.25-27).

Dorotheus describes what he learned in his rhetorical education as τοῦ ἐξω λόγου. Earlier he had defined rhetorical education as τὴν ἐξω παιδείαν (10.105.1). These descriptions differentiate monastic education from the classical variety. ‘Outside education’ and ‘outside speech’ signify the pagan culture Dorotheus competes with by constructing his own program of instruction. Such agonistic separation of monastic and classical education continues when Dorotheus tells the story of his victory over a local sophist who had questioned the logical cogency of Zosimas’ account of humility (2.36-37). But we should not overplay this competition between classical and monastic education. The debate between the Sophist, Dorotheus and Abba Zosimas is equally evidence for a world where creative social and intellectual contact and conversation between city and monastery were unremarkable. Ultimately, Dorotheus believed that school and monastery could be compared because they were of the same kind, with similar practices and goals. They both form character through the passionate exercise of particular capabilities. Passionate effort in both (ἐγένετο τοιοῦτος πόθος) brings about a characteristic disposition towards action (γενέσθαι ἐν ἕξει αὐτῆς). Dorotheus presents himself as living in a space created by mutual interaction between classical and monastic education.

Dorotheus’ contrast between logos and arete to separate rhetorical from monastic education itself fits into a long classical tradition, running from the Presocratics to the ‘Third Sophistic’ (for which see Fowler 2014, a recent set of studies of the abiding influence of Plato in fifth- and sixth-century intellectual life). As is well known, Plato interrogated the relationship between philosophy and rhetoric in detail, noting explicitly that it is as hard to distinguish a philosopher from a sophist (or a statesman or a madman) as it is to recognize the gods (Sophist 216c-d). There are competing scholarly interpretations of Plato’s position; one promising suggestion is that Plato separates philosophy from rhetoric on the basis of the virtues philosophers embody and which orient them towards beauty, goodness and truth, enabling them to become gods, inasmuch as that is possible (McCoy 2008; Sedley 1999). On this view, the development of distinctively philosophical virtues unites the intellectual and moral aspects of philosophical education in lives directed at becoming godlike (e.g. Theaet. 176b), because moral training directs desire towards objects of knowledge and beauty which could not be grasped without the stimulus of well-ordered desire. Later philosophers took up this aspect of philosophy as a training in philosophical virtues directed towards knowledge, beauty and divinity, variously defined, to the extent that one distinguished interpreter has made it the defining feature of all ancient philosophy (Hadot 1995).

Within this tradition, Dorotheus’ distinction between rhetorical education and monastic education on the basis of virtue aligns monastic education with philosophy over against rhetoric. He stands within the tradition that claimed monasticism as Christian philosophy. Earlier monastic writers had insisted that monasticism should be concerned with the proper ordering of God-given desire that aligns the monk with God and spurs him on to deeper relationship with God. For example, the author of the Asceticicon argued that love, ambition, anger, hatred and pride are all passions (πάθαι) that (for all their common perversions) are natural and good because they ground desire for God, lead to progress towards him, help monks to become pure, honour pure souls and
reproach evil-doers (Asceticon 2, pp. 43-45). Zosimas argued that human free will is not sufficiently passionate (ὁρμή), and that the monk must be inflamed with desire for God (Zosimas, Reflections VIId; compare Xa; Dorotheus 13.141). For writers in this monastic/philosophical tradition, ‘philosophical’ education is partly about the ordering of desire towards objects of knowledge or contemplation of God.

In this light, we may revisit what Dorotheus meant by the things related to outside speech as opposed to those related to virtue (ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔξω λόγου / ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς). Education outside the walls of the monastery trains the student in speech, and develops habitual dispositions for public rhetoric. With this characterisation, Dorotheus captures the way late-antique rhetorical education emphasized display and prepared students for roles in public life; he stands within the monastic tradition that saw removal from public life as necessary for authentic Christianity (as Plato had recommended for philosophical divinisation in the Theaetetus). His monastic education aims towards the cultivation of virtue and healthy communal living in the monasteries, and thus has affinities with contemporary philosophical education. The view of monastic paideia he constructs draws on contemporary understanding of philosophical education and contrasts it with classical rhetorical education.

3. Rhetoric and philosophy in the writings of Dorotheus of Gaza

Yet rhetoric clearly informs Dorotheus’ writings too, just as it did the writings of pagan late-antique philosophers. To take an example more or less at random, in On Renunciation, Dorotheus riffs on Matt 11.29 (‘Learn of me, for I am gentle and lowly of heart, and you will find rest for your souls’) (1.7.19f (full),31f (part); 1.8.1 (part),33ff (full)). His quotations form an inclusio, with the repeated full quotation enclosing further restatements of the first and second half. His exegesis of the passage begins by using the technical stylistic term σύντομος to describe the fitting directness of the biblical passage: its truth is thus partly determined by its rhetorical appropriateness using canons of contemporary rhetoric (for σύντομος see Arist. Rhet. 1414a25; Proclus takes it as a point of good style at In Tim. 3.200.2). Frequent anaphora intensifies the rhetoric (especially in 1.8). Question and answer, fictional dialogue, and analogy or metaphor expanded into extended passages of fictional divine speech (‘It is as if…’) are all employed to explicate the text. The exemplum is perhaps the most common rhetorical figure, introduced by ‘chreia’ or ‘hypodeigma’. These are all exegetical techniques well known from contemporary rhetoric and school exercises.

Turning to Proclus to provide a confirming instance of rhetorical standards in the case of σύντομος points to the close relationship between late-antique rhetoric and philosophy. Late-antique philosophers went about philosophising largely by exegesis, and while they had their own emphases and methods, they also drew heavily on common rhetorical conventions. Nevertheless, something of Dorotheus’ specifically philosophical approach may be reconstructed through a short comparison with Proclus’ exegetical practice. In broad terms, Proclus proceeds by explaining individual words and then considering themes: ‘As for us, we should first examine the wording (λέξεως) of the text on its own and then proceed to examine the whole theme (πρὸς τὴν ὅλην θεωρίαν)’ (in Tim. 299.19-21). He thinks competing interpretations cannot be resolved without examining ‘each of the lexēs involved one by one’ to determine how each ‘has force’ (δύναμιν ἔχει) (227.9-13) (Festugiere 1963; Runia and Share 2008, 4-5). Dorotheus also follows this exegetical method, explicitly directing interpreters to ‘pay attention to every word… how each word has force’ (Θέτε
τὸν νοὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἐκάστον ῥῆμα…πῶς ἕκαστη ἑξῆς…ἔχει δύναμιν) using terminology very similar to Proclus’ (4.50; also 4.51). One example of this method can be seen in 4.47-51, including the use of diaeresis to divide and more clearly define key concepts, a favoured philosopher’s move. At a finer level of detail, further correspondences to Proclus’ philosophical method emerge. Like Proclus, he begins with an assumption that his target text forms a unity, and so seeks its skopos (e.g. 14.156; Ep. 1.181). In accordance with widely-used Aristotelian scientific method, he first asks the ‘what-question’ (e.g. 4.47). Detailed reading of the text follows, first by drawing on different opinions and schemes of different interpreters (Basil, Anthony, Paul, Abba Agathon) and working them into the wider argument. Then he explains the main philosophical themes or problems thrown up by the text, recognisable from the philosophical genre of problemata. As in Neoplatonic commentaries, interpretive difficulties/differences are noted, although often, as in contemporary philosophical commentary, their harmonisation displays the commentator’s ingenuity. Praise for the biblical text is as common as Neoplatonic praise for Plato’s works. While biblical texts are the primary interpreters of other biblical texts Dorotheus also uses sayings of the desert fathers and earlier theologians to interpret biblical texts, just as contemporary philosophers used Homer, theological texts and the poets. Partly, this places Dorotheus within a long line of privileged ascetic teachers, just as Proclus’ citation of the opinion of earlier philosophers in his commentaries constructs his own persona within a privileged chain of philosophical interpreters. Each of these moves has been identified as central to Proclus’ exegetical method; together they build an image of Dorotheus as a philosophical exegete.

Multiple other influences inflected Dorotheus’ monastic instructions, themselves also intricated in classical discourses: e.g. practices of meditation and memorisation, homiletics, earlier ascetic texts. The virtues that Dorotheus prioritises and constructs as central to the monastic life and its trajectory towards godlikeness, truth and goodness also shape his paideia in distinctive ways. But aspects of philosophy and rhetoric from the ‘pagan’ world remained alive in his discourse and helped give form to the monasteries at Gaza.
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Les Vicennalia d'Anastase Iᵉʳ.
Les Panégyriques de Procope de Gaza et Priscien de Césarée

1. Procope de Gaza

Le Panégyrique pour Anastase Iᵉʳ fut prononcé par Procope de Gaza dans le cadre d’une cérémonie publique organisée par la ville en l’honneur de l’empereur. La cérémonie gazéenne, qui eut lieu en présence d’une effigie impériale exposée dans le théâtre local, semble s’inscrire dans un programme beaucoup plus vaste de manifestations célébrant la personne d’Anastase, un programme dans lequel toutes les cités de l’empire étaient activement impliquées :

« (1) Toute cité (πᾶσα πόλις), ô très puissant empereur, est fière de toi, elle s’enorgueillit de tes succès et elle […] désespère de pouvoir t’accorder une récompense qui sera à la hauteur de tes bonnes œuvres […]. Notre cité, à travers ton effigie, accueille la personne même de son bienfaiteur et, comme un amant fougueux, elle se dresse à sa vue et rallie à lui toutes les générations […]. (29) […] les villes prospèrent et ont des raisons diverses d’être fiers, mais toutes exhibent un ornement commun en exposant tes portraits sur la base de ta générosité, et nous avec elles (καὶ μετ᾽ ἐκείνων ἡ μεῖς), […] ce soit des discours qui puissent honorer tes portraits […]. (30) Puisses-tu à jamais gouverner l’empire romain, […] que les cités puissent tresser des couronnes pour tes succès, te consacrer des dédicaces et entonner des hymnes pour te chanter […] »

Or, à moins que l’on ne veuille reconnaître dans ces mots que l’image fade d’un *topos* littéraire rebattu, il nous semble légitime de nous interroger sur les raisons pour lesquelles les citoyens de Gaza, ainsi que ceux de toute autre ville (cf. καὶ μετ᾽ ἐκείνων ἡ μεῖς), auraient dû organiser des cérémonies par lesquelles exprimer publiquement joie et reconnaissance envers l’empereur, adresser des hymnes et des louanges à ses *eikones*, formuler le vœu d’un prolongement de son règne. Compte tenu de son caractère, rien n’empêche de croire que la fête célébrée à Gaza puisse s’encadrer dans le contexte d’un jubilée impérial, une occasion où des voeux publics (*vota publica*) et des manifestations de joie (*gaudia*) avaient normalement lieu dans chaque province de l’empire à la présence de l’empereur lui-même ou de ses portraits. D’ailleurs, du moins jusqu’à l’an 511 Anastase semble avoir régulièrement respecté l’habitude des jubilées impériaux, une pratique introduite par Auguste et restée d’actualité jusqu’à Justinien.

A ceci s’ajoute le fait que le contexte jubilaire permettrait de mieux expliquer la digression, faite par Procope au § 5, sur les circonstances et les modalités de l’élevation de l’empereur :

« Un décret véritablement divin faisait tomber son suffrage sur ta tête et comme sous le coup d’une décision unanime le peuple tout entier t’acclamait, le sénat s’y associait, l’impératrice donnait son consentement et l’élection état ratifiée » (trad. de P. Maréchaux).
Il va de soi que l'évocation du dies imperii, du reste non prévue par les préceptes ménandréens concernant le basilikos logos auxquelles Procope se tient largement, acquiert beaucoup plus de sens dans un discours conçu pour une célébration qui commémorait et perpétrait parmi le peuple le souvenir du couronnement d’Anastase.

Si la reconstruction proposée ci-dessus était correcte, nous aurions un élément en plus pour avancer une hypothèse plus ferme concernant la datation du Panégyrique, qui, malheureusement, demeure encore douteuse.

Or, nous savons que le Panégyrique fut prononcé avant la mort d'Ariane (515), indiquée comme étant encore en vie au § 23. D’autres événements historiques, mentionnés par Procope, et datables avec suffisamment de sûreté, sont l’abolition du chrysargyron de 498 (§ 13), la révolte des Isauriens réprimée la même année (§ 9), la suppression des venationes sanglantes (§ 15) datable de 499, l’interdiction des spectacles de pantomime (§ 16) datant très probablement de 501. Ce qui est plus problématique, c’est en revanche la datation de la construction ou restauration/renforcement du Long Mur mentionné au § 21 et que, faute de données certaines, il est plus judicieux de placer, avec Meier, à la première décade du VIe siècle.

Bref, si l’on ne se tient qu’aux données certaines ou considérées comme telles par les historiens, l’on se trouve devant une fourchette de temps assez longue qui s’étend de 501 à 515. La plupart des savants cependant ont supposé pouvoir fixer le terminus ante quem à l’an 507, date de construction de la forteresse de Daras-Anastasiopolis, ou même à l’an 502, date de début de la guerre romano-perse, du fait que Procope semblerait ne dire mot ni de la célèbre structure défensive, ni du conflit contre les Perses (502-505/506).

Toutefois une allusion au conflit romano-perse et au système de fortifications voulu par Anastase sur le front oriental (y compris la forteresse de Daras) suite à ce conflit, pourrait se trouver au § 7, où Procope, s’adressant à l’empereur, déclare :

« Car tu savais que la partie orientale, la plus riche de l’empire, était troublée par la présence de quelques barbares sis aux frontières, des hommes insolents, arrogants et aux yeux de qui l’unique preuve de vertu consistait à attenter aux biens d’autrui par de soudaines incursions et par des fuites éclairs, assurés qu’ils étaient, où qu’ils se trouvassent, de leur cachette […]

Eh bien ! des hommes de cet acabit de quelle audace pourraient-ils jamais s’abstenir ? Des cités, un temps prospères et florissantes, étaient exposées à leur devastation mais elles étaient désormais, en ces circonstances, sans défenseurs et sans alliés. Une était conquise, une autre était en passe de l’être, une troisième était évacuée. […] on entendait dire qu’une cité avait été prise, que sa prospérité avait été mise à mal, qu’on avait poussé les femmes à subir un déshonneur forcé, qu’on avait violenté les enfants, maltraité les anciens, emmené les jeunes, conduit les filles non pas à des noces fortunées et à un mari garant de leur bonheur, comme elles l’avaient espéré jusque là, mais aux violences d’un ennemi, barbare et repoussant jusque dans sa mise. C’est que tout était à leur portée » (trad. de P. Maréchaux).

Par la suite, le panégyriste ajoute que, grâce à l’intervention d’Anastase :

« le barbare après être vu infliger la leçon qu’il méritait, se prosterner, humilié, il reconnait son maître et il s’amende, fût-ce à son corps défendant. Les cités sont exemptes de toutes tragédies ; quant aux murs, les plus anciens sont rénovés, tandis que pour la première fois on en érige de nouveaux. Les cités cultivent la sobriété et donnent aux barbares la leçon d’un ordre infrangible. Partout des garnisons sont placées pour défendre les sujets […] » (trad. de P. Maréchaux).
En ces mots, à partir de Villoison et jusqu'à nos jours, l'on a voulu reconnaître une allusion aux pillages arabes de 498 et de 502 dont nous parle Théophane le Confesseur. Selon le chroniqueur, dans le premier cas, les Arabes furent rapidement battus par les ducès des provinces intéressées par les raids, dans l'autre, l'incursion (ἐπιδρομή) fut si rapide que l'on n'en arriva pas même à un affrontement.

Procope décrit, nous semble-t-il, une réalité tout à fait différente. Il déclare que les Arabes, habitués à accomplir latronum more de rapides incursions sur le territoire romain, ont récemment entrepris une action audacieuse (τόλμη) comme ils ne l'avaient jamais osé auparavant : au lieu des pillages habituels, ils ont organisé un ambitieux plan de conquête, une attaque militaire en règle avec de nombreuses villes assiégées, conquises ou évacuées, une attaque qui a été certes réprimée par Anastase, mais non sans difficultés : l'empereur, en effet, n'a pu éviter les massacres et les violences de tout genre aux dépens des civils, désormais τῶν βοηθούντων ἐρημοι. Bref, rien à voir avec les incursions (ἐπιδρομαί) sporadiques et rapidement réprimées par les généraux d'Anastase dont nous parlent Théophane. En revanche, nous savons que c'est à l'occasion du conflit romano-perse (502-506) que les Arabes Lakhmides, vassaux des Perses, s'étaient abandonnés à des pillages et des violences sans précédents, avec le but non seulement de s'enrichir personnellement, mais aussi et surtout de soustraire au contrôle romain de vastes zones de territoire. Les Lakhmides, en effet, agissaient sur ordre du sassanide Kavadh qui exploitait leurs qualités aussi bien de valeureux chevaliers que de pillards rapaces et sanguinaires. Bien informés sur les déplacements de l'armée romaine, ils saccageaient et dévastaient en toute tranquillité les territoires qui à ce moment-là étaient restés sans aucune protection militaire.

Contre cette hypothèse, l'on pourrait certes objecter que Procope n'a jamais prononcé le nom des Perses. Ce silence ne nous surprend pas, si l'on considère : a) le rôle stratégique joué par les Lakhmides dans le conflit, et b) le fait que les Perses ne furent pas vaincus et que Procope, donc, n'aurait pas pu compter le conflit romano-perse parmi les succès militaires d'Anastase. Il convient d'ajouter que le conflit, ayant déjà pris fin en 505, se conclut formellement en novembre de 506 avec une trêve qui eut comme effet la pacification du front oriental, une pacification dont les Arabes (aussi bien pro-romains que pro-perses) furent justement ceux qui en furent les plus grands frais. Le Ps.-Josué le Stylite rappelle en effet que, après la trêve de l'an 506 (ou lorsque on était en train de la signer), les Arabes de l'un et de l'autre bloc, en toute autonomie de leurs alliés et patrons, décidèrent de faire une nouvelle incursion sur le territoire de leur respectifs ennemis. L'initiative ne plut pas ni aux Romains ni aux Perses, soucieux de garder la paix entre les deux empires. C'est ainsi que le Marzebân perse mit à mort les commandants des Lakhmides et le dux Timostratos fit de même avec les 5 chefs Kindites. La répression, donc, dut induire les deux tribus arabes à un comportement beaucoup plus soumis et discipliné. C'est en ce sens-ci que l'on peut sans doute comprendre les mots ὁ γὰρ βάρβαρος, τὴν πληγὴν δεδεγμένος, κάτω νεύει καὶ δεσπότην ἐπίσταται καὶ σωφρονεῖ μὴ βουλόμενος (§ 7).

Quoi qu'il en soit, il y a cependant un autre élément, décisif faut-il croire, supportant l'hypothèse selon laquelle Procope ait fait effectivement référence à l'invasion du front oriental de la part des Arabes pendant les années du conflit romano-perse. D'après Procope, en effet, l'invasion eut un tel effet qu'elle poussa l'empereur à entreprendre un lourd programme de renforcement du front endommagé par les assauts arabo-perses et dont le conflit avait mis en évidence les faiblesses : τείχη τὰ μὲν γεγηρακότα νεάζει, τὰ δὲ νῦν πρῶτον ἀνίσταται (§ 7). De ce fait, l'œuvre de remise en ordre
et de renforcement de la frontière plus exposée aux incursions des Arabes n'est attestée qu'après la conclusion des hostilités contre les Perses (505), et en bonne partie avant même que les longs traités de paix n'aboutirent à l'acte formel de stipulation de la trêve septennale (en novembre de l'an 506). L'œuvre la plus grandiose et importante de ce programme est sans aucun doute la fondation de Daras-Anastasiopolis (Oğuz, Turquie) datant de 505-507. Procope ne la cite pas explicitement, il est vrai, mais il y fait clairement allusion lorsque, s'exprimant en des termes volontairement vagues et génériques, il rappelle que grâce à Anastase « les remparts vétustes se consolident, alors que d'autres s'en construisent pour la première fois ». La structure défensive de Daras-Anastasiopolis, en effet, ne fut pas la seule voulue par l'empereur. Toujours en Mésopotamie, Anastase pourvut aussi à la construction de la forteresse de Thannurios (Θαννούριος, Tell Tuneinir, Syrie) ; en Euphrate il entoura la ville d'Europos (Salhiyeh, Syrie) de nouveaux murs en 505 ; en Osroène, il encouragea et finança la reconstruction des murs de Batna (Tell-Batnan, Suriç, Turquie) en 504/505, de Birtha (Birecik, Turquie) en 505/506, d'Édesse (Şanlıurfa, Turquie) en 505.

Pour conclure, on peut dire que Procope aurait rédigé le Panégyrique pour Anastase Ier après le conflit romano-perse (502-505), lorsque l'activité intense d'urbanisme (civile et militaire) sur le front oriental (505-507 et 509/510) et la répression des dernières incursions arabes devaient désormais être perçues comme une garantie contre de nouvelles attaques. De surcroît, si l'on admet que le Panégyrique fut prononcé lors d'un jubilé impérial, l'on pourra dès lors proposer une datation plus précise, à savoir au printemps de 511, étant donné que, entre 507/510 et 515, il put y avoir lieu seule la célébration des quatrièmes Quinquennalia, c'est-à-dire des Vicennalia, probablement fêtées à la fin de la 20e année du règne d'Anastase.

2. Priscien

Le Panégyrique pour Anastase composé par Priscien de Césarée pourrait lui-aussi avoir été conçu pour célébrer un anniversaire impérial : en effet, il semble avoir été prononcé à la présence de l'empereur en personne ou de l'un de ses portraits (serenus quae [sc. pondera laudis] relevat vultus [sc. tuus] mihi / praesens ubique cernitur qui sensibus), qui étaient diffusés et exposés dans tout l'empire (ubique), comme on l'a vu, à l'occasion de cette circonstance spécifique. De surcroît, dans le final de son Panégyrique, l'orateur fait référence aux vœux publiques qui, ainsi que l'on a déjà observé, étaient usuels pour cette sorte de célébrations :

\[
\textit{Numen, quod caelum, terram pontumque revisit,}
\]
\[
\textit{Ausoniis servet regnis haec munera semper,}
\]
\[
\textit{Barabriaeque ferae capiant iuga vera subactae,}
\]
\[
\textit{Votaque firmentur populi Sanctique Senatus}
\]

Ces vota populi Sanctique Senatus, tout comme dans les autres panérygiques célébrant un anniversaire impérial, expriment vraisemblablement le souhait que le règne du laudandus puisse se prolonger à jamais (servet regnis haec munera semper) pour assurer bien-être et paix à son peuple.

La chronologie des événements historiques auxquels Priscien fait référence est tout à fait cohérente avec la datation (que nous proposons ici pour la première fois) à 511. Le seul terminus ante quem sûr est l'an 515, an de mort d'Ariane qui est présentée comme étant encore en vie (cf. v. 301-302). Priscien rappelle grosso modo les mêmes faits historiques mentionnés par Procope, à savoir la guerre isaurienne (qui se termine en 498), l'abolition du chrysaragron (498), la suppression
de *venationes* sanglantes (499). De plus, si la datation à 511 est correcte, dans le texte de Priscien on pourrait déceler sans trop de difficulté de références à d'autres événements mentionnés par Procope lui-même, tels que le traité romano-perse de 506 (cf. v. 256), la répression des dernières incursions arabes (cf. v. 255-260), dont nous connaissons au moins celle qui fut repoussée par le *dux* Timostratos ; le renforcement des frontières et l’activité édilitaire (civile et militaire) qui succéda au conflit romano-perse (cf. v. 184-185). Ce sont là toutes questions que l’orateur de Gaza lui aussi abordait dans le même laps de temps pour célébrer Anastase. Seule différence est que Priscien fait mentionne des succès d’Hypatius sur les Scythes (cf. v. 298-299), ce qui a fait penser tantôt aux invasions des Bulgares de 493, 499 ou 502 (mais nulle source ne mentionne Hypatius comme participant à les opérations contre les Bulgares ; on y nomme par contre le maître des milices Julien pour 493, le *magister militum per Illyricum* Aristus pour 499, alors qu’en 502 les Bulgares ne rencontrèrent même pas de troupes impériales), tantôt aux succès initiales d’Hypatius contre Vitalien. Cependant, la chronologie de la rébellion de Vitalien demeure incertaine. Si, en effet, le comte Marcelin (qui bénéficie maintenant de beaucoup de crédit auprès les chercheurs) en fixe la datation à 514, toutes les autres sources l’avancent de deux ou trois ans.

En effet, quoiqu’il nous n’en donne pas une chronologie exacte, Jean d’Antioche semble la placer au début du consulat de Sécondinus (511), père d’Hypatius et beau-frère d’Anastase. Selon Jean, en effet, pas longtemps après sa victoire, «Hypatius s’élança contre l’usurpateur», mais il fut capturé par les Huns et remis entre les mains de Vitalien, qui le rendra à Anastase seulement plus tard à la suite d’un traité de paix et au prix d’une forte rançon. La reconstruction que l’on vient de proposer semble étayée par Théophane continué, qui, tout en omettant la victoire d’Hypatius sur Vitalien, fixe la capture d’Hypatius à 512/513, alors que Victor de Tunnuna fait remonter la victoire d’Hypatius à 511. En s’appuyant sur ces trois témoignages, on peut donc proposer la chronologie suivante :

511: début de la rébellion de Vitalien et victoire d’Hypatius sur Vitalien ;
511/512 : capture d’Hypatius ;
512/513 : traité de paix entre Anastase et Vitalien.

Le tableau brossé ci-dessus est confirmé par Sévère d’Antioche qui dans l’une de ses homélies datant de 513 nous informe que le conflit avec Vitalien s’était déjà conclu pacifiquement, sans effusion de sang.

***

Si les hypothèses que nous venons de proposer sur la datation des Panégyriques pour Anastase Iᵉʳ sont correctes, nous aurions pas seulement un élément ultérieur en faveur de la datation haute (511-513) de la rébellion de Vitalien, mais aussi la possibilité de reconstruire l’une des dernières et plus importantes fêtes du calendrier impérial, vue en même temps depuis la capitale (Constantinople) et la périphérie de l’empire (Gaza).

A full version of this paper with notes and bibliography will be available here :
http://lamo.univ-nantes.fr/CV-Gianluca-Ventrella
Hypatia and the Birth of Early Byzantine Alexandrian Intellectual Life

When historians now think about Hypatia, the tendency is to speak primarily about her death. Her intellectual and personal accomplishments are noted, but they rarely represent anything more than background details included simply to make her murder seem even more ghastly and tragic. This paper offers a sort of maximalist reading of Hypatia’s intellectual career designed not to dramatize her death but to recapture some of the very real contributions of her life. It will show how the intellectual world of the Alexandria into which she was born differed dramatically from the one she left in 415 and it will argue that she was largely responsible for this change. It will conclude by describing how the Alexandrian intellectual culture of the later fifth, sixth, and early seventh centuries grew out of trends that she helped to initiate in the city.

Mathematics and Philosophy in Late Roman Alexandria

In the sixth century Alexandria of John Philoponus, Simplicius, and Olympiodorus, everyone understood the relationship between mathematics and philosophy. Mathematics was a crucial intellectual training that prepared one for the higher study of philosophy. It was essential for the philosopher, but also subordinate to the higher learning that came from the detailed study of philosophical texts. This had not always been the case, however. For much of the Roman imperial period the concentration of intellectuals in Alexandria encouraged regular debates between philosophers and mathematicians that required each side to know enough about the texts and ideas of their competitors to frame effective arguments. And it seems that the Alexandrian mathematicians routinely won these arguments in the second, third, and fourth centuries.

They were helped in this by the emergence of a Pythagorean revival in the second century AD. At this time, the mathematician Nicomachus of Gerasa and the philosopher Numenius both authored works that helped to spark a revival of interest in a philosophical system that drew heavily upon mathematical roots. Each man approached Pythagoreanism differently. Numenius constructed a philosophical history organized around the idea that Plato was effectively a Pythagorean. Plato himself, Numenius argued, had more or less held true to Pythagorean principles but Platonism had strayed from its roots when dissention arose within the Academy following Plato’s death. The Academy’s new leadership then pulled Platonic teaching away from its ultimate Pythagorean origins. Like the Pythagoreans, Numenius understood that mathematics played a fundamental role in the proper functioning of a philosophical system.

Nicomachus of Gerasa, Numenius’s slightly later contemporary, shared Numenius’s view that mathematics and Platonic philosophy were inherently complementary. Nicomachus also revered Pythagoras and even wrote a biography of him, but all of what we would immediately recognize as philosophical works written by Nichomachus have been lost. What we have instead is Nicomachus’s *Introductio Arithmetica*, a text that lays out the basic approaches one needs to master in order to understand the numerically-based theological system that Nicomachus developed in a second,
longer work called the *Theologoumena Arithmeticae*. This work contained ten books, each of which focused on a specific number and discussed the relationship between its mathematical properties and non-mathematical subjects like ethics and theology. Ultimately it pointed towards a sort of integrated philosophical and mathematical system that drew on principles from both traditions, but felt that mathematics offered the path to highest truth.

Third and early fourth century intellectuals across the empire worked hard to understand the implications of this Pythagorean revival. On one side were thinkers like Iamblichus who crafted a sophisticated philosophical system that combined the Pythagoreanizing mathematics of Nicomachus with the innovative philosophical approaches of the Alexandrian-trained philosopher Plotinus and ritualistic elements inspired by the third-century Chaldean Oracles. This intricate philosophical system ultimately promised to lead its followers to a higher level of interaction with the true, divine principles of the universe—but the mathematics only remained a tool to enhance one's philosophical development. Philosophy, in other words, depended upon math but ultimately trumped it.

Within Alexandria, though, it seems that these issues were hashed out in a different way. Most Alexandrian philosophers of the third century seem to have stood aside from the Pythagorean revival. Conventional philosophers seem to have been a thoroughly unremarkable lot. Plotinus, who came to Alexandria to study under the “the leading celebrities of the time” in the middle 230s, was thoroughly disappointed in their teaching. He instead turned to Ammonius Saccas, an intellectual outsider in Alexandria who was neither a Museum member nor a part of the Alexandrian establishment. While Ammonius’s ideas ultimately helped to shape the way that Platonism was understood for much of the next millennium and a half, the Alexandrian intellectual establishment resisted them. Plotinus soon left the city, leaving it bereft of the best philosophical talent of the day.

Part of the problem Alexandrian philosophers faced was the immense intellectual power of Alexandrian mathematicians. In his *Collectio*, the fourth century mathematician Pappus makes clear what these Alexandrian philosophers faced. The work contains three significant critiques of philosophers who, Pappus felt, were making claims based on unsubstantiated interpretations of Plato's *Timaeus*. One of these involved reworking an assertion made by Plato in the *Timaeus* that there were only five types of convex solids, a point that Archimedes had proven to be false. Pappus calls the bluff of philosophers who maintained Plato’s position and claims that they “fail to provide proofs” for the points that they make. At another moment, Pappus criticizes “the philosophers” who misidentified the Demiurge, the divine figure to whom Plato attributes the creation of the cosmos. He never names these philosophers, but the view that he ascribes to them is a minority opinion found in none of the works of third and fourth century Platonists like Plotinus, Porphyry, or Iamblichus. It did circulate in Alexandria in the early fourth century because of the work of Origen, a student of Ammonius Saccas who wrote a treatise that evidently caught the attention of Pappus. Pappus was then stepping in to a peculiarly Alexandrian argument about the relationship between mathematics and philosophy that played out in a particularly Alexandrian way.

Even more interesting is the way that some of Pappus’ critiques are presented. In one of them, Pappus pastes together small pieces of the writings of Nicomachus of Gerasa to prove that Plato misunderstood the number of solids. He refers to Nicomachus by name, but he classifies him as a Pythagorean. In another critique, in which he describes Plato as “most divine among philosophers,” Pappus demonstrates a thorough knowledge of Plato’s *Timaeus* that can only have come from close study of the text.
These exchanges reveal the messy border between mathematics and philosophy. While Pappus may not have claimed the title philosopher for himself, he evidently had read deeply in both the Platonic and Pythagorean traditions. He not only knew their core texts in intimate detail, but he was also keeping up with contemporary interpretations of these texts as well. When Pappus responded to contemporary philosophical ideas with which he disagreed, he critiqued them using mathematics, but he did so in a way that also clearly appreciated the philosophical implications of his points. Indeed, it is no surprise that later Byzantines marked Pappus as a philosopher, not a mathematician.

In truth, Pappus was first and foremost an Alexandrian. Even at the turn of the fourth century AD, the great Alexandrian intellectual institutions continued to foster a sort of interdisciplinary conversation and interaction that most modern scholars would envy. And what was true of the school of Pappus was equally true of the school of his younger contemporary Theon. Like Pappus, Theon is marked by later Byzantines as a philosopher. Probably like Pappus too, Theon may have disputed this identification as inaccurate, though his work about divination called “About signs and the examination of birds and the croaking of ravens” and his commentary on The Cynic Epistle might suggest otherwise. At the same time, Theon likely followed Pappus and Nicomachus in understanding that numbers and the mathematical study of them enabled one to engage with a higher order of reality than theoretical philosophy permitted. In the end, though, Theon came from the same Alexandrian environment that produced Pappus and fueled interactions like the one that Pappus had with Origen.

This is where Hypatia joins the story. Hypatia was the daughter of Theon and was trained by him in both mathematics and philosophy. Theon apparently trained her in a way that was true to the traditions of fourth century Alexandrian mathematicians. Her first publication was likely a revised edition of the proofs of books 3-13 of Ptolemy’s Almagest, a work that Theon used as the basis of his commentary on the text. Her first exposure to philosophy came in her father’s school as well, but it likely came in the context of a discussion that put philosophical texts in dialogue with mathematics. We are told, however, that Hypatia quickly surpassed the level of philosophical teaching her father could provide and seems to have decided that her father wrongly subordinated philosophy to mathematics. In the sixth century, the philosopher Damascius emphasizes that, because Hypatia was more intelligent than her father, Hypatia moved beyond his mathematical training and devoted herself to philosophy. If we read Damascius in a modern context, it seems that he is here contrasting two very distinctive disciplines; Hypatia seems almost to be rebelling against her father by embracing a very different thought system from anything that he knew or understood. But Damascius does not mean this at all. Damascius was a devoted admirer of Iamblichus and, like all late Platonists, he understood that mathematics and philosophy were intimately related. What Damascius implies is not that Hypatia turned her back on mathematics in order to embrace philosophy but that she recalibrated the balance between the two. A philosopher like Damascius differed from a mathematician like Nicomachus neither because he read different texts nor because he disregarded the utility of the discipline embraced by his rival. They simply privileged different things. For Damascius, mathematical concepts were useful tools that helped one to better understand more important philosophical concepts. For Nicomachus, numbers were more important than philosophical concepts like justice, but the philosophical concepts helped one to understand the true significance of numbers.
Hypatia then did not abandon mathematics for philosophy. Damascius suggests that her study of philosophy convinced her to shift the balance between them. She learned enough philosophy to come to the conclusion that math served philosophy. In the view of a later philosopher like Damascius, this allowed her to push beyond the intellectual limits of her mathematician father. This was likely less of an intellectual conversion than it was a gradual epiphany born of Hypatia's reading of philosophical texts, but it was nonetheless extremely important.

The philosophy that Hypatia embraced differed dramatically from the ideas of Origen against which Pappus had argued a few decades earlier. Writing a generation after Hypatia's death, Socrates Scholasticus explains that Hypatia “advanced so much in her learning (παιδείας) that she surpassed the philosophers in this, became heir to the Platonic interpretative tradition handed down from Plotinus, and expounded all philosophical doctrines (πάντα τὰ φιλόσοφα μαθήματα) to those who wished to hear. For this reason, people from everywhere who wished to philosophize assembled around her.”

Socrates is here being quite deliberate in the way that he describes Hypatia's teaching. Modern scholars often equate early Byzantine philosophy with the Iamblichian inspired Neoplatonic tradition taught in Athens and Alexandria in the later fifth and early sixth centuries AD. Socrates, who wrote before this Athenian tradition had taken form, understood a different, much more diverse philosophical ecosystem. Philosophy in the fourth century was much more heterogenous and diverse than we usually imagine. Indeed, it more closely resembled the intellectually robust world of the Hellenistic and Roman imperial periods than it did the Alexandrian Platonism of the sixth century. When Hypatia began teaching Platonic and Aristotelian texts in the 380s, philosophers in the empire still used a variety of approaches. In Constantinople, for example, Themistius presented an Aristotle-centered ecumenical philosophical training that included elements from the Platonic, Stoic, and perhaps even Epicurean traditions. Although Hypatia probably did not introduce Plotinian Platonism to Alexandria, she is the first Plotinian Platonist in Alexandria whose impact still echoes in surviving literary sources.

There was an additional component to Hypatia's teaching that gave it added potency. Although she was clearly a skilled philosopher, Hypatia's position as the heir of Theon meant that her mathematical bona fides were also beyond challenge. This gave her a unique profile in the city. Most students of philosophy needed to go to different teachers for their mathematical and philosophical training. Hypatia could provide both in the same school from the same teacher. She could then move seamlessly from one to the other in her teaching, lending her instruction a power that rivals could not match. She then managed to surpass Alexandrian philosophers in the sophistication of her philosophical instruction and sideline Alexandrian mathematicians who wanted to continue to argue that mathematics, not Platonic philosophy represented the pinnacle of learning. By marginalizing both of these traditional rivals, Hypatia set the stage for a new Alexandrian intellectual dynamic in which Neoplatonic philosophy and Alexandrian mathematics complemented one another—but the pursuit of philosophical union with the divine represented the ultimate goal.

This new Alexandrian dynamic was one that Hypatia helped to birth, but it matured only after her death. As we all know, Hypatia was killed in March of 415 by a Christian mob. Her death was not, as historians have often argued against all evidence, the result of an anti-philosophical or
anti-pagan turn in the city. Both philosophy and philosophical paganism continued in Alexandria for at least another century and a half. She was killed, it seems, because her involvement in an Alexandrian political conflict between the patriarch and governor had angered supporters of Cyril. Her murder did, however, change the direction of Alexandrian intellectual life.

Hypatia's Porphyrian-influenced cosmology was uniquely well-suited to the city in which she lived. Porphyry was, of course, not a Christian, but his conception of a sort of Trinity made up of a single divine principle with three aspects present in the same reality and his arguments against the utility of sacrifice made a system based on his teaching appealing to Hypatia's Christian students. [Synesius has followed a generally Porphyrian conception though he does here compress the procession of the divine mind back into the One. For this view attributed to Porphyry see Damascius, Dubitationes et solutions de primis principiis, vol 1.86.9-87.1 (Paris, 1889): Πορφύριον ἐρούμεν τὴν μίαν τῶν πάντων ἀρχήν εἶναι τὸν πατέρα τῆς νοητῆς τριάδος.] With Hypatia's murder, the culture she had created to join pagan and Christian philosophers in a common, non-confessional, purely contemplative philosophical pursuit died with her. Hypatia had trained no heir and had no spouse or children who could take over from her. This left a crucial vacuum in Alexandria's intellectual life. Hypatia had overturned the dominance that mathematicians had enjoyed for centuries in Alexandria and had done so in a way that was particularly well-suited to the majority Christian city in which she taught.

The years following her death showed that it is always far easier for a great thinker to undermine an old intellectual consensus than it is for her to establish a new one. Hypatia had done the former on her own but she, like most other great philosophers, needed capable and persuasive successors to carry on her work. She had none.

This meant that Alexandrian intellectual life began to drift in the decades following her murder. From the very limited information that we have about them, it seems that the Alexandrian teachers that Proclus encountered in the late 420s and early 430s may have taught the Plotinian-Porphyrian Platonism that Hypatia established. It is clear, however, that they were of middling quality and not terribly inspirational. Unlike Hypatia, they could not compete with the growing influence of the Athenian Neoplatonic school, an institution that taught the Iamblichan system and emphasized theurgic rituals rather than a purely contemplative path to divine union. The limitations of these Alexandrian heirs of Hypatia in fact pushed Proclus, the most gifted philosopher of the fifth century, to leave Alexandria and study instead in Athens. More Alexandrian students followed Proclus to Athens. As the 430s progressed, these students of Plutarch's Athenian school began returning to Alexandria in order to teach what they had learned in Athens. The Athenian philosophical colonies set up by Hierocles in the 430s, Hermeias in the 440s, Ammonius and Asclepiodotus in the 460s and 470s, and Isidore in the 480s ultimately crowded out any Hypatian-style teachers who remained.

So why then can we say that Hypatia changed Alexandrian intellectual life? Her teaching ended up being a sort of evolutionary dead end. The Alexandrian philosophical culture that came to dominate the city for a century and a half and which would later inform both later Byzantine and Arab philosophy was not Hypatia's. It was instead the product of the Alexandrian students who had fled the schools of their home city for Athens. Hypatia did not create this world, but she does represent the missing link whose existence made this later evolution possible. Her success explains why those Athenian colonists could be successful in so firmly implanting Iamblichan-influenced
philosophy in a majority Christian city. Because of Hypatia, fifth-century Alexandrians already knew to look to philosophy for higher level thinking than they found in mathematics. Iamblichans then needed only to show Alexandrian students that their philosophical teaching was superior to what was already on offer. This was a challenge, but not an impossible one. Had this been tried in the early fourth century, however, the Iamblichans would have needed to do two things. Not only would they have to show that their philosophy was superior to what was offered already in Alexandria, but they would also have to contend with a powerful and entrenched Alexandrian establishment that was dominated by mathematicians who did not necessarily accept the premise that philosophers offered the highest truth. This was a much higher bar to clear and it is doubtful that the Iamblichans would have cleared it. If we turn our focus away from Hypatia’s death and look instead at her life, we can see a largely ignored but deeply important chapter in the history of Alexandrian intellectual life. We also can begin to better understand how early Byzantine philosophy too the shape that it eventually did.
Famous First Words: Pagan Cosmogonies in the Age of Justinian

The closing of the Neoplatonic Academy in Athens as a result of Justinian's ban on philosophical education and divination (529 A.D.) is one event that stands out as the final victory of Christianity against paganism. While it has been argued that paganism was already weakened by then, it is still notable that two texts from the reign of Justinian refer to one of the cornerstones of pagan philosophy: cosmogonic myths. Damascius, the last leader of the Academy, writes a lengthy treatise in which he attempts to solve the metaphysical puzzles of his predecessors and which he concludes with an overview of ancient cosmogonies from Greece and the East. Some decades after Justinian's law, John Lydus writes his own book on the history of Roman magistracies, where, quite interestingly, he illustrates one of his points with a pagan cosmogony. Throughout this paper, we hope to be able to give nuances to the matter of the terminology of Ancient Greek cosmogonies, especially since the two authors are, essentially, the terminus of this tradition.

The fact that Damascius discusses ancient creation myths in his philosophical works is definitely not a novelty, not even in the particular direction it takes. He clearly shared Plato's opinion that the “sons of gods” (i.e. the theologians) were reasonable sources, since they “may be expected to know the truth about their own parents” (Tim. 40d) – modern scholars, however, noted that this process is “at its worst in the Neoplatonists” (Guthrie 1952: 70). While this is arguably true, we cannot fully dismiss Damascius, since he is the only author who gives an organized account of the Orphic theogonies (De princ. I.285.1). In the concluding chapters of De princ., he seeks to test his theory first by comparing it with “that which is agreed by all to be the most mystical, the Chaldean” (De princ., I.285.2). Unlike his predecessors, he has a more critical approach to this source, since he favored the multiplicity – not the unity – of the intelligible (De princ., I.285.3). To argue his view, he points to Egyptian and Phoenician theurgists, all of whom mention “a vast generation of gods in the intelligible”, while even “the divine Orpheus brings in many gods” (De princ., I.285.5 – I.285.13.). The theologians' intuition is what allows Damascius to identify the traditional gods with his more abstract (see Betegh 2002: 342 – 343).

His most impressive departure consists in his description of the One:

In a certain way, the Ineffable is negative—I say in a certain way not because it is at all positive, but because this name or reality is not denial or attribution but complete removal, though the removal does not mean that it is not something, since “not something” is among things, nor is this removal itself anything at all. If we define the term “Ineffable” so that it is not even a term, all that is prior to the One then has such a nature because we can have no conception concerning what is beyond the One (De princ. I.42.1. – I.42.5).

Although Plotinus had named the first principle “the One” in order to avoid giving it a “semantically significant” designation (Rappe 2000: 209), Damascius takes this enterprise to its logical conclusion: the only way to conceptualize it is by means of ἀποφάσις, i.e. by repeatedly
denying all lesser realities so as to reach the ultimate principle of reality. However, denial itself is a form of discourse, while the Ineffable should be “outside the realm of language” and “not knowable in any way” (De princ. 1.15.18 – 1.15.23).

This is, of course, not the only aspect Damascius considers in his De principiis, which also discusses other concepts of Neoplatonism, mostly in contradiction with Proclus. However, he willingly limited himself to the very first (and most abstract) elements of the universe, which also allowed him to focus on multiple myths over fewer pages. Thus, after his lengthy examination of the Chaldean Oracles, Damascius discusses three versions of the Orphic theogony: the one from the Rhapsodies and the ones described by Hieronymus (whose identity is otherwise unknown) and the Peripatetic Eudemus, respectively.

The discovery of the Derveni papyrus gives Damascius more credibility by confirming the authenticity of several Orphic quotes. This is relevant not only in establishing the relative age of the Orphic theogonies, but also in quantifying Damascius’ own faithfulness towards his sources: for instance, he takes time to discuss the lexical and semantic difference between Chronos’ “fashioning” of the egg and “natural generation” (De princ., 1.112.1 – 1.112.3). Judging by his version of the Rhapsodies, it is likely that he didn’t actively modify the other two accounts either. Whenever he does intervene, he never fails to delimitate his analysis from the rest of the text, which is helpful in reconstructing these lost cosmogonies and his own views on Neoplatonic metaphysics.

One good example is his account of the second Orphic theogony: in the beginning, there were water and matter, from these arises the creator of the cosmic egg, a three-headed winged serpent god called Chronos or Heracles (De princ. 1.317.15 – 1.317.23). Damascius adds the Ineffable before water and matter (or mud, if we follow Athenagoras’ account, as pointed out in West 1983: 183), since any multiple principle had to come after the One. Rudhardt makes a compelling argument concerning the possibility that “water and mud” should be interpreted as a single, formless and inert primordial element (Rudhardt 1972: 16 – 17). This interpretation is plausible, since it has been shown that Hesiod’s own Chaos was not a chasm, but rather a formless and boundless something that contrasted with Gaia and her successors (Mondi 1989: 28) – here, the contrast is between water-and-mud and Chronos, who is most definitely not formless.

He credits Acusilaus (and, curiously, not Hesiod) with establishing Chaos as the primordial element “because it is completely unknowable” (De princ. 1.320.10), which might indicate that the word Χάος was vague enough to stand for the Ineffable, unlike “water” and “mud”. When he discusses the non-Greek cosmogonies, he notes that the Babylonians “seem to have passed over the unique principle of all in silence” (De princ. 1.321.1), while the Egyptian philosophers are said to have discovered the truth that “the unique principle of the all was celebrated as unknowable darkness, and this was invoked three times under this name” (De princ. 1.323.16 – 1.324.2). This primordial deity is a non-negative expression of the world of the preexistence (Bickel 1994: 31), and thus quite similar to Hesiod’s Chaos.

As such, despite the many contradictions between the various generations of Neoplatonists (who traced their philosophical genealogy in strikingly different ways, as noted by Rappe 2000: 231) Damascius seems to be aware of the existence of a longer tradition, one that he had to conserve in spite of the administrative efforts to put an end to it. Although he and his pupils were protected by Chosroes’ treaty with Justinian, one would think that De principiis was the last cosmogonical
speculation of the pagan age. Two decades later, a man of the same imperial administration would incorporate pagan cosmogonies in his personal musings.

John Lydus had left his hometown in 511 following an extensive education and headed for Constantinople, where he was eventually offered a position on the judicial staff of the eastern praetorian prefecture. Although he was fairly prosperous under the patronage of his fellow countryman for the following two decades, his fortunes changed during John the Cappadocian's term as eastern praetorian prefect (531 – 541). His new superior implemented a series of reforms that favored his own colleagues from the financial staff (Kelly 2005: 431 – 432). Following his disillusion with “the works of Fortune against learned men” (De Mag., 3.28.), Lydus starts writing antiquarian works in the early 540s, which earns him praise as a man who was prouder of his knowledge than his position (De Mag., 3.30). After his retirement in 552, he writes De magistratibus, a defense of the traditional prefecture in the guise of a historical treatise. The second book contains the following comparison between the fate of the cosmos and that of the oldest magistracy:

All beings both come into existence and exist in accordance with the nature of the good. The beings exist, as they exist, but those coming into existence do not always exist nor exist in the same manner but revolve through generation to corruption, then from corruption, nature keeping them with itself and bringing them forth again into manifestation in accordance with the standards established by the Creator. Reason asserts these principles about the original aspect of our government, in which we know that the powerful office of the cavalry commander was instituted, as I have said, before any magistracy. Then, when it had been wiped away in the course of time, it was transformed into the prefecture, but, after the latter had taken over the government, the imperial office was reduced again to the need of the cavalry commander and the previously wiped away magistracy emerged publicly through another name or rather was brought forth by the nature of public affairs, in no respect lacking its very own substantial nature but fortified with greater power and the addition of features which formerly it did not have (De Mag., 2.23).

Whereas Damascius legitimized his ideas by applying them to older theological texts, John Lydus uses a mix of his own interpretation of Plato and Aristotle (Maas 1992: 84). Maas considers that John Lydus uses some philosophical terminology “that he did not understand very well” to create “carefully considered, though eccentric, theory of decline and restoration” (Maas 1992: 75) and concludes that he was a Christian with ambiguous ties to Christianity and, most notably, a “‘Sunday philosopher’ who in his writings tried to integrate the formal studies of his youth with his own professional experience” (Maas 1992: 97).

However, if one takes Lydus’ career into consideration, it might seem odd that he quotes a cosmogony that openly contradicts Christian dogma by stating that the world was created from a pre-existing “amorphous matter” (De Mag., 3.71) without ever referring to Christian literature (Kaldellis 2003: 301). This did not go unnoticed by later authors: Photius concludes that “in matters of religion he seems to have been an unbeliever. He respects and venerates Hellenic beliefs; he also venerates our beliefs, without giving the reader any easy way of deciding whether such veneration or hypocritical” (Phot. Bibl. 180).

Maas considers that Lydus should not be defined as either a Christian or a pagan, but as a man who used ideas that “had once characterized an anti-Christian pagan polemic, but that in his hands
now were completely devoid of immediate religious association” (Maas 1992: 3). Anthony Kaldellis criticizes Maas for assuming that Lydus was an unconventional Christian and dismissing Photius’ opinion (Kaldellis 2003: 302). His own arguments against Maas might, however, help us understand why Lydus chose that cosmogony.

For one, the concept of religious dissimulation was not unknown to the people of the time: thus, Lydus is to be seen not as someone who “formally accepted the Christian faith”, but as someone who “professed it in order to comply with the laws” (Kaldellis 2003: 303). Additionally, the man Lydus praises the most in De Magistratibus is Phocas, the praetorian prefect of 532, whose appointment was due to “divine providence” (De Mag., 3.72 – 3.76). Phocas, who sympathized with Lydus more than the later superiors, was a pagan who had come under suspicion on at least two occasions and ultimately committed suicide during Justinian’s purge of 545 – 546 (Kaldellis 2003: 304). It is unlikely that John Lydus considered Phocas’ contribution to the construction of the Hagia Sophia to be a sign of faith, but rather that he had the same sense of civic duty as other rich pagans, including Proclus, whose connection to Lydus is expressed in De Mag., 3.26 and implied by his cosmogony.

Kaldellis gives convincing arguments as to why Christianity and paganism could not be described as “not mutually exclusive” (Maas 1992: 4), but rather as a matter of choice (albeit a nuanced one). In the case of Damascius, the reasons are perhaps clearer: he had witnessed the wrongdoings of the Christians in Alexandria and was, nevertheless, the leader of last rampart of paganism. In writing his cosmogony, he makes an effort to integrate all previous pagan doctrines, be they Greek or foreign. Thus, according to Rappe, Damascius’ De principiis is an attempt “to break the silence maintained for centuries concerning their mystery religions and to publish their own, alternative salvation narratives as part of a concerted effort at a pagan revival” (Rappe 2000: 198).

His theory of the Ineffable that precedes everything was in itself at odds with the Christian dogma (which Damascius neither quotes nor criticizes). The incompatibility between metaphysics and human language would put a dent in any attempt to pray to God, who would either be first and unknowable, or knowable, but not first. It is, in a sense, impressive that a polytheistic philosopher opposes monotheism by denying God’s cosmic primacy while sacrificing philosophical terminology and human language by emphasizing their inadequacy.

John Lydus, on the other hand, was not a victim of Justinian’s anti-pagan policy. Unlike his protector, he was never suspected of pagan activity and his career had only reached an impasse due to administrative changes in the praetorian prefecture. His works, however, show that he was closer to the pagan circles than a Byzantine bureaucrat should have. In addition to his tribute to Phocas, Lydus showed his affinity towards the old beliefs by comparing the restoration of the old praetorian prefecture to a cosmology that contradicted the official dogma (which he never uses to legitimize his views). His scientific neutrality becomes even more doubtful when one takes into account that he compares Isis to “our Asclepius” in De Mens., 4.45.

One point in which scholars (Kaldellis 2003: 313; Maas 1992: 4) agree is that his interest in antiquities was his way of resisting the unpleasant realities of the age of Justinian – if anything, this is the conscious choice of a man who had witnessed a time of political, cultural and religious upheaval. Damascius and Lydus wrote their books in the decades that followed the closing of the Academy – the last period in which there was a choice between Christianity and paganism, not only on a political level, but also in terms of philosophically defining the birth of the cosmos.
Since the aim of my doctoral research is to discover whether the Presocratics had introduced any kind of terminology in their cosmogonies, I would like to discuss the lexical implications of the two 6th century cosmogonies. A closer look at either of Justinian’s contemporaries will reveal traces of Presocratic thought: Lydus’ primordial amorphous matter is reminiscent of Hesiod’s Chaos and, possibly, the Orphic mud-and-water. Judging by his interest in antiquities, he would probably have been aware of Greek or foreign cosmogonies that postulated such primordial elements. In Damascius’ case, one might be tempted to argue that his interpretation was meant to compensate for the absence of any terminology in the Presocratic cosmogonies, since he redefines their concepts with the proper terms that Neoplatonism could provide. In other words, the Presocratics suffered from hypocognition, i.e. the inability to express an idea by means of a single word (Lakoff 2004: 24).

I would argue against this generalization by pointing out that Damascius still identifies single terms with each other (e.g. Acusilaus’ “Chaos” is roughly equivalent to “the unknowable”). Other texts were lacking in counterparts to the Ineffable: such is the case of the Orphic and the Babylonian theogonies. Even so, it is debatable whether there was any reason to mention an Ineffable origin in these cosmogonies, seeing how Damascius himself knew that it was flawed means of expressing the ultimate cause.

On the other hand, John Lydus argues his position by comparing the evolution of the praetorian prefecture to the laws of nature. His method is by no means innovative – it is, in a certain sense, a conceptual metaphor, i.e. “the systematic connection between two different conceptual domains, one of which acts as the target domain (X), while the other acts as the source domain (Y) within the metaphorical mapping. Thus, X is understood as Y, and one conceptual domain is made available on a cognitive level with the help of a different field of experience” (Jäkel 2003: 24). Lydus explains a matter of political bureaucracy through the lens of cosmogony, thus providing an unusual variant of the method that may have been fundamental in constructing cosmogonical terminology.

After studying this final period of Greek paganism, we are faced with a rather complex image. Damascius strived to conserve older traditions while refining the interpretations that he had inherited; Lydus hid his pagan sympathies until retirement, but his disappointment with the imperial administration made him oppose Justinian’s policy in his antiquarian works. Each of these works is of immense value to those who want to study the specialized vocabulary of ancient cosmogonies: one provides both vital sources and an intriguing reading of metaphysics; the other provides a new perspective of the process that may have been the basis of the terminology of cosmogony.
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Introduction

The objective of the named round table is to discuss new narrative and documentary evidences, as well as archeological findings, which have been discovered during the last years, cartographical, numismatic, sigillographic sources, works of art, relating to the Black Sea region in the late medieval period.

One complex of papers is dedicated to problems of international trade and to shifting of sea and land routes in the area (A. Tzavara, T.Sinclair and E.Todorova), to economic and political crisis of the mid-14th century and its origin (S. Karpov), to finances and taxation of Caffa, the greatest Black Sea town in the 15th century (M. Balard).

Another field, covered by participants, is architecture and archaeology of the Pontic region (F.Karagianni, A.Milanova, Ju.Mogarychev).

Cartography of the Black sea in the 13th-15th centuries is analyzed by K.Nenov.

New methodological approaches are equally taken into consideration. A. Nanetti has proposed an original showcase of the Black Sea region in the intercontinental network systems (1205-1479).

The wide range of source material sheds new light on political, economic and cultural life of the region as well as considerably enriches and often amends our knowledge about the history of neighboring regions, and especially Byzantium, the Eastern Mediterranean, the Caucasus and Russia. The round table session intends to develop and encourage interdisciplinary and comparative approaches contributing to bridging traditional gap between written sources and material findings.
Tana (modern-day Azov) was the most remote of all the Venetian overseas settlements. It was founded in 1320-1330s in the estuary of Don -- a periphery of the Byzantine world where sea terminals met the caravan routes running into Asia that were at the time controlled by the Golden Horde. Tana, surrounded by territories belonging to nomadic tribes, was subjected to extreme danger from its neighbors, not only from the Tatars, Zikhs, Circassians and other peoples, but also from the Genoese, who constructed a settlement nearby and became rivals and partners at the same time. Initially only earthen ditches and mounds with a wooden palisade protected Venetian Tana. A more secure yet fragile safeguard was established through agreements with the local khans and emirs. Gradually city walls and a castle were erected, helping to keep Tana safe from unexpected assaults, though these edifices were unable to protect the place from attacks of regular armies, like that of Timur in 1395 or of the Ottomans in 1475. Tana had been completely destructed several times, but it was repeatedly reconstructed from the ashes. The Venetians themselves regarded their sojourn in the region as a very dangerous enterprise and stated that it was “on the edge of the earth, in the mouth of our enemies” («ad confinia mundi et in faucibus inimicorum nostrorum»).

What drove the Venetians far from their homeland to the steppe, to its unexpected and often lethal dangers? Above all they were motivated by its potentially fabulous commercial profits, the lucrative acquisition of slaves sought after in Western Europe and in Mamluk Egypt, and scarce goods, including salmon, caviar, furs and spices. Secondly, the establishment of Tana carried the military, political and strategic interests of the maritime republic, as it was located in a place where valuable information on the situation in the East could be collected. And, due to the Ottoman expansion, this information became more and more valuable.

In 1343 a conflict arose in Tana that opposed “the Latins” against the Golden Horde, initiating a long war between the maritime republics and the Tatars, which consequently became the starting point of the global crisis of the mid 14th century. This conflict had disastrous economic and social effects and was supplemented by the most ferocious plague ever known. International trade in this region ceased to exist for a while and later, in the 1360s, changed its focus towards local products, away from the luxury goods that predominated earlier. A rather inconspicuous and apparently domestic accident in Tana in 1343 gave birth to these great disasters. Let us try to trace the origin of this accident based on available sources.

The Tatar officials and the Venetian merchants regularly acknowledged violations in paying trade taxes, the kommerkioi, established in the agreements between Venice and the Khans in 1333 and 1342. This created a potential danger of conflict of which the Senate was aware. The problem was discussed on information from reports by Venetian ambassadors to the Khan in July 1343, on the eve of the departure of a fleet of Venetian trade galleys to Tana. At this time the Senate adopted a resolution demanding that every Venetian in Tana make an oath to the Venetian consul...
in Tana to duly pay taxes to Tatar customers. Severe penalties were introduced against violators. However, perhaps this was a belated measure as the growing mutual distrust had already created the grounds for a sudden outbreak at any moment. And not by chance the conflict that occurred in Tana in September 1343 was called in the Senate official deliberations as a «casus inopinatus». It was unexpected and produced disastrous results.

What happened in Tana is described with varying degrees of detail and reliability by Venetian, Genoese, Byzantine and other historians and chroniclers. Perhaps the most complete narrative is contained in the chronicle of the Swiss Franciscan friar Johann von Winterthur, who evidently took his information from a witness or from his own written records.

The chronicler affirms that a rich and powerful pagan furiously beat a noble Venetian with his fist or a whip. The name of the offender was Hoja Omar, “Choacaamar” in Venetian transcription. Scholars believe that he was either a khan’s vicegerent, a daruga (M.G. Safargaliev), or a customs officer (V.L. Myts). When the Venetian Andreolo Civrano found a chance to avenge the insult, he along with other Venetians attacked the house of the Tartar and killed him and his domestics. Fearing Tatar attacks on Tana, the Venetians offered the Genoese to work together with the intention of returning to the Tatars their property and the bodies of persons killed in order to avoid reprisals from the “pagans.” However, the Genoese turned down this offer and, taking advantage of this opportunity, attacked the Tatars, seizing as much of their property as possible. They then escaped on their ships and sailed away. Meanwhile the Tatars, gathered in a large number, demanded that the Venetians render to them the killers and when their request was refused, they attacked the Venetians, killing 60 people. The Venetians with the help of local Greeks had in turn tied a battle, killing, as a chronicler wrote, 2000 pagans. The description clearly shows an anti-Genoese sentiment on the part of the author. Perhaps the informer belonged to the Venetian camp and thus distorted the truth concerning the rapid evacuation of the Genoese trading station. The significant losses of the Genoese in Tana contradicts their reported behavior, although unauthorized actions by some Genoese merchants and ship owners carried out to the detriment of the interests and security of the Genoese trading station in Tana cannot be excluded.

The Venetian chronicles of Enrico Dandolo (mid-XIVth century) and of Antonio Morosini (early XVth century) make small clarifications to this story. In particular, they point out that those Venetians who arrived aboard galleys had rushed to the ships leaving behind their goods and suffering losses. The same applies to some Genoese, who equally suffered damages. Some of them were able to escape to Venetian galleys. Perhaps the Venetians could have lost more people, but due to the Senate provisions adopted before the departure of Venetian commercial fleet to Romania they had avoided the worse. The Senate then demanded that the patrons of the galleys not go ashore in order to be ready to sail at any moment. The Venetian merchant fleet traditionally arrived to Tana in September and synchronized its arrival with the appearance of trade caravans from the East to conduct intermediary trade. According to the Venetian chroniclers Pietro Giustinian and Antonio Morosini, 10 Venetian galleys were in Tana captained by Nicolò Belegno. According to the deliberations of the Senate, a fleet of 7 auctioned galleys and 2 galleys equipped by the Venetian commune itself were sent to Tana from Venice on July 22, 1343. Some private ships could join the convoy. By November 22, 1343 all these ships had returned to Venice and the deliberations of the Senate state that they had suffered significant damage. Notwithstanding the events, the merchants and patrons started a dispute concerning the payment of freight for the returned cargoes. The
commander of the fleet, Nicolò Belegno, was an experienced captain, who had driven fleets from Venice to the Black Sea ports even before 1333. Being the captain in 1343, Belegno may have tried to stop the outbreak of the conflict and ordered the execution of a captured marauder. On his return to Venice he had to answer for that in the court.

The Venetian historians, the Chancellor of Crete Lorenzo Monaci (1375-1429) and Pseudo-Zancaruolo (mid-XVth century), place the blame for the incident exclusively on the Tatar who slapped a representative of the Civrano family and was consequently killed by sword on the spot. A well-informed Florentine chronicler Giovanni Villani adds that during this confrontation other “Latin” merchants also suffered, including Florentines. Sixty Western European merchants were taken in Tatar captivity, where they spent more than two years. The Venetian losses, according to his estimate, equaled more than 300 thousand florins, and that of the Genoese - 350 thousand. Later, in 1360, the Senate assessed the direct registered losses of the merchants from the incident in Tana at 166,215 ducats. In addition, we have to consider damages to the lost immovable property.

The unique material contained in the fund Grazie of the Great Council of Venice indirectly confirms the high figures of the damages borne by individual merchants. Special judges in a claims commission fixed cases of losses and accepted petitions of citizens, mainly of merchants. Here are some examples: Graziano Navagero was robbed 400 ducats and lost 2,000 ducats in Tana from the attacks of “Saracens”. The owner of a merchant ship Lorenzo Morosini purchased in Tana skins and sturgeon for 3000 ducats and lost the whole cargo in the conflict. All goods of the Viadro family company were also lost in Tana. The merchant Zanino Boldù invested in the trade with Tana his entire fortune (as it seemed profitable and attractive), but lost everything during the uprising. To compensate for the losses of this father (he had 5 children) the Venetian authorities allowed him to exploit one old galley belonging to the state and suspended rentage for 5 years. A similar decision of a preferential loan of a galley was made, also with respect to the damage endured, to Luca Marin, father of 4 children and a former patron of galleys. As recorded, he had suffered first from damages in Flanders and then moved to Tana, seeking better fortune, to meet even greater trouble there. The Venetian Republic often took into account the gravity of the damages suffered by its merchants in Tana and when it could it provided help through indirect measures, such as release from fines and penalties or by assigning income-bringing positions for a limited period. However, the Republic did not provide any direct compensation or credit to the victims.

The well-informed Byzantine historian and Emperor John VI Kantakouzenos does not contradict the descriptions presented by the cited Western European writers. He says that a Venetian had quarreled with a “Scythian” (a Tatar) and that their clash ended in homicide. The Tatars retaliated for their tribesman and the Latins for their compatriot, which consequently provoked fighting among all of them; many of the Latins were killed, while Tatars, he affirms, fell in a double quantity. After this all the Latins rushed onto their ships, while the “Scythians” could not, because they were not knowledgeable in the art of navigation. Instead, they besieged Caffa, a fortress, built by the Genoese at the seaside of “Scythia”. The siege lasted for 2 years to no avail and there were significant losses among the inhabitants of the city. Despite the weakness of the city walls (their construction was not completed), the defenders fought bravely and the Genoese spent a lot of money on mercenaries and suffered significant losses.
Another Byzantine erudite Nicephoros Gregoras misplaced the episode and inserted it into his discourse about the foundation of Caffa and the growing arrogance of the Genoese. One of the Latins, according to Gregoras, offended a “Scythian” at a marketplace. The Tatar hit the offender with a whip and was immediately hacked to death by him with a sword. A great confusion (θόρυβος) ensued. The head of the “Scythians” (the Khan) was filled with anger and considered the incident to be a violation of his sovereign rights. He demanded that the Latins leave the city, which they refused to do and with insults sent the Khan’s ambassador back. In response, the Khan besieged the city (Caffa) and unsuccessfully fought the war, because the Genoese had fortified the town and supplied it from sea. In addition, they organized a maritime blockade and destabilized the trade of grain, thus causing a lack of bread in the Tatar-dominated coastal areas, where they also captured slaves. The besiegers became besieged. As a result, Gregoras explained the motives of the conflict, but confounded the events in Tana with the siege of Caffa that followed the Tana incident.

Not only the Venetians in Tana bore heavy damages. Those who performed voyages through the territory of the Golden Horde and used previously safe trade routes equally suffered from robberies and many were captured. One of them, a nobleman Nicoletto Dolfin, later reported that he was seized long away from Tana. All his goods, including wares belonging to other people, were robbed; he was left in one shirt, tied up and cast into jail, where he was kept naked in a closed room. The merchant suffered from food deprivation. At a great risk to his life, he managed to escape and reach some compatriots. He was obliged to make a loan of 12 lire of grossi to payout those who helped him escape and to disburse his travel back to Venice. Upon his return, he asked the Venetian authorities for a compensation, taking into account his father’s services to the Republic, and demanded to be granted some trade privileges. After many legal proceedings, he received such privileges, but did not have time to make use of it.

The Christian merchants expelled from Tana found their refuge behind the walls of Caffa, that endured a three-year siege. The provisioning of the city by ships helped to save the fortress from capture, but not from the pandemic of the plague, which rapidly spread from the Black Sea shores all over Europe with unprecedented human losses.

Still, not the entire property of the Venetians had been lost, despite the fact that all the “Saracens and Tartars living in Tana” had participated in the hostilities against the settlement. Merchant galleys staying on the roads managed to take on board some goods of the Venetians and other Latins and brought them to Venice. Some merchants with their goods were transported to Constantinople and remained there. At the beginning of 1344 the Senate decided to send 2 galleys to support trade in Romania and to bring goods from there. All this demonstrates the importance the Venetians ascribed to the trade with Tana and their remaining hope of one day resuming their profitable viagium, with the desire «ire ad Tanam vel in Romaniam», despite the fact that, as the document says, “via Tane expiraverit propter casum occursum”.

Venice was slowly drawn into a crisis. It steadily gathered information about the true state of affairs. One of the couriers, carrying a message about the incident, was killed on his way. On October 25, 1343 the Senate, based on the obtained information, appointed a commission to study the incident. This commission was instructed to analyze all the particularities of the incident and in a week’s time to provide a written proposal to the Senate. It became clear that during the riots in Tana some Venetians took (and possibly robbed) property from the neighboring “Saracens”. Learning of this the Senate passed a special deliberation requiring the Venetians concerned to denounce in written form what property they had of others and how it came into their hands within 8 days after the announcement.
of this decree by public heralds. The government sought to achieve a reconciliation with the Khan and was eager to return the property seized from the Tatars during the conflict. The deliberation of the Senate in 1349 summed up the value of the confiscated goods in the hands of the Venetians. It equaled to 3700 ducats, but it was only a small fraction of what they really lost.

In November 1343, when the involvement of certain Venetians in the excesses that took place in Tana became clear, the Senate formed a special commission of the highest magistrates of the Republic to investigate the case and to arrest the culpable in the murderers, allowing the use of torture during the inquest. The Grand Council created a special judicial board of three members to conduct the inquiry, noting that ordinary judges could not carry out this investigation due to branched family ties among the patricians, which included suspects in the excesses in Tana.

Later, when the investigation was closing, the Grand Council noted that had the rules of excluding relatives been strictly applied, then almost no one could have been a member of the court. Consequently, the Senate decided to exclude from the board only the nearest relatives of the accused or those involved in transactions with them: fathers, sons and brothers. But even then relatives of two of the three judges appointed by the Great Council were co-involved in the transactions with the accused Nicoletto Civrano. Despite this the auditors were allowed to carry out the process, because it was not possible to find patricians not involved in the transactions with the accused in the Tana cases. So great was the commercial integration of the Venetian patricians in the commerce with Tana.

The proceeding dragged on slowly and the Senate had repeatedly extended the work of the board of judges. Finally, on March 30, 1344 the Senate brought charges in the murders of the “Saracens” in their own houses in Tana against Petraca Contarini, Marino Soranzo and against two sansers: Andrea from Parma and Abraham from Cremona, and a servant of Graziano Zorzi named Moramus. The accused were not present in Venice, but the strong evidence of their guilt incited public criers to encourage them and their lawyers to appear in court in Venice within 8-days time. All this was done in the search for a speedy reconciliation with the Khan, which had been achieved first by the Genoese and later by the Venetians in 1347.

The direct effects of the outbreak of the conflict with the Golden Horde had been very painful for the maritime republics and for all of Europe. Italy and the Byzantine Empire had began to feel the shortage of bread and salted fish imported from the Black Sea, an important dietary element. The prices for spices and silk had quickly doubled and the value of slaves considerably augmented, which was important manpower, especially considering the human loss due to the plague. The increased difficulties of exporting goods also brought detrimental consequences. The established links between the Venetian settlements through the markets of the Volga-Caspian region with Persia, Central Asia, India and China, which passed through Tana and Caffa, were broken. As a result, the navigation of Venetian merchant galleys to Tana was interrupted for five years, while at the same time the pope imposed severe bans prohibiting trade with Alexandria, which made the crisis even more noticeable. The first thing that the Venetians undertook was to soften the papal restrictions and to conclude an agreement with the Mamluk sultan permitting Venetian trade in his dominions. This was, however, only a partial indemnification. But while Venice managed to find at least some kind of compensatory mechanism, in Byzantium the crisis intensified the political instability, the shortages of vital goods and brought further altercations with the Italian maritime republics.

Clashes in a market place in a seemingly peripheral area caused global instability. And this is why this example is relevant.
Finances et fiscalité à Caffa au XVᵉ siècle

Pendant plus de soixante ans (1280-1345), Caffa, la grande colonie génoise sur les côtes de Crimée, a été la plaque tournante du commerce international, le débouché des routes mongoles de la soie et des épices, le relais par excellence entre les terres russes et mongoles et l'Occident, le poste de commandement de tous les comptoirs que les Génois avaient réussi à créer en mer Noire lors de la première moitié du XIVᵉ siècle. La ville, devenue l'une des plus grandes agglomérations des régions pontiques, avec au moins une dizaine de milliers d'habitants à la fin du XIVᵉ siècle, en avait tiré une grande prospérité qu'attestent aussi bien les actes notariés instrumentés in situ que le montant des taxes douanières perçues par les autorités du lieu.

L'essor commercial de Caffa reposait sur la libre circulation des navires dans les Détroits (Dardanelles et Bosphore) et des marchands occidentaux sur les routes mongoles, aboutissant à Tana à l'est, ou à Trébizonde au sud de la mer Noire. L'horizon des hommes d'affaires s'assombrit dans la seconde moitié du XIVᵉ siècle, avec l'avènement en Chine de la dynastie des Ming, hostile à tout contact avec l'étranger, et surtout avec la progression des Ottomans qui menacent Constantinople aux lendemains de la défaite des croisés à Nicopolis et finalement s'emparent le 29 mai 1453. Cet événement majeur de l'histoire orientale et même mondiale a naturellement des conséquences sur le sort des colonies pontiques de Gênes et sur Caffa en particulier. Les flux commerciaux entre l'Occident et la mer Noire sont entravés par la domination turque sur les Détroits, le tribut imposé à Caffa par les Ottomans ainsi que les dépenses occasionnées par l'armement des navires et l'entretien des fortifications grèvent le budget du comptoir, alors que ses ressources s'affaissent. Il s'agit donc de voir les conséquences de la prise de Constantinople sur les finances et la fiscalité de Caffa, au moment où le Banco di San Giorgio, association des créanciers de la Commune de Gênes, se voit concéder la gestion des colonies pontiques.

Nous disposons pour ce faire des registres comptables de la Massaria (Trésorerie) de Caffa, conservés en une série discontinue et souvent désordonnée, à la suite des destructions provoquées par le bombardement de Gênes en 1684 par la flotte de Louis XIV. Les employés préposés à la réorganisation des archives dans les années suivantes ont souvent mélangé en un même registre...

---

4 Archives d'État de Gênes (abrégé A.S.G.), San Giorgio, Caffa Massaria, registres n° 1224 à 1262.
des cahiers appartenant à des années différentes, parfois éloignées les unes des autres. Le premier d’entre eux, pour le XVe siècle, va du 9 juillet 1410 au 19 mai 1412. La série s’interrompt de 1412 à 1420, puis de 1426 à 1441, de 1443 à 1446, enfin de 1448 à 1454 pour ne retrouver une certaine régularité que de 1455 à 1473, les derniers registres de l’administration génoise ayant sans doute disparu dans la tourmente de la conquête ottomane deux ans plus tard. Mais les années représentées ne le sont pas toujours de manière continue. Certains registres peuvent correspondre à une année fiscale complète ; d’autres, en revanche, ne comportent que des cahiers arrachés à des registres aujourd’hui disparus et portant sur des années échelonnées tout au long du siècle. Il n’est donc pas toujours aisé d’obtenir des informations sur la totalité du budget de la colonie génoise ni sur les diverses taxes qui l’alimentent et qui constituent l’essentiel des ressources caffiotes.

Celles-ci se présentent sous le nom de gabelles ou introytus et sont mises aux enchères soit chaque année pour les plus importantes, soit pour une période de plusieurs années pour les plus modestes. Un article de la Massaria de 1420 indique la procédure suivie. Le consul Manfredo Sauli, assisté des trésoriers et des quatre membres de l’Officium Monete, met aux enchères, par l’intermédiaire du crieur public et en présence de nombreux habitants, citoyens et bourgeois, la gabelle sur les courtages (gabella censarie) qui est adjugée à Andrea de Octovegio, le plus enchérisseur, pour la somme de 771 sommi, soit 155.742 aspres, payables par quart, tous les trois mois. Quatre Génois se portent garants de l’adjudicataire qui, pour enchérir, a au préalable déposé un sommo (barre d’argent équivalant au début du XVe siècle à 202 aspres, la monnaie de Caffa). De fait, dans la comptabilité en partie double, tenue par les trésoriers de l’administration, se retrouve généralement au debet du bénéficiaire et au recepimus du compte Commune ou de l’introytus gabellarum le versement trimestriel du bénéficiaire.

Parmi les gabelles levées à Caffa, comme d’ailleurs dans les autres comptoirs génois d’Orient, les comerchia fournissent les plus importants revenus à la Commune. On peut y voir l’équivalent des carati, la principale taxe douanière génoise, et surtout l’héritage du kommerkion byzantin frappant l’importation, l’exportation et la circulation des marchandises et la vente sur les marchés. Institut en 1316 par l’Officium Gazarie de Gênes, soucieux de promouvoir la reconstruction du comptoir, après qu’il ait été ravagé par les troupes mongoles, ce comerchium a subi des augmentations et une diversification au cours des XIVe et XVe siècles : d’abord fixé à un taux de 0,5%, il est porté en 1351 à 1% de la valeur des marchandises, tant à l’entrée qu’à la sortie, se dénomme comerchium magnum en 1411, date où est instauré un comerchium parvum au taux de 1,5%, qui passe à 1,6% après 1453, à la suite d’une augmentation partielle (salsa) décidée par le Banco di San Giorgio. Ce dernier, à court d’argent, institue deux nouveaux comerchia : une gabelle de 1% affermée pour la première fois en 1455 et une autre de 0,25% affermée en 1457. Toutefois, à partir de 1469, le Banco unifie ces diverses taxes en adjoignant les quatre comerchia à un seul acheteur, ce qui en porte le taux à 3,85%, que l’on comparera aux 5,43%, taux de base des carati maris perçus à Gênes au début du XVe siècle. Malgré ces augmentations successives, le régime douanier de Caffa demeure plus favorable aux affaires que celui de la métropole.

5 A titre d’exemple, le registre n° 1228 contient 13 cahiers répartis de 1420 à 1473.
6 ASG Caffa Massaria n° 590/1229 (année 1420), f. 4r.
Mais il faut tenir compte d’autres taxes pesant sur le trafic : la *cabella ponderis et scalitici*, instituée par le Banco di San Giorgio en 1455, succède à l’*introitus pontis et ponderis Caffe* qui frappait au XIVᵉ siècle la pesée des marchandises chargées ou déchargées sur les quais du port.

S’y ajoutent une *cabella salse*, au taux de 4%, qui apparaît pour la première fois en 1441, une *cabella censarie*, taxe sur les courtages, au taux d’un aspre et demi par sommo de transaction, soit environ 0,74%. La taxe est due pour chaque vente, effectuée avec ou sans l’intervention d’un courtier, de sorte que le montant de l’adjudication est un indice minimal de l’évolution des affaires, puisque l’adjudicataire espérait percevoir un montant supérieur de 25 à 50 % pour couvrir ses frais et lui procurer quelque bénéfice.

Cet ensemble de taxes douanières fournit toutefois des revenus inférieurs aux taxes sur la consommation, en particulier les gabelles sur le vin qui sont d’un gros profit pour l’administration coloniale : *introitus* de 1,5% par metreta (mesure de capacité correspondant à 95 litres selon un auteur, à 159 selon un autre13), *cabella* de 11% sur la vente du vin, augmentée en 1456 par le Banco d’une gabelle de 0,5 aspre par metreta, puis d’un aspre supplémentaire en 146214, et d’une *stazia vini*, petite taxe sur la jauge du vin, soit au total cinq prélèvements différents qui frappent la commercialisation du vin et constituent la plus grosse part des recettes sur la consommation. S’y ajoutent la *cabella jhegatarie granorum* et la *cabella jhegatarie erbarum*. Le mot *jhegataria* est sans aucun doute d’origine mongole. Le statut de Caffa de 1449 précise les tarifs à percevoir sur les charrettes apportant blé, orge et millet à Caffa ou sur la vente de ces produits au bazar de la ville : de 6 aspres pour les céréales à un demi aspre pour les amandes et caroubes, tandis que les légumes et les fruits ne paient qu’un aspre ou un demi, selon la capacité des charrettes.

De même origine mongole apparaissent deux taxes sur la vente des tissus, l’*introitus tamoge parve*, frappant la vente des camelots et des toiles de chanvre, et l’*introitus tamoge magne* celle des velours, des camocats et des bocassins. Les autorités génoises ont aussi créé des taxes sur les cuirs (*cabella sive appaltus coreorum*), sur la soie (*officium ponderis septe*), sur les draps (*cabella pannorum*) et sur le bétail (*cabella bestiaminum*). Les approvisionnements venus par terre et par mer sont frappés de droits particuliers : la *cabella victualium campanie* et la *cabella victualium maris*. On ne saurait oublier que Caffa joue un rôle essentiel dans l’exportation des esclaves pontiques vers l’Occident ou vers l’Égypte mamelouke : l’instauration d’une *cabella capitum februarii* et d’une *cabella capitum iunii* est là pour nous le rappeler, sans que l’on puisse, dans l’état actuel des connaissances, distinguer l’une de l’autre : est-ce, comme à Gênes,16 la distinction entre une taxe sur la vente des esclaves et une autre sur leur possession ? La petite différence entre leurs montants respectifs est loin d’équivaloir à celle des deux taxes génoises, qui va de un à quatre.

L’addition de tous ces revenus permet-elle à l’administration génoise de Caffa de subvenir à ses besoins financiers ? En fait, il n’en est rien. Dès la fin du XIVᵉ siècle, lorsque les trois premiers registres de la *Massaria* révèlent le budget approximatif de la colonie, son déficit est structurel : la

---

14 ASG, Caffa Massaria n° 239, f. 14v ; n° 1242, f. 39r.
guerre contre Dobrotitch, dynaste en Dobroudja (1374-1375), la participation de Caffa à la guerre de Chioggia contre Venise, puis le conflit contre les Tatars de Solgat entraînent de lourdes dépenses militaires et obèrent les ressources de la colonie. Elle est vite contrainte de recourir à des expédients : emprunts gagés sur les revenus de telle ou telle gabelle, nouvelles taxes et aliénation à de riches particuliers de revenus publics, telles sont les méthodes auxquelles recourt l’administration caffiote pour se procurer de l’argent frais en créant des parts d’une dette publique qui, au fil des ans, ne fait que s’accroître. En 1398, les ambassadeurs de la colonie criméenne, envoyés en métropole, demandent au doge que les dépenses militaires soient limitées et qu’aucune nouvelle ressource ne puisse être attribuée aux créanciers de l’État, car « créer des luoghi (parts de la dette) de la Commune auxquels l’on attribue des revenus, c’est étouffer l’État et soumettre les habitants à de nouvelles gabelles ».

La situation financière de Caffa reste soumise aux mêmes contraintes au cours du XVᵉ siècle, d’autant plus qu’aux dépenses ordinaires s’ajoutent de lourdes charges de défense (armement de galères, achats d’armes, restauration des fortifications) et surtout, après 1453 le versement d’un tribut annuel payé aux Ottomans. Celui-ci passe de 246.350 aspres en 1457 à 333.146 aspres en 1473, selon le barème suivant :

![Graphique du tribut versé aux Turcs](image)

Comment l’administration génoise peut-elle faire face à ces charges ? Peut-elle se satisfaire de l’ensemble des gabelles ? Le tableau de leur montant fait apparaître d’importantes ressources en 1410, s’élèvant à plus de deux millions d’aspres, mais un net fléchissement à partir des années 1426 pour atteindre un minimum en 1446 avec 673.224 aspres, soit moins du tiers des rentrées de l’année 1410 :

---

On ne s’étonnera donc pas que l’effondrement du produit fiscal ait incité les autorités génoises à confier la gestion de Caffa au Banco di San Giorgio, jugé seul capable de redresser la situation. De fait, bien que l’on ne connaisse pas les effets immédiats de cette prise de possession, dès 1456 le montant total des gabelles se relève à plus d’un million et demi d’aspres, sans doute en raison de l’augmentation du taux du *comerchium parvum* et de la création d’un nouveau *comerchium*, au taux de 1%, de la *cabella ponderis et scaliatici*, tous deux prélevés pour la première fois en 1455 et de la gabelle d’un demi aspre par *metreta* de vin, créée en 1456. Mais pendant dix ans, le montant des gabelles fléchit de nouveau et il faut attendre la fin des années 1460 pour qu’un relèvement se constate, dû essentiellement aux années de répit que connaît Caffa entre 1463 et 1473, les Ottomans étant alors occupés par la guerre vénétoturque en mer Égée et par le conflit entre la Porte et le seigneur du Mouton Blanc, Ouzoum Hassan18. La plupart des taxes frappant l’activité commerciale connaissent ainsi une embellie dans les dernières années de la domination génoise, comme l’attestent les graphiques du *comerchium parvum* et de la *cabella ponderis et scaliatici*. De même le montant des taxes sur la consommation se relève, grâce à l’augmentation des taux, ce qui pourrait expliquer les troubles de la population caffiote, réduite en nombre par suite du départ de beaucoup de Ligures, mais plus durement assujettie au paiement des taxes sur les produits de première nécessité.

L’examen de l’évolution de quelques gabelles fait ressortir le contraste entre les taxes douanières dont le produit baisse régulièrement, et les taxes sur la consommation, beaucoup plus stables. La vente aux enchères du *comerchium magnum* atteint son maximum en 1410, avec un montant de 462.782 aspres ; en 1468, dernière année avant la fusion des quatre *comerchia*, la vente ne rapporte plus que 182.013 aspres, soit à peine 40% du montant initial. Le *comerchium parvum*, vendu 379.760 aspres en 1411 ne produit plus que 238.562 aspres en 1471, soit 62% du montant initial. Seule la *cabella ponderis et scalitici* demeure à peu près stable entre 1455 et 1473, avec des valeurs fluctuant autour de 10.000 aspres par an19.

---

Les taxes sur la consommation ne varient guère d'une année à l'autre, ayant même tendance à augmenter dans les dernières années de la domination génoise. Par exemple la cabella victualium campanie, après un fléchissement entre 1460 et 1468, retrouve après 1470 les valeurs les plus hautes des trente dernières années, de même que la cabella ihegatarie granorum qui atteint une somme de 236.592 aspres en 1472, à comparer avec un produit de 23.000 aspres en 1457, et la cabella victualium maris, vendue 156.500 aspres en 1473, mais seulement 84.394 aspres en 1442. Les gabelles sur les approvisionnements atteignent donc leur rapport maximum dans les dernières années de l'administration génoise, accroissant ainsi le coût de la vie et, par conséquent, la rancœur des administrés envers les autorités de Caffa.

Les difficultés financières de la colonie peuvent être illustrées par le rendement déclinant des taxes sur les esclaves. Caffa, pendant près de deux siècles, a été l’un des marchés les plus importants de la traite. De là partaient des Tatars, des Zygues, des Lazes, des Circassiens, soit vers les grandes métropoles d’Occident, soit vers l’Égypte mamelouke où ils venaient renforcer les corps d’armée de la Bahriyya. Le témoignage en 1420 d’Emanuel Piloti dénonçant le rôle funeste des Génois dans la traite, rappelle que ce sont plus de 2.000 âmes qui prennent chaque année la route du Caire à partir de la Crimée. De fait, en 1411, la cabella capitum februarii est adjugée à Raffael Salvaygo pour un montant de 475 sommi, soit 95.950 aspres. Le montant des enchères, augmenté d’environ 25% pour les frais et le bénéfice du collecteur, est un indice de l’importance de la traite, soit une valeur d’environ 120.000 aspres à cette date. Le taux étant de 41 aspres par tête, ce sont au minimum 2900 esclaves qui ont été taxés, un chiffre proche de celui que rapportait Piloti. Au cours du XVᵉ siècle, les montants des deux gabelles sur les esclaves, celle de février et celle de juin, toutes deux affermées, baissent par paliers : 65.044 aspres pour la gabelle de février en 1442, 41.000 en 1456, 19.100 en 1459 et 20.100 en 1471, date à laquelle il n’est plus question de la cabella capitum iunii, peut-être réunie à la précédente sous la simple appellation de cabella capitum. Ces chiffres, augmentés de 25% pour le profit de l’adjudicataire, signifiaient que la traite ne concernerait plus que 1980 « têtes » en 1442, 1250 en 1456, environ 600 en 1471-1472. Il s'agit là d'un effondrement d'un commerce extrêmement prospère au XIVᵉ siècle et qui, de plus, échappe progressivement aux Génois, pour passer aux mains de négociants grecs et sarrasins qui transportent les esclaves vers les ports turcs d'Anatolie, dont le rôle de relais pour les esclaves-soldats emmenés vers l’Égypte devient essentiel.

Pour essayer de surmonter le déficit structurel de leur budget, les autorités génoises de Caffa ont recours à des expédients : d’une part créer une nouvelle taxe, dite salsa, en fait une hausse du taux des taxes existantes. Instituée en 1455, puisqu'elle est qualifiée à cette date de nuper imposita, elle rapporte 123.624 aspres lors de sa création, est renouvelée chaque année, mais son produit se réduit à 56.207 aspres en 1471 et remonte à 76.000 en 1473. D’autre part, imposer des emprunts forcés, tels...
celui de 1412 auquel participe le célèbre Nicola Notaras29, ou celui de 1455 imposé aux Arméniens (75.546 aspres), aux Grecs (31.070 aspres) et aux Juifs (29.950 aspres)30. En de nombreuses occasions, les autorités de Caffa sont ainsi contraintes de créer des parts (luoghi) de la dette publique et d’affecter à celle-ci les revenus de certaines gabelles pour en payer les intérêts31. Une administration spécialisée est créée pour gérer la dette publique, dont l’accroissement, au fil des ans, impose l’instauration de nouvelles gabelles ou la hausse (salsa) du taux des gabelles anciennes. Un engrenage sans issue, qui profite à l’élite génoise, mais dresse la plus grande partie de la population contre les autorités.

Moins intéressé par l’affectage des taxes sur la traite que par la gestion de la dette publique, un milieu restreint de fermiers s’enrichit ainsi en se faisant adjudger la perception des comerchia et des taxes sur la consommation, tout en entretenant des liens étroits avec les responsables de l’administration caffite. Dans ce milieu ne figure aucun Oriental, à l’exception de quatre individualités qui n’ont pas joué un rôle majeur dans la gestion financière de la colonie. Trois Grecs, Anthonius Tatoli, Vaxillis de Janachi et Christofforus Narice obtiennent l’adjudication pour un an ou deux, l’un de l’introytus ponderis et scaliatìci, l’autre de l’Hôtel des monnaies (la Zecca), le troisième de la gabelle du vin de Cembalo (Balaklava), tandis que le Juif Cochos se rend acquéreur en 1471 de la Zecca, mais se retrouve débiteur de 21.341 aspres à la fin de sa gestion32. A ces exceptions près, il est clair que toute la vie financière de la colonie se trouve aux mains des grandes familles génoises.

Ses représentants s’illustrent en effet comme adjudicataires des gabelles. Les exemples pourraient être multipliés. Entre 1459 et 1465, Andrea Fatinanti domine la perception des gabelles pesant sur le vin. Entre 1457 et 1470 Babilano Adorno s’intéresse aux taxes sur les approvisionnements venus par terre ou par mer et à la perception des droits sur le vin à La Copa. Paolo de Roistropis monopolise la perception des gabelles de 0,25% et de 1% entre 1463 et 1468 et Andrea Zaccaria celle de la tamoga parva de 1462 à 1471. A côté de ces individualités se distinguent quelques groupes familiaux : les de Gaspe représentés par Antonio (1455-56), Domenico (1466-1471), Giuliano (1457-1472), Lorenzo (1458-1471) et Lodisio (1446-1458), qui passent de la perception d’une gabelle à une autre ; les Fieschi avec Luchino, Innocenzo, Teodoro et surtout Giuliano qui, entre 1456 et 1473, est le plus gros traitant de Caffa, ayant investi près de deux millions d’aspres dans l’affectage de diverses gabelles. On citera encore six Spinola, trois Doria, trois Grimaldi, trois Adorno, tous des habitués des enchères, alternant la perception des gabelles avec des responsabilités politiques33.

Ces aspects des finances et de la fiscalité de Caffa sont tout à fait comparables à ceux de la métropole génoise. Indigence financière des autorités, mais richesse de quelques élites marchandes, recours constant à des expédients et gonflement de la dette publique, création de nouvelles gabelles ou hausse du taux des plus anciennes, telles sont les caractéristiques d’un budget en déficit structurel. Mais si, en métropole, le mécontentement de ceux qui paient peut être canalisé, à Caffa, majoritairement peuplée d’Arméniens, de Grecs, de Juifs et de Mongols, la lourdeur des taxes s’ajoute aux tensions ethniques et religieuses, créant une situation explosive, dont profitent les Ottomans en 1475 pour s’emparer de la ville en quelques jours.

30 Ibidem, p. 30
32 ASG, Caffa Massaria n° 1240, f. 38r et 118r ; n° 1241, f. 18r ; n° 1240, f. 171r ; n° 1260, f. 126v ; n° 1259, f. 102r ; n° 1241, f. 118r ; n° 1247, f. 52v.

The role of Constantinople in the ecclesiastical architecture both in and outside of the byzantine empire has often been pointed out. In all the byzantine world as well as in the areas under its radiation a series of monuments has been preserved in which the influence of the architecture of the capital, its typological and morphological characteristics are distinguished and recognizable. The existed medieval monuments indicate that in the Black Sea area there were activated building workshops which had direct relationship with the capital, including builders who were originated from Constantinople, or were extremely familiar with the Constantinopolitan architectural and artistic trends.

The closest to the Constantinopolitan architecture is the case of Mesemvria (mod. Nessebar), where some very important monuments of byzantine style are preserved influenced by the nearby capital. In terms of typology, the monuments of the period preserve a variety of types (three aisled timber-roofed basilica (St. Stefan or New Metropolis), single-space church (St. Paraskevi and St. Theodore), single domed church (Archangels) but mainly, the most preferable type of the era: cross in square, of the composite four-columned type (St. Aleitourgetos, Pantokrator). Especially in St. John Aleitourgetos, one can easily follow the Constantinopolitan planning forms of a tripartite sanctuary developed in the eastern part of the central square, defined by the necessary three apses and by a characteristic pair of piers.

The churches display considerable similarities in the sector of masonries and morphological characteristics which all recall the art of the capital. They are all built with the opus mixtum technique which is one of the two dominant techniques found in Constantinople even from the early Christian era (e.g. in big part of the Theodosian walls) and mainly in the monuments of the middle and late byzantine period. In this case, the walls of the churches are built with zones of ashlar stone blocks, alternating with multiple courses of bricks.

The facades of the monuments of Mesemvria also recall the impression given by the Constantinopolitan ones since they are articulated with blind arches and niches. Especially in the apse, the narrow and tall blind arches are modulated in two zones, as in many middle and late byzantine monuments of the capital (Lips Monastery, Zeyrek Camii, Pammakaristos chapel, Chora chapel etc.)

In the general system of the exterior arcading, one can also highlight the fact that the pilaster strips between the blind arches in the exterior of the churches, do not correspond to the structural system within the building, which is a characteristic found in some of the early Paleologan churches of Constantinople.

Furthermore, the monuments of the Paleologan period in Mesemvria become extremely colorful with the alternation of white ashlar with red bricks in the vaults as well as with the extended
use of bricks incorporated in ways which form a variety of ceramoplastic patterns in the tympana of the blind arches. In comparison with other monuments of the byzantine world, in Mesemvria’s churches, following the example of the capital, the ceramoplastic decoration includes patterns found in Constantinopolitan monuments, and covers the arched part and not the whole vertical tympanum of the blind niches.

To the north of the Black Sea, in the Crimean Peninsula, the influences of the byzantine Constantinopolitan architecture are traced in Cherson (mod. Sevastopol), which never stopped having direct relationship with the capital. Among the numerous monuments, Jakobson excavated three churches built in the byzantine type of the simple four columned cross in square (nos 9, 6, 21). Although the churches have not been preserved in big height, the excavational data lead in their dating to the middle byzantine period.

Some kilometers to the east of Cherson, at the edge of the Crimean peninsula, in Cimmerian Bosporus city (mod. Kerch), there has been preserved one of the most important medieval monuments of the Black Sea area, St. John, where the byzantine architecture of the capital in reflected both in the type as well as in the morphological characteristics. The church has been extensively restored at the ‘90s and has been dated by scholars in two periods: 8th and 14th c. It consists a typical byzantine cross in square of simple, four-columned type, where the sanctuary coincides with the eastern part of the square. The interesting characteristic here is the height of the monument, which is extremely big, due to the fact that the four columns support piers on which the central dome rises, a characteristic found in Northern Balkan (Serbian)- Russian architecture. As a result, in the exterior of the church the arms of the cross with the dome in the centre are highly protruded whereas the four bays in the corners are covered in a much lower level, by pitched roofs.

The exterior of the monument repeats, like the Constantinopolitan and Mesemvrian monuments, the opus mixtum technique with the alternation of zones with stones and bricks, whereas the whole surface is fully articulated with successive blind arches and niches in zones. What one has to highlight here though is the construction of the arches of the niches only with bricks, unlike the Constantinopolitan practice where in the arches of the blind niches one can see an alternation of bricks and stones. Moreover, another peculiar characteristic is also the articulation of surfaces in the upper parts of all sides of the exterior of the arms of the crosses, a characteristic that is not familiar to the byzantine architecture of Constantinople.

To the south coast of Euxeinus Pontus, in Trebizond, even from the middle byzantine period there have been erected ecclesiastical monuments repeating architectural types of the capital, mainly the cross in square type, in many variations. But one can undoubtedly recognize that maybe the Trabezuntine architecture is the less close to the capital, since it incorporates local characteristics and influences mainly from the close-by Georgian and Armenian architecture. The Constantinopolitan trends are mainly focused on the use of opus sectile floors, of columns, capitals and bases coming from the quarries of the capital.

Among the most important monuments, one can focus on the church of St Sophia in Trebizond, which was built on a local variation of the cross in square where the bays in the corners are elongated and porches are annexed to the north and south aisles.

The extended use of stone in all the monuments of the city and the very characteristic relief decoration preserved in the surfaces of the porches of Hagia Sophia, as well as in t dome drums
of St. Philip and St. Eugenios are characteristics of the mountainous architecture of Asia Minor, influenced by the Armenian and Georgian architecture. On the other hand, the existence of bricks in structural points of the masonries, such as in the tympanum of the dome recall the byzantine tradition of the capital.

Based on the testimony of the medieval monuments of 13th to 15th c. one can conclude that they are very often taking mixed characteristics which are defined by the local architectural trends, the building materials that is available (stone or bricks), decorative principles and motives. In any cases though, the influence of the capital is visible and can be identified both in the typological solutions given in the monuments, but also in the configuration of their facades, in the masonries, as well as in the decorative motives.
La sculpture architecturale de la côte bulgare de la mer Noire entre l'Est et l'Ouest aux XIIIe–XVe siècles

Ce texte est basé sur les résultats préliminaires d'un projet franco-bulgare qui étudie la sculpture architecturale byzantine de la côte bulgare de la mer Noire du IVe au XVe siècle et auquel participent également B. Bavant, C. Vanderheyde et M. Vaklinova. Pour cette raison, le présent texte se propose de cerner l'état des échanges dans cette zone entre le XIIIe et le XVe siècle par l'étude des sculptures préservées dans les musées et sur les sites du littoral entre les villes de Kavarna au nord et d'Ahtopol au sud.

Durant le Moyen âge, la côte occidentale de la mer Noire a toujours été partagée entre plus d'un agent politique. Pendant le haut Moyen âge et jusqu'à la fin Xe s., l'Empire byzantin et le Royaume bulgare ont rivalisé pour la domination de la région. À partir du début du XIe s., les Nomades tardifs devinrent aussi acteurs, d'abord par leurs ravages puis par leur installation – les Petchénègues et les Ouzes les premiers, et après le XIIe s. et d'une manière plus décisive, les Coumans. A partir du XIIIe s., parmi les forces qui se disputaient l'influence sur le territoire, les ressources et les hommes de cette région pontique se suivent les Tatars, et d'une manière plus prononcée au siècle suivant les Occidentaux (Vénitiens, Génois et de façon transitoire les Francs du conte Amédée de Savoie). Les rivalités maritimes entre Vénitiens et Génois impliquèrent d'autres états balkaniques (surtout le Royaume de Serbie et la principauté valaque) et différents souverains indépendants ou semi-indépendants. Ce milieu à pluralité ethnique, culturelle et religieuse se greffa sur une société déjà hétérogène constituée essentiellement de Bulgares, de Grecs et d'orientaux, principalement des Syriens et des Arméniens. C'est ainsi que la côte occidentale de la Mer Noire représente aux XIIIe–XVe s. un carrefour où se rencontrèrent une fois de plus l'Est et l'Ouest.

Jusqu'à présent, les chercheurs se sont intéressés surtout aux conséquences politiques, économiques et plus rarement démographiques de la présence ou simplement du passage des éléments étrangers évoqués. Elles ont été étudiées sur la base des textes essentiellement – chroniques, actes des archives occidentales, cartes. Peut-on diversifier ce fond documentaire en interrogeant des données issues d'horizons autres que celui de l'histoire traditionnelle des textes et découvrir ainsi un autre visage du passé? On pense d'abord aux données du terrain. Dans ce sens le matériel numismatique et sigillographique a été le premier à être interprété puisqu'il reflète directement les aspects politiques et économiques principalement traités dans la littérature scientifique existante. Or, les données des objets d'art et de l'architecture auxquelles on ne pose pas de questions historiques proprement dites restent largement inexploitées. Lorsqu'elles sont étudiées, il est de règle d'utiliser nos connaissances sur les événements et les processus historiques tirés d'autres sources pour expliquer certains traits ou particularités de la production artistique et artisanale. Peut-on inverser la démarche? Cette question est le moteur méthodologique qui a généré la présente étude : elle se propose donc de tester la possibilité

D’une manière générale, la sculpture médiévale de la région est peu connue et demeure en grande partie non-publiée. Dans l’optique de la problématique évoquée ci-dessus, l’exégèse de ce riche matériel inexploité demande de procéder d’abord à la recension des pièces sculptées en rapport avec l’architecture, d’établir les centres de leur provenance et leur répartition par catégorie et par iconographie. Il sera ensuite instructif de comparer ces observations avec la situation durant les époques antérieures (la période protobyzantine et la période mésobyzantine) afin de saisir les modifications et de les expliquer.

La plus riche collection de sculptures architecturales du littoral bulgare nous vient de la période protobyzantine. Mais des ateliers locaux semblent avoir encore fonctionné aussi tardivement qu’aux XVIᵉ-XVIIIᵉ siècles ottomans, à en croire les nouvelles interprétations des reliefs de Kaliakra. Le plus grand lot de sculptures recensées de la période tardobyzantine qui nous occupe ici provient de la ville de Messembria (Nessebar). Un nombre important d’entre elles est encore sur place, ornant les églises depuis le XIIIᵉ- XIVᵉ s. En ordre quantitatif décroissant, Messembria est suivie par Sozopol. Trois autres sites ne fournissent que des pièces isolées : Varna (1 console, 2 clés d’arcs, 1 plaque), Kavarna (2 blocs avec reliefs de chevaliers-guerriers, 1 corniche et 1 icône du Christ en relief) et Primorsko dans la région d’Urdoviza (1 plaque avec chevalier). Cette répartition révèle de considérables modifications par rapport à la haute période byzantine : en tête de cette liste venait alors incontestablement la cité de Varna avec laquelle seule Messembria pouvait rivaliser. Mais à leurs côtés, on trouve d’importantes églises décorées de sculptures pratiquement tout le long de la côte : il suffit de citer Dionysopoli (Balčik), Marcianopolis (Devnja), Anchialos (Pomorie), Naulochos ou Templum Iovi (Obzor), Byala, Sozopol et dans une moindre mesure Akré (Kaliakra) et Agathopolis. Une première et très importante réduction de cette liste intervient entre le VIIᵉ et le XIIᵉ siècle, lorsque Sozopol et Messembria finirent par être les seuls endroits où on continuait à enjoliver les édifices religieux avec un décor plastique coûteux et prestigieux. La superposition des cartes des distributions géographique et chronologique des monuments met en évidence la place de prédilection occupée de manière constante par de la ville de Messembria parmi tous les sites connus du littoral pontique occidental en matière de production sculpturale.

En ce qui concerne la distribution par catégories, une étude statistique du matériel permet de constater que les divers chapiteaux confectionnés en plus grand nombre à l’époque protobyzantine furent destitués de la première place par les éléments de la structure du temple à l’époque mésobyzantine, pour céder à leur tour leur place aux XIIIᵉ-XIVᵉ s. aux consoles et corbeaux. Cette
évolution révèle les profonds changements survenus à l’époque paléologue dans le concept même de décor architectural, avec les soins particuliers apportés à l’embellissement des façades contrairement à la tradition byzantine où le décor était concentré à l’intérieur des églises.

À cette évolution de la répartition géographique et fonctionnelle s’ajoute un changement dans les sources d’inspiration ayant influencé cette pratique décorative dans la zone étudiée. L’analyse ponctuelle des formes, du répertoire et des techniques d’exécution de l’énorme fond de sculptures médiévales, comptant en tout environ 600 pièces pour toutes les périodes, permet de faire quelques observations quant à leurs affinités avec la sculpture d’autres régions et d’en déduire les principaux facteurs d’impact qui évoluent eux aussi. Durant la haute époque toute la production est fortement redevable à la capitale impériale aussi bien en ce qui concerne les importations des marbres, que le travail sur place des ateliers constantinopolitains itinérants et les imitations locales plus au moins habiles. Aux IXᵉ et Xᵉ s., l’influence byzantine reste dominante avec l’apport de l’école de Veliki Preslav, comme l’on peut le déduire des pièces de Sozopol, des piliers à incrustation de Karaach-Teke à Varna ou des blocs grossièrement taillés de la forteresse bulgare de Bailçik. La restauration du pouvoir byzantin pour une longue période durant les XIᵉ et XIIᵉ s. semble avoir eu un effet niveleur, et la sculpture suit entièrement les tendances d’alors à Byzance comme le confirme les pièces conservées à Sozopol et Messembria. L’icône monumentale du Christ Evergetis de Messembria et celle du Christ Pantocrator de Kavarna datant du XIIᵉ-XIIIᵉ s. inaugurent la dernière phase de l’évolution de la sculpture par une fidélité à l’héritage mésobyzantin. Leur stylistique et leur iconographie révèlent l’intérêt grandissant pour les représentations humaines d’actualité en ce moment à Byzance. Cependant, au XIVᵉ siècle suivant, la sculpture s’en éloigne de sa tradition byzantine et s’ouvre à des idées plastiques bien différentes. En quoi consistent-elles et comment traduisent-elles les rapports entre l’Orient et l’Occident ?

C’est également à Messembria que revient la place d’honneur au sein de ce mouvement innovateur. L’un des traits originaux caractérisant l’architecture des églises construites dans la ville aux XIIᵉ et XIVᵉ s. est la rangée de consoles qui agrémentent le départ des petits arcs purement décoratifs dans les parties supérieures des murs. Ils peuvent prendre la forme de tores simplement moulurés (les Saints-Archanges, le Christ Pantocrator, Sainte-Paraskévi, etc.) ou être ornés de divers motifs sculptés (palmettes, feuilles d’acanthe, griffons, lions, agneaux, colombes sirènes, croix, masques, fleurs de lys) exécutés en haut ou moyen relief (Saint-Jean Alitourgitos, collection du musée). Cette pratique qui est très en vogue à Messembria était peut-être répandue à Varna, où l’on ne connaît malheureusement pas bien l’architecture de cette période. Toutefois, l’église fouillée de Saint-Georges fournit trois exemples similaires : une console d’angle avec griffons affrontés, et deux clés d’arcs avec croix et rosace en haut relief. De Sozopol proviennent deux consoles seulement moulurées et une décorée.

Il s’agit d’une toute nouvelle conception de mise en valeur des extérieurs des églises dans cette région, et elle reflète très vraisemblablement les influences de l’Occident. D’une part, ce sont des influences indirectes ressenties dans le principe général de procéder à une décoration des façades, contrairement à Byzance où elle est traditionnellement réservée aux intérieurs. Pour mettre en œuvre cette nouvelle conception, on a également recours au décor céramoplastique rendu par l’infini jeu ornemental des combinaisons de briques, de ronds et de trèfles coloriés et vernissés. Cet aspect fort pittoresque est poussé à l’extrême à Nessebar, où parfois (le Christ Pantocrator ou le Saint-Jean Alitourgitos) la variété est telle que chaque mur diffère des autres, entraînant le regard dans une
infinité ornementale conforme à l'esprit de l'arabesque et niant ainsi toute uniformité. D'autre part, ce sont des influences directes visibles à travers la manière d'articuler les façades au moyen de courts arcs reliant une frise de consoles qui s'apparente à l'architecture romane italienne, et illustre l'éloignement des ateliers de Mesembria des plus fortes traditions byzantines suivies jusqu'alors en faveur de ces modèles occidentaux répandus également, par l'intermédiaire de la Dalmatie, en Serbie.

Il est bien connu que contrairement à l'Occident et au Caucase, la sculpture des façades n'a jamais été développée sur les monuments religieux byzantins. La mise en valeur des extérieurs d'églises par des frises et des plaques a connu une distribution limitée dans le temps (entre le Xe et le XIIe s. et fut ensuite abandonnée) et dans l'espace (essentiellement la Grèce, Constantinople n'étant pas touché par cet engouement. La capitale continue à renier cette sculpture extérieure même à l'époque paléologue qui nous occupe ici, ce qui n'était pas le cas d'autres centres byzantins majeurs où la décoration plastique en pierre fleurit sur les murs extérieurs. Et presque partout son apparition s'explique par l'influence de traditions artistiques non-byzantines. C'est le cas des arcs sculptés avec scènes bibliques du portail à Paregoretissa à Arta, qui présente l'unique évidence d'influence directe du roman tardif occidental de la région d'Apolie, ou bien celui de la Sainte-Sophie de Trébizonde qui reflète les idées décoratives du Caucase et de l'Anatolie seldjoukide. Quelques exemples de Mistra (Peribleptos, Pantnassa) apparaissent dans le contexte du patronage et de l'héraldique francs. Ces cas isolés confirment l'apparition du décor sculpté sur les façades comme un phénomène étranger à la sculpture paléologue de la capitale mais non inconnu de l'espace byzantin périphérique où il est introduit par l'action de facteurs étrangers. Je crois que c'est également le cas des consoles de Mesembria et de Varna qui semblent traduire les influences occidentales véhiculées par les colonies vénitiennes et génoises relativement nombreuses qui s'y installèrent. Il est instructif de rappeler qu'avec l'accord de 1347 entre la République de Saint-Marc et le Royaume de Tarnovo, s'établit à Varna le premier consulat occidental et les Vénitiens reçurent le droit d'acquérir des biens immobiliers dans la ville et d'y construire des églises et des loges. Peu après, il en fut de même avec les Génois à Mesembria. L'environnement « occidental » dans les deux cités, comme un peu partout dans les ports du littoral occidental, donna l'impulsion nécessaire à l'émergence d'un riche décor sculpté des façades et à sa plasticité stylistique. En effet, ces phénomènes étaient un héritage de l'Antiquité qui aurait pu se prolonger n'importe où en pays méditerranéen. Il avait fleuri sur les façades jusqu'au VIe s. à Constantinople pour se déplacer ensuite sur les parois intérieures et se faire oublier, à tel point qu'on considéra le décor sculpté abondant des façades comme étranger à la tradition byzantine. Son émersion sporadique des débris de l'art antique, si cher aux Byzants, ne devint possible à l'époque paléologue qu'aux seuls endroits attestant du patronage ou de la présence des Occidentaux, et non pas grâce à une renaissance endogène des phénomènes latents dans la tradition byzantine même. Les exemples des XIIIe et XIVe siècles du littoral bulgare confirment d'une manière convaincante cette observation.

Parallèlement à ces déviations de la stricte ligne byzantine, un groupe de pièces liées à l'aménagement de la barrière du sanctuaire – petits chapiteaux, colonnettes, piliers et plaques provenant de Sozopol et de Mesembria, l'arcosolium ou encadrement d'icône avec Archange de Mesembria, les icônes monumentales en relief du Christ de Mesembria et de Kavarna, illustrent la vigueur de la tradition sculpturale byzantine toujours d'actualité dans cette région qui ne coupa jamais ses relations très proches avec Constantinople à cause de la proximité et la facilité des contacts avec la capitale impériale par voie maritime et du passage fréquent sous autorité impériale des villes méridionales (Mesembria, qui était aussi un apanage des Paléologues au XIVe s., Anchialos,
Sozopol, Urdoviza, Agathopol). On peut noter que l'influence de l'Orient byzantin est évidente essentiellement dans le décor des installations liturgiques liées au rituel orthodoxe (le templon) et à la vénération orthodoxe des icônes.

La production sculptée du littoral occidental n'a pas échappé au courant artistique venant de l'Orient non-byzantin. Trois reliefs avec chevaliers portent bien les traces d'une inspiration extérieure et étrangère aux Balkans et à l'Europe. Ce sont les deux blocs encastrés autrefois dans l'enceinte de Kaliarka. Sur le premier sont représentés deux guerriers à cheval engagés dans une bataille. Le second présente le vainqueur en marche triomphale. Une plaque trouvée à proximité d'Urdoviza présente un autre chevalier dans une marche tranquille et non armé. À ce groupe thématique s'ajoute un relief de provenance incertaine du Nord-Est bulgare figurant un chevalier triomphant, les mains levées très haut. La plaque avec un serpent de Varna peut y être rattachée par son style et sa composition. Tous ces pièces sont exécutées grossièrement dans une pierre locale et sont un apax dans l'art plastique de la région. Leur datation est controversée – entre le XIIIᵉ et le XIXᵉ s. La plupart des chercheurs acceptent leur attribution médiévale. Il nous paraît certain que le motif du guerrier et du triomphe du vainqueur est du plus pur style sassanide. La question est de savoir comment il apparaît dans le contexte de l'art pontique. Je n'ai pas à ce jour de réponse satisfaisante. L'hypothèse la plus répandue pour les reliefs de Kaliakra est celle des Seldjoukides comme médiateurs, finalement remplacés par les Ottomans puisqu'on tend à rejeter la version d'une présence seldjoukide dans la Dobroudja. Or, l'encastrement de reliefs était pratiqué à grande échelle notamment dans les forteresses et les auberges du Sultanat seldjoukide. La technique de méplat utilisée pour les sculptures de Kaliakra peut être retrouvée un peu partout en Anatolie et en Mésopotamie du Nord. À titre d'analogies les plus proches de nos sculptures, on peut citer les animaux sculptés sur les murs de Çardak-Han en 1230, un aigle bicéphale du Musée de Konya de 1221, des reliefs de Van, Adana, Ankara. Le serpent à queue nouée sur elle-même est aussi un sujet banal dans la sculpture seldjoukide. Le corps écaillue du reptile comme dans notre cas peut être trouvé sur des blocs du début du XIIIᵉ s. au Musée de Konya ou encastrés dans la citadelle d'Alep. Les Seldjoukides de Rûm restent très marqués par le monde iranien dont ils ont assimilé de nombreux éléments artistiques. L'aristocratie seldjoukide établie dans les villes d'Asie Mineure et à Constantinople se comporte plus en Iraniens qu'en Turcs et intègre parfois les plus hauts rangs de la classe dirigeante byzantine. Mais le médium précis du courant iranisant perceptible à travers la sculpture reste à découvrir.

L'émancipation du dictat artistique de la capitale est un point commun à toutes les régions du monde byzantin à l'époque paléologue, et ceci à plus forte raison dans le domaine de la sculpture. Il est intéressant de constater que l'architecture et la peinture religieuses restèrent bien plus fidèles à la tradition byzantine. La raison en est que le monde byzantin rejette « l'utilité » théologique de la sculpture. Les messages didactiques et dogmatiques de la foi chrétienne sont transmis principalement par la peinture religieuse et les textes. De ce fait, la sculpture a développé une plus forte « perméabilité » aux influences étrangères, même à celles venant d’un Occident « schismatique » qui incitent à des expérimentations très réussies sur le décor des façades, et à celles d’un Orient islamisé qui fait revivre d’anciens thèmes de l’art iranien sans jamais perdre de vue les tendances pionnières élaborées dans les ateliers de la capitale byzantine.
Крымские пещерные монастыри XIII–XV вв.


Уже к концу XVIII в. в историографии сформировались две противоположные традиции, прошедшие через всю дальнейшую историю изучения искусственных пещер: первая связывает создание пещерных помещений с каким-либо из народов, живших в Таврике; вторая приписывает их белым византийским монахам.

В 1877 г. В.Г. Васильевский, на основании одного из сюжетов Жития Стефана Нового, пришел к заключению, что в иконоборческий период Крым занимал иконопочитательскую позицию и сюда иммигрировали бежавшие от преследований монахи-иконодулы.

Ю.А. Кулаковский в работе «Прошлое Тавриды», в развитии гипотезы В. Г. Васильевского, выдвинул предположение, что крымские пещерные монастыри были созданы в VIII - IX вв. бежавшими сюда иконопочитателями. Правда, никаких материалов, датирующихся ранее XII - XIII вв. в пещерных монастырях он не обнаружил, но все же писал: «во начало пещерножительства можно все-таки отнести к эпохе иконооборства. Основанием для такого предположения является сходство в типе между крымскими сооружениями и в Южной Италии и Сицилии».

Поначалу члены Таврического общества истории, археологии и этнографии (бывшая Таврическая ученая архивная комиссия) единогласно заявили, что «пещерные города» «к иконооборской мути… не имеют отношения» и датируются не ранее XI в. Но позднее, вероятно под воздействием авторитета В. Г. Васильевского и Ю. А. Кулаковского, эту гипотезу, уже оформившуюся в концепцию, поддержали С. П. Шестаков, А. А. Васильев, а еще позже А. Л. Якобсон, Е. В. Веймарн, О. И. Домбровский, И. А. Баранов и другие.

Ю.М. Могаричевым, совместно с А.Г. Герценцем, был сделан вывод: иконопочитательская ортодоксия таврических светских и церковных властей, а в связи с этим и создание пещерных монастырей на полуострове белыми византийскими иконодулыми - историографический миф. Аргументация следующая: изучение письменных источников приводит к выводу об отсутствии надежных сведений о пребывании в Крыму значительного количества белых иконопочитателей. Напротив, они указывают на то, что епархии Таврики прочно стояли на проправительственных позициях, а монастырская жизнь даже в начале IX в. только зарождалась. Создание скальных монастырей происходило не гонимыми
и скрывающимися людьми. Архитектурные остатки, данные эпиграфики, выявленный археологический материал говорят о поздней дате их основания (не ранее X – XIII вв.). Большинство пещерных монастырей расположены в границах бывшего книжества Феодоро (XIV – XV вв.) и группируются на поселениях (или вокруг них), которые появляются или возобновляется в XIV - XV вв., реже в XIII - XIV вв.

Большинство современных специалистов по раннесредневековой истории и археологии Таврики, в той или иной степени, поддержали «иконоборческую» гипотезу, дополнив ее новыми аргументами.

На данный момент в Крыму выявлено более 60 скальных церквей. Они встречаются двух видов: 1) входящие в комплексы пещерных монастырей; 2) приходские. К сожалению, современный уровень изученности памятников скальной архитектуры не всегда позволяет однозначно интерпретировать ту или иную пещерную церковь как монастырскую или приходскую.

Скальные приходские церкви известны на Эски-кемене, Тепе-кемене, Мангупе, Бакле. Всего их было не более 10.

По нашим подсчетам в Горном Юго-Западном Крыму в средневековый период функционировало около 20 пещерных монастырей.

**Обзор памятников.**

**Инкерман.** Все скальные памятники Инкермана группируются, в основном, в трех местах

Монастырская скала (в обрыва крепости Каламита), где вычленяется две группы помещений:

1). Монастырь на южном и западном обрывах (более 200 помещений, из них 9 церквей).


2). Скит в районе храма Евграфия (1 церковь XIII в.), состоящая из двух помещений, в настоящее время засыпана землей. В храме сохранилась ктиторская надпись 1272 г.: «моление раба божьего Сотика с женою и детьми, лета 5780».

На Загайтанская скале известны два комплекса скальных помещений:

3). Небольшой монастырь (25 помещений, 2 церкви) на юго-западном краю;

4). Монастырь, состоявший из 96 помещений, в том числе 10 церквей, в восточной части.

Скальные сооружения Загайтанской скалы мало изучены. Труднодоступность (в некоторые помещения невозможно попасть без специального снаряжения), плохая
сохранность привели к тому, что они часто осматривались поверхностно. Вероятно, здесь еще могут быть выявлены новые пещерные храмы, один из которых, был открыт только в 2004 г. Большинство церквей здесь подверглись сильному разрушению. Вероятно, монастырский комплекс Загайтанской скалы, в основном, сформировался до середины XIV в., а его древнейшая часть располагалась в восточной части.

Левый (противоположный от Каламиты) берег реки Черной.

5) Монастырь св. Софии (Каменоломный овраг) (22 помещения, 4 церкви). Он возникает в XIV-XV вв., хотя не исключен и XIII в.
6) Скит (10 помещений, 1 церковь) напротив станции Инкерман.
7) Скит в Георгиевской балке (6 помещений, 1 церковь).
8) Скит в Троицкой балке (6 помещений, 1 церковь).
9) Небольшой скит, тесно связанный с инкерманскими монастырями находился в Мартыновской балке.

Первоначально группы монахов, или отдельные отшельники, появились на восточной части Загайтанской скалы, в наиболее удаленном и труднодоступном месте Инкермана (вероятно X - XI вв.). Скорее всего, это были выходцы из Херсона (Херсонеса). Со временем монастырь разрастается, его монахами основываются новые скиты. В XIII в. создается церковь Евтрафия. Возможно тогда же отдельные отшельники осваивают Каменоломный овраг и Монастырскую скалу. В XIV-XV вв. создаются монастыри на южном и западном обрывах Монастырской скалы и монастырь св. Софии. Последний дает жизнь еще трем скитам на левом берегу р. Черной. Наивысшего расцвета монастырская жизнь в Инкерманской долине достигает именно в XIV - XV вв., когда данная территория стала частью княжества Феодоро. Тогда здесь функционировало не менее 9 комплексов монастырского типа, в том числе порядка 30 церквей. Такое количество культовых сооружений позволяет сделать вывод о нахождении в Инкерманской долине в период развитого средневековья монашеского центра. Комплекс источников указывает на то, что ктиторами монастырей и церквей были весьма состоятельные люди, которые, очевидно, входили в правящую элиту Феодоро. Господствующая над Инкерманской долиной крепость Каламита была не только стратегическим опорным пунктом Феодоро, но и важным портом, через который вели торговлю не только правители этого православного княжества, но и владетели Крымского ханства. Доходы от торговых операций и таможенные сборы, вероятно, позволяли местным властям и участвовавшим в них феодоритам сооружать храмы и заботиться о местных монахах. После турецкого захвата Крыма в 1475 г. большая часть монастырей прекращает функционирование, а оставшиеся, по сведениям источников, влачат жалкое существование.

Пещерные сооружения монастыря Чиллер-мармар были расположены в пять ярусов. В нижнем ярусе - 16 помещений. Это погребальные помещения и естественные гrottы, где содержался скот. Помещения 2-5 ярусов соединены между собой лестничными переходами и имеют общий вход в виде калитки в восточной части второго яруса. Пещеры второго яруса (8 единиц) наиболее крупные в комплексе. Здесь расположен главный храм монастыря (церковь № 1), трапезная и еще ряд помещений. Церковь находится в восточной части большого естественного гrottа. В третьем ярусе насчитывается около 20 помещений. Большинство
из них, вероятнее всего являлись кельями, но есть и одна церковь (№ 2). Она расположена с южной стороны прорубленной там галереи. Все помещения третьего яруса соединялись между собой, образуя единый комплекс. Пещеры 4 яруса (6 помещений) представляют собой обособленный комплекс, состоящий из одной церкви (№3) и сопутствующих ей жилых и хозяйственных помещений. На стене алтаря храма, слева от престола, вырезан крест и надпись «раб божий ... 6911» (1403 г.). Основание Чилтер-мармара, очевидно, относится к XII - XIII вв. Однако, отдельные отшельники могли поселиться и немного ранее, облюбовав карстовую пещеру в пятом ярусе (церковь №4). В XIV - середине XV в. монастырь расширяется и достигает своих максимальных размеров. Турецкий захват Крыма в 1475 г. привел к тому, что жизнь здесь затухает. Возможно, отдельные монахи жили здесь и в XVI -XVII вв., однако следы их пребывания практически не отмечаются.

Монастырь Шульдан состоит из двух пещерных храмов и сопутствующих им помещений (кельи, хозяйственные и др.) общим числом до 20. Они расположены в два яруса. Главный храм (церковь № 1) был устроен в первом ярусе, находящимся в естественном громе. Судя по подрубкам в скале, сохранившийся храм возник на месте более раннего и меньшего по размерам. Церковь № 2 расположена во втором ярусе, над восточным входом в монастырь.

Висториимонастырьотчетливовыделяетсядвастроительныхпериода.Первоначальный христианский культовый комплекс в скале Шульдан мог возникнуть в XIII - XIV вв. В период Феодоро, вероятно, не ранее начала XV вв., монастырь перестраивается, храм расширяется, появляется новый баптистерий. Не исключено, что это была одна из резидентий Гетского митрополита. После 1475 г. комплекс практически не функционировал, а его помещения использовались жителями соседней деревни для содержания скота.

На территории городаща Эски-кермен и в его ближайшей окрите известно 5 пещерных храмов. К монастырским объектам, с большой долей вероятности, можно отнести группу пещер в районе пещерного храма «Донаторов». Комплекс расположен в верховых балки Черкес-кермен, к западу от Эски-кермена. Свое условное название он получил от сюжета росписей, изображающих семью донаторов церкви. Вероятно, храм был создан около середины XIV в., и являлся частью небольшого скита, выполнявшего функции фамильной усыпальницы местных правителей.

На городеще Мангуп (во второй половине XIV в. - 1475 г. – столица княжества Феодоро) известно 4 пещерных монастыря.

1). Монастырь на оконечности мыса Тешки-бурун, условно делится на комплексы Барабан-коба, № 2, № 3, "гарнизонную" церковь и церковь в оконечности мыса Тешки-бурун. Наиболее значимыми культовыми сооружениями здесь являются "Гарнизонная" церковь и Церковь в оконечности мыса Тешки-бурун. Вероятнее всего, рассматриваемый монастырь начал формироваться во второй половине XIV в., являясь неотъемлемой частью архитектурного ансамбля цитадели Феодоро. Названный его расцвет приходится на 20 - 70 гг. XV в. После 1475 г. он прекращает существование.

2). Юго-восточный монастырь состоит из двух уровней помещений. На верхнем (на плато) находится так называемая «церковь на площадке со склепами» и ряд сооружений, в том числе и погребальных. Нижний уровень монастыря расположен в естественном громе, в восточной части которого был устроен храм. Данный памятник представлял
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единный монастырский комплекс периода Феодоро. Наиболее ранней его частью были погребальные сооружения на плато, затем над ними была вырублена церковь (XIV – XV вв.). Завершается формирование монастыря созданием храма в громе под обрывом.

3). Южный монастырь (1 церковь и 5 иных помещений) расположен под южным обрывом плато. В монастыре можно попасть по искусственному туннелю из небольшого естественного гроба в подножье обрыва. Туннель ведет в другой, более обширный естественный гроб, в восточной части которого вырублена церковь. Фресковые росписи, датирующиеся первой половиной XV в. некогда покрывали апсиду, арку, окаймляющую алтарь и фриз над аркой. Основание монастыря, вероятно, следует датировать первой половиной XV в. Возможно, он являлся семейной усыпальницей княжеской династии Феодоро.

4). Северный монастырь состоит из церкви и 6 сопутствующих помещений. В одной из пещер сохранились фрагменты надписи 1220/1221 г. Вероятнее всего, возникновение этого комплекса можно отнести к началу XIII в. А его расцвет приходится на эпоху княжества Феодоро.

Архитектурный ансамбль монастыря Чилтер-коба состоит из 23 скальных помещений, в том числе одного пещерного храма. Под храм был приспособлен естественный скальный гроб. Монастырь выглядит единовременным комплексом, без следов значительных ремонтов и перестроек. Скорее всего, обитель была основана в XIV – XV вв. на северной границе княжества Феодоро. По своим особенностям обитель входит в так называемую группу монастырей с трапезными, которые основывались на погребальных местах и выполняли функции хранения реликвий и приема посетителей.

Качи-кальон представляет собой комплексный памятник. Сельское поселение здесь появляется в период раннего средневековья. Впоследствии, вероятно, в XIII/XIV - XV вв. на части поселения основывается монастырь, который функционирует до 1778 г. Все памятники поселения, в том числе 118 пещерных сооружений, группируются вокруг пяти естественных скальных гробов. На Качи-кальоне известна одна пещерная церковь и три «полупещерных».

На Тепе-кермене традиционно выделяются две пещерных церкви «Церковь с баптистерием» и «Церковь с ризницей». Возможно на Тепе-кермене функционировало еще несколько ныне разрушенных пещерных церквей. «Церковь с баптистерием» расположена на северо-восточном краю плато. Над западной могилой южной стены процарапана греческая надпись XII - XIV вв. Комплекс архитектурных особенностей церкви позволяет отнести ее ко времени не ранее XI в. Возможно, именно «церковь с баптистерием» была главным культовым сооружением Тепе-кермена, а на последнем этапе функционирования городища могла относиться к местному монастырю. По крайней мере функционирование на городище монастыря предполагает найденная здесь надгробная надпись монаха Николая, датированная V.V. Латышевым XVIв.

Пещерный монастырь находился на Чуфут-кале. Городище, очевидно в XIII – первой половине XIV в. (для более раннего времени источники отсутствуют) было центром Крымской Алании. Монастырь располагался в районе так называемых Южных (Малых) ворот (Кичик-капу) и был основан в промежутке XI - XIII вв. Свое существование он, видимо, прекратил в XV в., когда поселение становится столицей Крымского ханства. Монахов переселили в
расположенное в окрестностях городища ущелье Марьям-dere, где был основан Успенский монастырь. Пещерная церковь в период позднего средневековья подверглась значительным перестройкам и утратила свой первоначальный облик.

Пещерные монастыри Горного Юго-Западного Крыма условно можно разделить на четыре группы.

В первую входят памятники, не затронутые “ремонтами” и перестройками XIX в. Это Чилтер-коба, Чилтер-мармара и Шулдан. Они имеют все признаки классического монастыря: один (Чилтер-коба) или несколько (Чилтер-мармара — 4, Шулдан — 2) храмов, монашеские кельи, трапезные, подсобные помещения, погребальные сооружения.

Вторая группа - комплексы Инкермана.

В третью группу пещерных монастырей следует отнести Успенский и Качи-кальон. Их объединяет то, что в середине XIX в. на месте древних были воссозданы новые монастыри, во многом изменившие облик первоначальных памятников.

Последнюю группу составляют обители, расположенные на городищах и в непосредственной близости от них. Это 4 мангупских комплекса, один чуфут-кальский, один тепе-керменский и храм “Донаторов” в округе Эски-кермен.

Наблюдение за топографическим расположением пещерных обителей показывает: их подавляющее большинство расположено в границах княжества Феодоро, Кнефеодоритским (очевидно “аланским”) можно отнести только монастыри на Чуфут-кале, Качи-кальоне и Тепе-кермене. При этом большая часть пещерных монастырей Феодоро группируется в двух центрах. Это Мангуп – столица Феодоро – 4 комплекса и Инкерман (морской порт княжества, получавший экономические дивиденды за счет торговли) – 9 монастырей и скитов. Таким образом, за пределами Мангупа и Инкермана функционировали только обители на Чилтер-кобе (северная граница княжества), “храм Донаторов” (возникший, очевидно после затухания жизни на Эски-кермене как семейная усыпальница местных правителей), а также Чилтер-мармара и Шулдан. Причем два последних комплектса расположены на дороге, ведущей из Мангупа в Инкерман и явно территориально тяготели к столице Феодоро.

Мангупские князья, по крайней мере в XV в., позиционируют себя как защитники православного населения, хранители и продолжатели тысячелетней традиции крымского христианства. Например, по инициативе князя Алексея восстанавливается монастырь Святых Апостолов в Партените, тем самым подчеркивая неразрывную духовную связь между Мангупским княжеством, территория которого в основном совпадала с Готской епархийей и основателем епархии - Иоанном Готским. В контексте данной политики, вероятно, происходило и строительство (иногда возобновление и расширение) популярных тогда в восточном христианстве именно пещерных монастырей.
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Abstract

As more historical databases come online and overlap in coverage, we need to discuss the two main issues that prevent ‘big’ results from emerging so far. Firstly, historical data are seen by computer science people as unstructured, that is, historical records cannot be easily decomposed into unambiguous fields, like in population (birth and death records) and taxation data. Secondly, machine-learning tools developed for structured data cannot be applied as they are for historical research. We propose a complex network, narrative-driven approach to mining historical databases. In such a time-integrated network obtained by overlaying records from historical databases, the nodes are actors, while the links are actions. In the case study that we present (the world as seen from Venice, 1205-1533), the actors are governments, while the actions are limited to war, trade, and treaty to keep the case study tractable. We then identify key periods, key events, and hence key actors, key locations through a time-resolved examination of the actions. This tool allows historians to deal with historical data issues (e.g., source provenance identification, event validation, trade-conflict-diplomacy relationships, etc.). With this project in mind, the proposal is to showcase the Black Sea region in the intercontinental network systems using the research result of Sergej P. Karpov’s and Michel Balard’s works.

KEYWORDS: Visual reasoning, Visual analytics, World History, Black Sea region (1205-1479), Intercontinental communication networks

In 2013, when I received the invitation by Sergej P. Karpov to submit a proposal for his Round Table on The Black See Region between East and West in the XIII-XV centuries: New Sources and Approaches to be held in the framework of the 23rd International Congress of Byzantine Studies (Belgrade, August 22-27, 2016), I accepted it with great pleasure, because I considered it as a highly relevant academic venue to share with more historians my research project on Engineering Historical Memory, and engage as many of them as possible, enlarge the community of historians interested in experimenting machine learning and automatic narrative via visual analytics and reasoning. My proposal aims to engage first of all the two conveners of this round table. I am especially referring to their works on the Black Sea region, for the period between 1205 (the beginning of the conquest of the Latin empire territories) and 1479 (the treaty of Constantinople that ended the first Venetian Turkish war, with, among others, the promise of Venice to pay 10,000 ducats per year to the Sultan to commerce in the Black Sea). Let me start with an introduction to the two key concepts that I am proposing to use in the historical research field.

Eugene S. Ferguson seminal works published in 1977 (The Minds Eye: Non-Verbal Thought in Technology, in «Science», 197, 4306, pp. 827-836) and 1992 (Engineering and the mind’s eye. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press) investigated and explained visual reasoning from a mechanical engineer and historian of technology perspective. Architects, designers, and engineers are used to manipulate objects in “the mind’s eye” before putting them on paper. Instead, in the humanities,
scholars are mainly verbal rather than visual thinkers. But, in historical studies, there is an important exception, which is represented by mapping and visualising data as a tool to present theories in “the mind's eye” first and than in a visual medium (e.g., cartography or historical geography). My research team and I have exemplified this theory using the Fra Mauro map of the world in 2015 (Andrea Nanetti, Angelo Cattaneo, Siew Ann Cheong, Chin-Yew Lin, Maps as Knowledge Aggregators: from Renaissance Italy Fra Mauro to Web Search Engines, in «The Cartographic Journal», 52/2, pp. 159-167) and demonstrated how effective can be visual knowledge aggregation.

The next consequential steps are in visual analytics, which use computational tools to bring (big) data to the human scale of measure and understanding, help situation assessment, and inform decision making at any level. For an introduction, see the special issue of the journal Information Visualization edited by Joe Kielman and Jim Thomas on Foundations and Frontiers of Visual Analytics on (Vol. 8/4, Winter 2009) and the book edited by Daniel Keim, Jorn Kohlhammer, Geoffrey Ellis, and Florian Mansmann on Mastering the Information Age Solving Problems with Visual Analytics (Goslar, Germany: Eurographics Association, 2010).

Research collaboration between Nanyang Technological University (Singapore) and Microsoft Research on “Augmenting Bing Search through Automatic Narratives in the Interactive Global Histories” started in 2014-2015 wanted to use maps to aggregate knowledge and generate visual narratives on the web that can be tested at the same level of rigor as scientific hypotheses and theories as the research team did with chronicles. Although the idea of a knowledge aggregator was first mooted close to 20 years ago, we believe its potential is not yet fully exploited. We envisage a future where online maps are once again knowledge aggregators, in some Fra Mauro meets ICT way. This is not merely nostalgia: in 2013 Henson et al. explained that as we move into the era of Big Data, data is generated so quickly that we would drown in it if we do not have knowledge aggregators to help us navigate (Cory Henson, Payam Barnaghi, and Amit Sheth, “From Data to Actionable Knowledge: Big Data Challenges in the Web of Things,” IEEE Intelligent Systems 28, no. 6, 2013: 0006–11).

The aim of the research team is to draw connection of what we wrote about Fra Mauro and then create a modern day Fra Mauro, as a digital assistant, by meshing up various internet services (e.g. to illustrate what a version of Fra Mauro’s mappa mundi would be looked like if we build it over Bing, Bing Maps, Wikipedia, and all other possible reference sources), just to recreate it in a modern way and make it interactive to users as we have described in the paper. After that, we can draw upon what we have learned on analyzing Fra Mauro’s work, its significance and implications, and apply the methodology, which Fra Mauro used to create the map and propose a way to organize knowledge but with modern technologies.

In fact, most of the behaviours of the future map-based knowledge aggregator described in the above mentions 2015 paper can already be implemented using present-day technologies (existing mostly in search engines). What is yet to be done is the clustering of courses of actions, and recognizing that these clusters are the results of the users following through specific narratives. With more and more data collected on what sequences of information users want the map-based knowledge aggregator to present to them, we will eventually be able to make this knowledge aggregation fully automated, and also fully user-driven.

The chief limitations of Fra Mauro’s mappa mundi as a knowledge aggregator are that firstly, the map has to be ‘finished’ before it can be useful to someone else. Once it is ‘finished’ it cannot be updated to reflect new information. This is the paradox facing old media: the product becomes
outdated the moment it is produced. Secondly, the *mappa mundi* cannot adapt to its user. In contrast, online maps like Google Maps and Bing Maps are always works in progress. This allows new information to be added as they become available, and ultimately all old information stored in a timeline. However, they do not provide narratives produced by experts or drawn from Wikipedia.

Built on top of online maps such as Google Maps or Bing Maps, the future knowledge aggregator that we envisage will start by showing its user a map with minimal information, like country or state names. When the user moves the mouse over a location, and double clicks it, then additional information widgets appear. The automatic selection of these information widgets are based on user action statistics collected by either the map-based knowledge aggregator, or the associated search engine, very much like the related searches suggested by search engines like Google and Bing. Correlations between user actions can also help to crudely define narratives, like the grouping of Grand Century Place and Ladies’ Market into a ‘shopping’ narrative, and the grouping of Occupy Central news, images, and videos into a ‘protest’ narrative. When the user clicks on one of the information widget, it opens up a full-height side panel on the knowledge aggregator. This allows the user to view the full contents of the information widget, as well as interact with other information widgets that might be embedded.

Our ultimate vision is not for the map-based knowledge aggregator to combine only contemporary sources, but also draw on historical associations through curated as well as crowd-sourced timelines in the form of interrelated narratives. More importantly, not all information is made available to the user, because they would be overwhelming. Instead, the user navigates the information widgets one at a time, and as his/her course of action becomes more consistent, more relevant information would be presented to him/her. By consolidating courses of actions by previous users, the map-based knowledge aggregator will increasingly be able to predict the interests of the current user (i.e. what a recommendation engine does).

When Fra Mauro created his *mappa mundi*, he had intentions in mind. He wanted to provide sense to a world that was expanding and changing very quickly. He did not want to be just a passive spectator of these processes: he wanted to change his world. For what greater purpose shall we ascribe to the future map-based knowledge integrator? If we browse through the events since 1900, we see a growing intensity of strife and conflicts. As the world become more interconnected through travel and media, our cultures and knowledge of each other remains highly fragmented, mostly because media companies decide (mostly on grounds of profitability and ratings) what news stories to present to the masses. Modern ICT can change this imbalance resulting from media companies being self-interested knowledge aggregators, by giving the power to aggregate knowledge to individual users. We suppose it would be presumptuous to claim that an enhanced Google or Bing map can make the world a more peaceful place. Nevertheless, we believe the future map-based knowledge aggregator we describe here not only helps us better understand the Renaissance world placing it in a more flexible global context, but can also potentially help us understand ourselves and our world. In this way, maps continue to be storytelling devices that provide a point of view by filtering information, but according to the user's needs instead of an author(ity)'s proposal. For example, for the same global issues, how many narratives will emerge? Will these narratives be antagonistic? We can also ask how local communities can converge or diverge when we place in their hands this tool to make sense of the world (past and present). More importantly, with a tool to understand themselves and others, can people finally learn the art of the living with each other?
Moving from these problematic, the project Engineering Historical Memory (EHM) was born (http://www.engineeringhistoricalmemory.com and now on Microsoft Azure http://ehmazure.cloudapp.net). It constitutes an experimental methodology and an ongoing research project for the organization of historical data in the digital age, that Andrea Nanetti first theorized when he was Visiting Scholar at Princeton University in 2007, in order to develop and test new sets of shared conceptualizations and formal specifications for content management systems in historical studies. What sets it apart from other approaches is a focus on developing and applying computationally intensive techniques (e.g., pattern recognition, data mining, machine learning algorithms derived from other disciplines, and visualization solutions) to achieve this goal. It entails the creation and advancement of databases (relational, graph, and hybrid), algorithms, computational, statistical, and complexity techniques and theories to solve formal and practical problems arising from the study, interpretation, conservation, and management of historical data and information.

In the historical landscape, the real frontier research starts when we want to use computers to structure historical information, model historical narratives, simulate theoretical large scale hypotheses, and incent world historians to use virtual assistants and/or engage them in teamwork using social media and/or seduce them with immersive spaces to provide new learning and sharing environments, in which new things can emerge and happen.

EHM, as an experimental methodology, is based on a few simple questions: What shall the historian do having all data available in a digitalized form and available in any language? What the implications will be when all research materials will be digitized and searchable through metadata in any language? When we know the relationship between (past) events and their (still present) traces/evidence, what kind of interpretation can be built on top of them? Are universal interpretations possible, supported by relations between events?

With this crucial question in mind, the proposal is to showcase the Black Sea region in the intercontinental network systems, starting from the visual proposal made by Janet Lippman Abu-Lughod in 1989 (Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250-1350, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989, p. 34). In the eight circuits of the thirteenth-century world system, she places the Black Sea region at the intersection of System II (The Mediterranean Sea) and System III (The Mongol Empire) and the one made in the mid-fifteenth century by Fra Mauro in his mappa mundi.
The West Black See in the Portolans, 13th–15th Centuries

The massive influx of Italian sailors in the Black Sea in the 13th–15th centuries contributed to the revival of the trade in the region and to the inclusion of ports, goods and people of *Mare maius* in the network of Mediterranean trade. The increasing economic interest of the Apennine republics to the Black Sea outlets triggered the need for more precise data on the geographical features of the Black Sea coast and obstacle-free routes. Therefore, quite understandably, *Mare maius* started to be increasingly depicted on maps and in portolans appeared sections adjoining the Black Sea area which provided information on ports and distances between them; presence of obstacles; characteristics of the bottom and depth; tips on approaches to ports for mooring or anchoring and guidance on geographical directions.

In terms of geopolitics the section of the Black Sea coast, locked between the Bosphorus and the Dniester River, is in the 13th–15th centuries particularly interesting because in this area intersected the interests of many political subjects, bearers of different cultural values: Byzantium, Latin Empire, Bulgaria, Golden Horde, Wallachia, Moldavia, Cumans, Italian maritime republics, Ottoman Empire. However, the geographical nomenclature reflected in Western cartography contrasts this colorful civilizational exchange since it largely kept its ancient and monumental appearance during the three centuries. Unlike the static character and monotony of maps the portolans dating from this period represent a much more dynamic and complex picture of the pulsating west Black Sea coast, knowledge of which was acquired on the basis of experience in shipping along saltwater arteries.

*Compasso da navigare* is the earliest known portolan. It was compiled in Italian between 1250 and 1265 in Pisa, and in 1296 an additional part of the Black Sea was added. According to it, the geography of the western area of Mare maius included the following sites: *Fanaro* (Rumeli Feneri) – *Filea* (Karaburun) – *Malatra* (Malatra) – *Strangnara* (lığneada) – *Viopoli* (Kastrich?) – *Gatopoli* (Ahtopol) – *Sisopoli* (Sozopol) – *Asillo* (Pomorie) – *Mezembre* (Nesebar) – *Erminio/Arminio* (Emine) – *Varna* (Varna) – *Galata/Gailata* (Galata, Varna) – *Carbona* (Kavarna?) – *Caliacra* (Kaliakra) – *Pangalia* (Mangalia) – *Costanza* (Constanța) – *Grosseto* (Lacul Sinoe) – *Vecina/Vicina* (Danube) – *San Georgi* (Sfântul Gheorghe) – *Aspera* (Lacul Roșu?) – *Vecina* (Isaccea?) – *Saline* (Sulina) – *Licostoma* (Chilia) – *Filoxia* (Snake Island). *Strangnara, Mezembre, Varna, Aspera*. The said Danubian arm *Aspera* is examined in more details because it served as a road corridor to *Vecina*, although the possibility of reaching this Danube town through the sleeve *San Georgi* is also pointed out. Still in this regard it is stated that *Grosseto, San Georgi, Aspera, Saline* and *Licostoma* are estuaries to the *Vecina/Vicina* river, but not all are navigable. The presence of the *Filoxia* island is noted too, probably to orient routing detour eastwards after *Licostoma*. Remarkably, only *Vecina* is designated as a town, while at *Mezembre* is marked only
the existence of a fortress. From the geographical points on the West Coast mentioned above only sixteen are awarded with special attention, and for the remaining eight there is no accompanying information. One can only surmise what the nature of their status was, but it is likely that most of them were not a subject of commercial interest. It is noteworthy also that in Compasso Licostoma is the most northern point on the west Black Sea route while Mauro Castro (Bilhorod-Dnistrovskyi) and the sites located on the north of it are completely absent. This probably could be assessed as an indicator of the initial stage of economic relations between East and West, when the scope of travel and trade was still limited.

An anonymous Venetian portolan dated in the late 14th century, is known in two versions – Italian and Greek. The Italian version of this document in the possession of company of Naples, is preserved in a late transcript which by palaeographic data is determined to belong to the time before 1602–1634. It lists the following geographic objects that do not completely coincide with the toponyms contained in the Greek version: Fanale (Rumeli Feneri) – Inda (İğneada) – Aghatopoli (Ahtopol) – Vergonise/Vergnise/Vergognise (Urdoviza) – Sica (Maslen Nos) – Sisopoli (Sozopol) – Isola de Zaffrana Blanco (Sveti Kirik) – Sangioanne (Sveti Yoan) – Miscuria/Miscurria/Misuria (Nesebar) – Xillo (Pomorie) – Cavo di Limano (Emine) – Oizi (Sveti Atanas?) – Negro molto (Cherni Nos) – Rossito (Karantinata, Varna) – Galata (Galata, Varna) – Varna (Varna) – Castrici (Sveti Georgi) – Carbona (Kavarna?) – Caglialara/Cagliaca/Caglialara (Kaliakra) – Seluda (Shabla?) – Bagaglia (Mangalia) – Costanza (Constanta) – Sanarana (Cernavodă?) – Vessina/Danubio/Danobia/Danubia (Danube) – Bambulo (Vadu?) – Grossia (Lacul Sinoe) – Grosea/Grosea (Lacul Sinoe) – Aspas (Lacul Roșu?) – Solinis (Sulina) – Ghlicostis/Glicostimo/Gli Castromo (Chilia) – Isola de Serpi (Snake Island) – Gli Castromo (Vylkove). As regards the Greek version, it was discovered in a 1559 manuscript, now lost, and it is especially detailed regarding Miscuria/Miscurria, Misuria (Nesebar) – Urdoviza – only as Xillo/Ἄχιλο/Ἀχίλος – and between Ahtopol (Kavarna?) – Kaliakra – Inda – and between Mauro Castro (Bilhorod-Dnistrovskyi) – Sisopoli/Σιζόπολι – and between Miscuria/Miscurria/Misuria/Μεσηβρεία, and it is especially detailed regarding Sisopoli/Σιζόπολι. The presence of salt pans near Xillo/Ἄχιλο and between Lυκοστόμι and Μονόκαστρο is stated in order.
to alert traders on the whereabouts of this product which was particularly valuable in the Middle Ages. Veronice/Vergnise/Verognise/Bernice, Sica/Siciba, Grosea/Grosea/Irosa, Aspa/Aspa, Solinis/Solinis, Isola de Serpi/Φιδονήσι are marked only with their geographical characteristics and Sanarina/Zapharva is distinguished in the text by the fortress positioned there. Unlike Compasso the anonymous Venetian portolan publishes data on 32 or 33 sites along the Western Black Sea coastal route, which shows a difference of nearly 1/3 more in favor of the latter. The development of geographic knowledge is due to the growth of the ports on the West Black Sea coast – Compasso lists 4 ports for ships and 5 piers for boats, while this text lists already 8 ports for ships. Actually the absence of Filea and Vicina in the document resonates on the smaller total number.

It is believed that the geographical description of the Black Sea included in Anonymous universal cosmography from the 16th century, is based on a portolan source from the late 14th – early 15th century. It is striking that much of the Western Black Sea nomenclature is absent being drastically reduced to the following geographical points: Fanale (Rumeli Feneri) – Malita (Malatra) – Misenbi/Missenbi (Nesebar) – Varna (Varna) – Caiasa (Kalikra) – Gostansa (Constanța) – Grosea/Cirosca (Lacul Sinoe) – Danubio (Danube) – Stanibico/Staniuco (Lacul Razim?) – Sprea (Lacul Roșu?) – San Giorgio (Șfântul Gheorghe) – Licostoma/Licostroma/Lisostoma (Chilia) – Moncastro (Bilhorod-Dnistrovskyi) – Fidonixi (Snake Island). Unlike the sources discussed above in this document there are no clear definitions of availability of ports and towns, however, some geographic features are given for some of the toponyms mentioned. For example, it is mentioned that there was a river flowing to Misenbi/Missenbi; Varna is defined directly as a river (?); a river Tormolo is located north of Moncastro, and Grosea/Cirosca, Stanibico/Staniuco, San Giorgio, Licostoma/Licostroma/Lisostoma constitute the arms of the Danube Delta. Furthermore, two islands are marked – at San Giorgio and Fidonixi. Even assuming that the portolan presents the main towns, ports and geographical formations, the absence of Tineada, Sosopolis, Anchialos is striking as there is indisputable evidence that they constituted significant coastal stations. Therefore the explanation for the absence of a substantial part of the Western Black Sea nomenclature should be sought either in the lack of serious knowledge, as a result of which the range of geographical picture is reduced, or in a selective presentation of the sites on the West Black Sea coast based on certain sea route.

The so-called Leyden Code drawn up in 1553 contains a portolan of the Black Sea in Greek, which in all likelihood was copied from the original, which should be dated in the early 15th century. Unfortunately, the copy does not contain the full text of the protograph and therefore an essential part of the initial information about the Western Black Sea coast is probably irretrievably lost. The use of Greek geographical directions and toponyms written according to Greek phonetics proves that this nautical guide is not a translation from an Italian original, but instead a Byzantine treatise which is the most detailed medieval Loci of the Black Sea. According to the instructions of the text the geographic system included the following sites: Φιδονήσι (Snake Island) – Άσπροκαστρο (Bilhorod-Dnistrovskyi) – Λυκόσταμον (Vylkove) – Σουλινά (Sulina) – Λασηρά (Lacul Roșu?) – Άγιος Πρόδρομος (Șfântul Gheorghe) – Άστραβικος/Παγκράτης (Lacul Razim?) – Γλωσίδα (Lacul Sinoe) – Βιτζιάνας (Danube) – Τζαναβάρδα (Cernavodă) – Κωστάντζα (Constanța) – Πάγκαλα (Mangalia) – Καλιάκρα (Kalikra) – Παλτζίκι (Balchik) – Βιτζά (Sviti Atanas?) – Νέμονα (Emine) – Μεσέβριας (Nesebar) – Άχελω (Pomorie) – Πόρος (Foros) – Πρόδρομος/Άγιος Ιωάννης (Sveti Yoan) – Σωζόπολις (Sozopol) – Άγιος Κήρυκος (Sveti Kirik) – Έλλεια (Masslen Nos) – Ὀριοπάταμο (Ropotamo) – Αθάνατα (Koraka?) – Βορδοβίζού (Urdoviza) – Αγαθόπολις (Ahtopol) – Ρέσβι (Rezovska Reka) – Νίαδας
The information on the Western Black Sea in the document is full of particulars relating to individual details of the physical and economic geography of the region. Among the sites equipped with ports are Νιάδας, Ιστορικό, Μεσέβριας (?), Παλτζίκι, Καλιάκρα, Πάγκαλα, Τξαναβάρδα and Άσπρόκαστρο. The lack of Agathopolis, Anhialos, Varna and others is due to omissions made in the transcript, because in all likelihood they had been dealt with in the original which did not survive until today. The estimated total sum of loading bays showed a significant increase in the number of port structures along *Mare maius* in the 14th–15th centuries compared to the previous century. There are data on the approach of the ships and the morphology of the waters in the information about Νιάδας, Βορδοβιζοῦ, Αθάνατα, ΢ωζόπολις, Άχελώ, Μεσέβριας, Βίτζα, Παλτζίκι, Καλιάκρα, Πάγκαλα, Τξαναβάρδα, Γλωσσίδα, Άστράβικος/Παγκράτης, Άγιος Γεώργιος, Λυκόστομον, Άσπρά, Σουλινά and Άσπρόκαστρο. This long list of stations indicates that the ships had the opportunity to stop at the mentioned sites not only to be loaded with economic output for Mediterranean markets but also to be provided with necessary supplies. Γλωσσίδα, Άστράβικος/Παγκράτης, Άγιος Γεώργιος, Άσπρά, Σουλινά, Λυκόστομον are designated as arms of the *Βιτζίνας* river. Apart from *Βιτζίνας* Πόρος is also designated as river, and it is unequivocally stressed that Πρόδρομος/Άγιος Ἰωάννης and Άγιος Κήρυκος are islands near Σωζόπολις. With its information on the geography of the region, this nautical guide is rightly considered the most detailed written source, presenting a description of the medieval organism of the *Mare maius*’ west coast.

A portolan was found in a French code, known by a copy from 1499. It includes a section about the Black Sea. This document differs significantly from the known navigations not only in its linguistic characteristics, but also because of its stylistic features. The text attests only to the following ports: Mesember (Nesebar) – Exillo (Pomorie) – Amo (Emine) – Varna (Varna) – Castrici (Sveti Georgi) – Callaroza (Kaliakra). The existence of ports is mentioned in the information about Mesember, Exillo, Varna (?) and it is clarified that the pier of Exillo is much better than that of Mesember – an assessment that is likely related to its geographical features and infrastructure and is comparable with clues from the anonymous Venetian portolan. Only the information about Exillo and Varna contains data on the approach of the ships and the morphology of the waters. The other sites mentioned in the document are present with brief information on their geographical characteristics and presence of fortifications, which indicates that they are mentioned only as a guide to people traveling along the West Black Sea coast. Explanation for the presence of only 6 toponyms can be sought in two directions: lack of detailed information on the part of the compiler of the nautical guide or the actual representation of the agonizing port system due to the Ottoman expansion from the end of the 14th – the first half of the 15th century.

The portolans discussed include the main and largely the most important information about the geography of the Western Black Sea, which helps to accurately reconstruct the physical and economic picture of the region in the 13th–15th centuries. Based on these documents, we can partially clarify the development, prioritization and structure of the port, urban and fortification system as well as the physical outlines of Western Black Sea coast and route corridors used by skippers. Moreover portolans serve as corrective and help to properly understand the indications of farmed landscape and nomenclature in navigational charts from the same period, which also include a wide range of heterogeneous data. Last but not least the examined texts illustrate in an eloquent way the significant commercial interest in the outlets of *Mare maius* in the 13th–15th centuries which managed to attach the region to the global Mediterranean market.
Trebizond and Bursa

From the end of the 14th onwards the European economy witnesses a recovery, which helps to explain the emergence of Bursa as the pre-eminent outlet to the west for silk originating from Iran. Other factors of a global nature can be suggested. Timur had attacked the steppe cities north of the Black and Caspian Seas in the 1380s and 1390s. The eventual diversion of Chinese silk from these cities and so from northern Black Sea ports such as Caffa perhaps helped the development of Bursa; it added a new element to the volume of goods assembled in Sultaniya and Tabriz and intended for European markets, and this new element could have been channelled through Bursa rather than through Trebizond. Yet it is with Iranian rather than Chinese silk that Bursa is connected, and paradoxically the diverted Chinese silk seems more to have been exported via Aleppo. Certainly the growth in Iranian silk exports could have contributed to Bursa's development as a great silk trading centre.

But none of these factors explains why the first known sales in Bursa of silk from the Iranian area should have taken place exactly in 1396 or why the long land route through Armenia and northern Asia Minor and ending at Bursa should have been preferred to the journey through Trebizond. The latter journey admittedly required the passage of three high passes in the sector between Erzurum and the port of Trebizond. But thereafter the journey took place by sea; and ship transport, certainly not without its drawbacks, offered greater economy than transport by pack animals.

Let us look, in the round, at actual trading behavior in the two cities. Trebizond precedes. Until the year 1337 goods assembled at Tabriz could reach the Italian ports in one of two ways. The first was by way of Trebizond, the ports of Samsun and Sinop, Constantinople and the Aegean Sea. The second was to take a long inland route through Erzurum, Erzincan and Sivas and then southward through the Antitaurus and Taurus to the port of Ayas in Cilicia. In 1337 Ayas was acquired by the Mamluk sultanate of Egypt and Syria, and the loss of the port to the Mamluks by the kingdom of Little Armenia, vassal of the Il-Khanate, seems to have put paid to the Ayas route as an outlet for goods starting from the great Il-Khanid trading centre of Tabriz. For the time being, until the pattern of settlements and transport changed, the road to Trebizond and the sea journey to Constantinople were the only line by which goods from Tabriz could reach Europe. At Trebizond Venice was given a quarter by the sea in 1367; the quarter's fortifications were kept up at least until the 1440s. Another chrysobull was granted to Venice in 1396. As regards the Genoese, their trading community in Trebizond seems to have remained, again, until 1440 at least. The silk trade through Trebizond continued until the first decade of the 15th century, therefore somewhat beyond the inception of Bursa as a silk market.

Trebizond's monopoly situation was spoilt by two developments. One was the resumption of international trading activity at Aleppo. Trade on a significant scale restarted at Aleppo in the 1390s, if not somewhat before. It presupposed, and depended on, the partial rebuilding of the city after a century or more of depopulation, the latter caused by Mongol attacks taking place over five
decades starting in 1260. Silk trading activity in Aleppo meant not just facilities in that city itself, but the adoption of a new route through Armenia and Upper Mesopotamia, coming through cities such as Akhlat, Hisn Kayfa, Mardin and Ruha or Urfa. Strangely it is Chinese rather than Iranian silk for which we have evidence in the years starting in the 1390s; Iranian silk seems to have come later, perhaps in the mid-15th century.

The second development which undermined Trebizond’s monopoly of the Tabriz trade was the emergence of Bursa. Our very first evidence dates to 1396, when Schiltberger tells us of the arrival in Bursa of silk from Shirvan on the south-west shore of the Black Sea. The apparent suddenness and confidence of the phenomenon are worth noting. The first large building project in Bursa, the Great Mosque, was under construction precisely from 1396 to 1400. Another aspect of the phenomenon worth noting, or reminding ourselves of, is that this end-14th century appearance of silk trading in Bursa is not a mere continuation of the commerce in silk reported by the Moroccan globetrotter Ibn Battuta in 1332. The circumstances in 1332 were very different. Bursa was the newly-constituted Ottoman capital, having been captured from the Byzantine state just six years before. Ibn Battuta dwells on several different precious commodities for sale in the city. In short the infant Ottoman state, having captured the beleaguered second city of a potentially prosperous district – Bithynia --, now, merely by becoming master of Bursa and its district, secured the exploitation of the district’s agricultural potential and took advantage of the city’s proximity to Constantinople to encourage exchange in commodities. The origin of these commodities is not specified, nor are we told the geography of their transport to Bursa; however a variety of different approaches to Bursa can be surmised, chiefly via the Dardanelles and the Sea of Marmora, but also from the direction of Ankara and Sivas as a spin-off from the Ayas trade.

Between Ibn Battuta and the very end of the 14th century there are no references to silk trading in Bursa, and at the second of these dates the conditions were much changed. Bursa was no longer the Ottoman capital. The capital had moved to Edirne at some point in the late 1360s. So the magnetic field of a local princely court had been transferred to a city at a good distance from Bursa and on the far side of Constantinople. The silk on sale is now identifiable as silk from the Iranian region, which was to form the mainstay of Bursa’s exports to the Italian cities. Moreover, as we have pointed out, the mention of silk from Shirvan comes exactly when work begins on the first grand building project in the city, the expansive Great Mosque: the previous Ottoman mosques had been notably limited in size. Thus we are dealing, not with a continuation of the trading activity seen in Bursa by Ibn Battuta in the 1330, but with a new and somewhat sudden phenomenon.

Also new, at least substantially, was the approach to Bursa from the east that was now established, the long land route through Armenia and northern Asia Minor. From Tabriz as far as Sivas roads and associated installations were already in place: cities, other settlements, caravansarays and bridges had been developed and were known. The roads consisted simply of the Ayas route shorn of its final sector, the southward leg from Sivas to Ayas itself. From Sivas westward the road to Bursa proceeded via Ankara, where the building of zawiyas, probably starting in the early 15th century, and of mosques and masjids, apparently in the mid-century, testifies to a certain commercial vitality.

One proviso must be expressed. The inclusion of Sivas on the route is valid only until 1400, the year when Timur attacked the city and left it a barely-inhabited shell. Sivas was acquired by the Ottoman state in 1398, so the period when the sectors of the Bursa route immediately east
and west of the city were in Ottoman hands was distinctly short. On the one hand the attack itself argues the city’s commercial importance at the time. It seems to have resumed its pre-Mongol role of slave market, supplying slaves to the Mamluk sultanate, whose territory lay just a few days’ journey south-eastwards, at the edges of the broad plain watered by the river Euphrates as it flowed past the city of Malatya. Sivas’s role as a slave market was perhaps Timur’s first reason for the attack of 1400, especially as after the siege he turned south and moved on Malatya and other, more traditional Mamluk cities such as Aleppo itself. But Sivas’s value to the Ottoman trade at Bursa must have been a second source of the city’s vitality and a second reason for Timur’s near-annihilation of it. Our proviso here is that after 1400 we cannot speak of the land route’s going through Sivas until a later period, when the whole route as far as Erzurum was safely in Ottoman hands. Instead, Sivas’s role as the principal crossroads city of Asia Minor was inherited by Tokat, two days’ journey to the northwest. However Tokat too displays a certain vitality in the 15th century.

Now that we have set up a fast-expanding Bursa at the end of the 14th century and the new land route taken by Iranian silk, it is time to return to Trebizond. Why in the end did Trebizond lost the silk trade and why did Bursa gain it? The explanation generally put forward is that because Trebizond declined, Bursa took over the trade. We could put the opposite argument: Bursa was developed as a market for Iranian silk, stole the trade from Trebizond and so precipitated Trebizond’s decline.

Yet neither argument works. We have seen that Trebizond did not decline in the second half of the 14th century. Trade volumes may not have stayed at the levels of the Il-Khanid period; but given the drop in demand from Europe those levels could hardly have been maintained on any route. After 1337 and until the 1390s, we argued, Trebizond enjoyed a monopoly position. Were transport conditions, on the road past Erzurum, on the passes to Trebizond and on the Black Sea past Samsun and Sinop, worse than in the Il-Khanid period? Taking all the circumstances into account it does not seem that a decline of Trebizond took place which was dependent on the trade itself; and the emergence of Bursa cannot be explained by such a decline.

It is equally difficult to explain why traders and the relevant Turkish states would be able to set up the long and difficult land route past Erzurum, Erzincan, Sivas (later Tokat), and Ankara to Bursa, when the cheaper and easier alternative via Trebizond was available. So the obverse argument considered above, that the Bursa trade, once set up, would have crippled that of Trebizond, fails too.

Clearly the requirement here is an exogenous and preferably non-commercial factor. That requirement is surely met by the blockade of Constantinople undertaken by the Ottoman sultan Bayezid I in 1394, and only lifted in 1402 after Bayezid’s defeat and capture at the battle of Ankara of 1402. The blockade stopped all traffic from passing through the Bosphorus, the Black Sea approach to Constantinople was therefore cut and the Trebizond route as a whole became unworkable. Bursa’s sudden emergence, the new-found confidence embodied in the start of the Great Mosque’s construction, are explained by the rapidly acquired importance of Bursa in the silk trade, first attested two years after the institution of the Bosphorus blockade. When the blockade was lifted in 1402 Bursa precisely had taken the trade: patterns and volumes had shifted irreversibly and it can truly be said that the decline of Trebizond as a silk-trading centre had decisively begun.

Despite the drastic effect of the Bosphorus blockade, neither the decline of Trebizond nor the rise of Bursa should be presented as having been completed quickly. As we pointed out, Trebizond was still handling silk in the first decade of the 15th century. In the same decade Bursa continued
to trade in the face of formidable impediments. The city was visited by Timur’s son and by Timur himself soon after the battle of Ankara. The engagements and campaigns of the Ottoman civil war which took place over the years 1403-13 often involved or implicated Bursa. But at any rate Trebizond had lost its role as a silk trading centre and Bursa was now established as the prime market where Genoese and Florentines could purchase Iranian silk. And it seems that the largest upswing in the silk trade was yet to come.
Angeliki Tzavara
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(No title, no text)
The 13th-15th Centuries Sailing Directions’ Evidence about the Shifting Navigational, Economic and Political Conditions in the Black Sea Basin

Knowledge about spatial realities during the middle ages is scarce due to the general lack of interest in preserving data concerning everyday life. Random survival and recent discoveries and publication of texts describing coastlines, coastlands and spanning the waters of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, recorded by mariners that have frequently visited those basins, calls for revision of the available navigational documentation concerning the Black Sea.

The growth since the 11th-12th century of European participation in the Mediterranean long distance trade affected transportation of goods and all related navigational activities such as ship design, capacity and speed or finding the route to desired destination, as well as access to ports and rivers’ estuaries where cargos were regularly loaded and unloaded: over time for all of the above reasons were necessary more and more sailors the majority of whom were not familiar with the local environment.

A way of orienting foreign navigators into the Black Sea waters was either by hiring pilots, presumably from among the Pontic sailors in the Golden Horn or along the Bosporus, or relying on sea-farers’ records as a description and graphic depiction meant to help those occasionally visiting that basin. Because Italians since the eleventh century casually, and after 1204 legally visited the Pontic area, Black Sea coasts and ports appear in the earliest survived sailing directions and nautical charts.

Recent scholarship revised the relationship between sailing directions and nautical charts concluding that they were not compiled by the same people, or that the data coming from navigational texts were not used for the construction of maps: close examination of both, at least as far as coastal toponymy is concerned, shows that they do not overlap; there are many more place-names on the charts than in the most detailed navigational instructions that focused on ports and provided description of landmarks.

Yet both of these aids were necessary for successful trips of travelers overseas, be they mariners, merchants, diplomats or pirates; if lost at sea after storms or other disaster captains, pilots and sailors had to figure out how to get back to their route. A necessity for fast and accurate reorientation had prompted the requirement of carrying maps, pilot books and an array of other navigational tools for the recovery and continuation of an interrupted trip.

Maps and sailing directions used at sea are lost, while those that had come down are copies of the practical ones; some of them had survived because of humanists’ interest in the world while the artistic qualities of the maps contributed to their appreciation and collection. Marine knowledge has also been transmitted by inserting records in navigational, commercial or geographic works. Thus, descriptions of seamen’s experience and knowledge had survived despite not being considered of great importance.
There are 21 medieval sailing directions that include Black Sea environment, mainly ports with their appearances, ways of escaping dangers when approaching them and best places for landing, beaches, anchorages, finding fresh water, food and desired goods - are among the main features of a good port. Portolans named after ports displayed the goal of every sailing. And here are the portolans where the Black Sea, the Sea of Azov and many of their ports and navigational particularities are reported.

1. Liber de existencia riveriarum, before 1200
2. Il Compasso da navegare, opera italiana della meta del secolo XIII
3. Portolan of Carlo di Primeriano Girolami, late 14th century
4. Venetian scroll portolan of the late 14th century
5. Portolan of Grazia Pauli, late 14th century
6. Venetian portolan from Arte del mare, late 14th – early 15th century
7. Portolan from the Sfera of Gregorio Dati, before 1435
8. Portolan of Michael of Rhodes, ca. 1445
9. Portolan Rizo, 1445
10. Portolan of Grazioso Benincasa, 15th century
11. Portolan of Alvise (Ca) da Mosto, 15th century
12. Portolan of Gerolamo Azzuri, 15th century
13. Anonymous portolan from the Bell Library, Minneapolis, 15th century
14. French portolan from BNF, 1449
15. Portolan in De Navigazione of Benedetto Cotrugli, 1465
16. Abridged Greek portolan, 1534
17. “Second” Greek portolan, 1573
18. Leiden Greek portolan, 1553
19. Italian Cosmography of 1550
20. Portolan from the National Library of Madrid, 16th-17th century
21. French portolan from Jean Baptiste Colbert’s fond in BNF, 1669

The abundance of navigational information from the above texts is difficult to organize and analyze due to variations of statements, even contradictions: they are hardly records from direct observations, but their information comes from copies of copies of copies with multiple gaps and variations – even (1), the earliest portolan dating from end-12th century, is a result of preliminary collected information and possibly personal navigation around the Black Sea, but lacks the distances between ports despite their marking with ‘miles…’

Not all the listed portolans are complete or describe all the shores of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov. Only 10 (1, 2, 6, 7, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21) cover more or less, with additions and omissions, the entire circumference of those seas, while the remaining 11 are only partial, intentionally or
because by error passages or pages from their originals were skipped. Most are following the route from a port to port along the coasts, while in many (1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 15, 17, 19 and 20) are included “pelenggi” or direct sailing across the open sea.

In accordance with Venetian policies in the Black Sea navigation, Venetian portolans (3, 4, 6, and 8) used sailings along the southern coast to Trebizond and then either continued the same way to the Straits of Kerch, or headed directly to the Sea of Azov and Tana. The most complete (with certain gaps) Venetian portolan is the one in Arte del Mare which is quite similar to Compasso, while the most informative one comes from the book of Michael of Rhodes, where different sailings for getting to Tana are described.

Compasso (2) as well as 5, 7, 15 and 19 - they all come from Tuscany or are attributed to central Italy. Although Florence was not a maritime city its commercial agents and humanist intellectuals had a vast web of commercial networks everywhere in the Mediterranean, including Constantinople and the Black Sea. They collected and preserved numerous and various documents of all kinds including navigational direction which were used for instruction (7), diplomacy (19) and in technical treatises (15).

At least 5 of the 15th century navigational compilations – 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 – are variations of the same archetype, although they are copied by people of different origin: if judged by the names under which the manuscripts had come down, they came from various Italian port-cities from Ancona and Venice to Florence and Genoa. Considered works produced to assist the limited Venetian Black Sea navigation after the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans, today they might be taken as such of personal interest.

The 3 published by A.Delatte Greek navigational instructions (16, 17 and 18) come from manuscripts dated between the 30s and the 70s of the 16th century. They are included in this study for two reasons: first, because numerous Greek nautical charts of that time are almost identical to Italian copies; and second, the Abridged Greek portolan (16) uses many Italian words written in Greek letters, while the content of the “Second” (17) is very much the same as the Italian one from Madrid (20). The reason for that is the Greek mariners’ diaspora everywhere in the Mediterranean after the fall of Byzantium.

The two French nautical instructions (14 and 21) are not related to any of the Italian or Greek sailing directions. There is no other explanation for their uniqueness except that the portolan of 1449 was copied from a special French of other coastal reconnaissance expedition related to the planned for 1444 but aborted crusade; while the quite complete portolan coming from the archives of Colbert is trying to update medieval knowledge with the 17th century reality, probably due to military or economic interests.

There is a lot of evidence about Catalan and Spanish visits, travel, piracy and even residence of Catalan subjects in the Black Sea area. The sea is present in all Majorcan, Catalan or Portuguese nautical charts but no text in Spanish or Catalan dedicated to Black Sea navigation has surfaced so far. A possible explanation for this deficiency is the extensive use of Lingua Franca among Catalans or the presence of an international crew aboard Catalan ships.

In conclusion: The medieval nautical instructions that had come down to us evidence not just how mariners negotiated the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov water with their navigation, but also
that they created and maintained economic networks there. Preferred ports and destinations of both authors and users of nautical information reflect the interests of their compilers, e.g. Venetian aiming at Tana and Trebizond while others, mainly the Genoese, sailed to Vicina in the Danube delta or Caffa in the Crimea.

On the other hand, as pointed out in dating Black Sea material in Italian and Greek sailing directions, it was not necessary for the authors had no access to the Pontic area - something easily controlled at the Straits of Bosporus. Neither before the 13th century the “Byzantine” Black Sea, nor after mid-15th the “Ottoman” were completely closed to outsiders: the cosmopolitan crews of the Mediterranean navigators did always find a way if not to the commerce, at least to collect information about the Pontic Sea.
Diether Roderich Reinsch,
Zu einigen Problemen bei der Edition von Autographa

Beatrice Daskas,
Χάρτη καὶ μέλανι :
les manuscrits ambrosiens de Nicolas Mésaritès, vieilles acquisitions, nouvelles hypothèses

Sofia Kotzabassi,
Authors’ Corrections in Manuscripts of the Paleologan Period

Ernst Gamillscheg,
Beobachtungen zu Autographen und Hausbüchern

Brigitte Mondrain,
L’auteur au travail dans ses livres

Antonio Rigo – Marco Scarpa,
Le successive redazioni delle opere di Gregorio il Sinaita (sulla base della tradizione manoscritta greca e slava)

Raúl Estangüi Gómez,
L’élaboration de l’Ekthésis Néa retour sur la tradition manuscrite d’un manuel de la chancellerie patriarcale de la fin du xivᵉ siècle
Zu einigen Problemen bei der Edition von Autographa

Nichts ist leichter als ein Autographon zu edieren – so scheint es jedenfalls auf den ersten Blick. Man hat es nicht mit vielen Manuskripten zu tun, die mit Schreiberversehen aller Art behaftet sind, braucht also kein *stemma codicum* zu erstellen, keine *recensio* durchzuführen und ist der Mühe entbohnt, zwischen Varianten zu wählen oder kraft des eigenen *ingenium* das Richtige zu konjizieren, sondern muss nur getreu das wiedergeben, was man im vom Autor selbst geschriebenen *codex unicus* vor sich hat.

In Wahrheit jedoch gibt es Probleme verschiedener Art, von welchen hier einige an drei Beispielen skizziert werden sollen, von denen ich mich mit zweien zu verschiedenen Zeiten als Editor beschäftigt habe.


Die *lapsus penneae* des Autor-Kopisten sind deshalb aufschlussreich, weil sie uns vor Augen führen, dass auch Autoren in dieser Beziehung keineswegs fehlerfrei arbeiten. Einige Beispiele: Ausgelassen sind kleine Wörter τοῦτο, ξυν, ὐ, ὕ oder Buchstaben und Buchstabengruppen innerhalb von Wörtern: So lesen wir προσεδόησαν statt προσεδόκησαν, παρεθεὶν statt παρελθεῖν, στραᾶς statt στρατιᾶς, σφόδα statt σφόδρα, ταῦ statt ταύτης, λάβεν statt ἔλαβεν, ἔρυμνότα statt ἔρυμνότατα, στενώτα statt στενώτατα; wir finden Dittographien wie τελελέσας statt τελέσας, διάβασις τοῦ βασις τοῦ statt διάβασις τοῦ und Assimilationen wie τατᾶνῳ statt τιτᾶνῳ. All das ist leicht zu erkennen, und was der Autor eigentlich sagen will, unterliegt keinem Zweifel; wir sind daher berechtigt, den Text selbst der Absicht des Autors entsprechend herzustellen und die Fehler im *apparatus* zu dokumentieren.

Die für den Text selbst verfolgte Methode, die, Fassung letzter Hand‘ zu drucken und die Entstehungsvarianten im *apparatus* beizugeben, funktioniert für das Geschichtswerk selbst, nicht


Der Fall Dukas ist interessant und gibt seinerseits für die Behandlung des Textes in der Edition spezielle Probleme auf, deren Lösungen auch davon abhängen werden, ob man den Text als Autographon ansieht oder nicht.
Xάρτη καὶ μέλανι : les manuscrits ambrosiens de Nicolas Mésaritès, vieilles acquisitions, nouvelles hypothèses

Cette intervention veut recueillir une série de notes autour des témoins ambrosiens des écrits de Nicolas Mésaritès (1160 env. – post 1216), érudit byzantin actif à l’extrême fin de l’époque des Comnènes, connu pour son engagement dans les débats politiques et religieux au lendemain de la prise de Constantinople par les Croisés (1204).

Au cœur de cette communication se situe la comparaison paléographique de certains documents et manuscrits avec les témoins autographes de Nicolas Mésaritès conservés à la Bibliothèque Ambrosienne de Milan (F 93 sup. et F 96 sup., respectivement nos. 350 et 352 Martini-Bassi).

La comparaison semblerait permettre l’identification de l’érudit byzantin comme celui qui présida à la rédaction de la missive envoyée par Alexis III Ange aux Génois (mars 1199) afin de rouvrir les négociations sur la concession de privilèges à la République maritime après le blocage des relations diplomatiques et commerciales provoqué par l’affaire Gafforio (Genova Arch. di Stato, Mat. Pol. N. g. 2737 D-E: Dölger, Regesten, n. 1649, Facsim. Taf. V, nr. 8; Miklosich-Müller III, nr. VIII, pp. 46-47). Le document nous conduit à élucider un aspect de la carrière polymorphe de Mésaritès jusqu’à présent demeuré inconnu, c’est-à-dire son engagement en tant que médecin à la cour d’Alexis III Ange. Sa connaissance de l’art médical, envisageable à la lumière de ses écrits publiés (cf. par ex. sa Description de l’Eglise des Saints-Apôtres, [42], p. 91 s. Heisenberg 1908), est ultérieurement confirmée par un discours inédit dédié au même empereur, dont on présentera des extraits (F 96 sup., ff. 35r-37v; 41r-42v).


L’exposé s’articulera autour de ces points, afin de jeter une lumière nouvelle sur les circonstances historiques et culturelles de rédaction de ces témoins.
Authors’ Corrections in Manuscripts of the Paleologan Period

The paper attempts to illustrate why a byzantine scholar would like to change his own text and how he realizes these changes, using examples of authors like Gregory of Cyprus, Constantine Acropolites, Manuel Philes and Nicolaus Kabasilas.
Beobachtungen zu Autographen und Hausbüchern

L'auteur au travail dans ses livres

Dans la reconstitution de l'histoire culturelle de Byzance, l'examen des manuscrits joue un rôle important car il permet d'apprécier l'usage que les érudits ont fait de leurs livres. La copie réalisée peut conduire le lecteur à des commentaires ou des scholies dans les marges du texte, comme elle peut quelquefois l'amener à effectuer dans ce texte même des modifications, dont l'appréciation critique dépendra de divers facteurs. Les progrès qu'autorise l'identification de l'écriture de copistes dont l'activité comme intellectuels peut être peu à peu reconstruite grâce aux manuscrits, que leur nom soit établi ou qu'ils restent anonymes, contribue même parfois à parvenir au cœur de la création littéraire.

Des annotations en marge d'un manuscrit de contenu complexe, astronomique ou philosophique par exemple, sont susceptibles de témoigner de la façon dont un ouvrage a été lu. Encore s'agit-il de déterminer si ces annotations marginales ont été portées par le scribe du texte principal ou par un copiste autre, contemporain ou postérieur ; il faut aussi établir si ces notes sont de nature originale et peuvent être attribuées à celui qui les a écrites, comme c'est bien souvent le cas des annotations d'Aréthas de Césarée, ou si elles reproduisent un commentaire déjà existant et attesté dans des manuscrits plus anciens – peut-être même, tout simplement, dans le manuscrit qui avait été utilisé comme modèle par le copiste du livre que l'on analyse.

Le travail de lecture active, 'intelligente', que des annotations peuvent aider à mettre clairement en évidence, est souvent moins aisé à repérer dans le corps du texte lui-même. Des interventions telles qu'une rature ou le grattage d'un mot ou d'un passage, par exemple, et leur remplacement par un autre élément sont souvent des éléments pertinents pour réaliser l'analyse philologique du traité reproduit, elles constituent des jalons dans l'établissement de l'histoire d'un texte ; mais leur signification peut être différente selon qu'elles sont dues au scribe lui-même ou à un réviseur contemporain, ou bien qu'elles sont le fait d'un lecteur plus tardif du manuscrit. L'interprétation variera aussi s'il s'agit d'une œuvre de la littérature grecque antique, d'un traité patristique ou d'un ouvrage byzantin.

Un Planude ou un Nicéphore Grégoras, par exemple, se sont illustrés, c'est bien connu, non seulement en s'efforçant de corriger des textes transmis avec des fautes dues à la copie mais aussi en 'éditant' à nouveaux frais des œuvres littéraires ou scientifiques dont le texte ne leur paraissait sur certains points pas conforme à ce qu'avait dû écrire l'auteur antique, ou même à ce qu'il aurait dû écrire. La variante n'est alors plus l'attestation d'une leçon transmise par une tradition qui serait susceptible de remonter à l'auteur et que l'on reconstitue selon les lois de la critique textuelle ; elle peut être la marque d'une 'récriture' d'un texte. De nouveaux cas illustrant les interventions critiques de ces deux érudits dans et sur les textes sont encore trouvés aujourd'hui : ils ont eu une activité remarquable et sont particulièrement connus, mais ils ne sont pas les seuls à avoir mis en œuvre un tel talent.

Dans le cas des compositions byzantines, lorsque la copie d'un manuscrit est contemporaine de la rédaction de l'œuvre par son auteur, l'étude du livre mérite une approche un peu différente : dans quelle mesure un manuscrit pourrait-il être mis en relation avec l'auteur même des ouvrages
qu'il contient ? A-t-il été copié auprès de l'auteur, par un secrétaire, voire par l'auteur ? Cette recherche d’autographes peut se révéler particulièrement fructueuse dans la période paléologue, où les érudits copient souvent eux-mêmes leurs livres et pour laquelle elle s’enrichit constamment. Le repérage de brouillons ou de copies intermédiaires avant une mise au propre définitive est souvent un préambule à de telles identifications ; l'analyse des ratures peut donc être très pertinente, même si elle mérite d’être effectuée avec prudence pour ne pas induire en erreur. Mais l'examen même des modalités de la constitution de livres, de recueils, de lettres par exemple, est de nature à aider à retrouver l’auteur-éditeur au travail.

Quelques exemples illustreront les différentes facettes d’une recherche qui combine philologie et histoire.
Le successive redazioni delle opere di Gregorio il Sinaita  
(sulla base della tradizione manoscritta greca e slava)

Gregorio il Sinaita è sicuramente l’autore spirituale più importante del XIV secolo. Il suo influsso, considerevole a Bisanzio e tra gli Slavi meridionali già durante la sua vita e nel periodo immediatamente successivo, fu potente anche in Russia sul finire del XV secolo e sul Monte Athos e in Moldavia nel XVIII secolo. L’edizione critica delle sue opere resta un desideratum, dal momento che il testo presentato dalla settecentesca Filocalia, e poi ripreso dalla Patrologia graeca è difettoso, e quello preparato da Hans-Veit Beyer (1985) nel suo lavoro di abilitazione, oltre a essere stato condotto su un campione limitato di manoscritti, non tiene conto delle successive rielaborazioni e stratificazioni dello stesso testo. Appare necessario perciò un inventario e uno studio dell’intera tradizione manoscritta greca, accompagnati da un lavoro parallelo sulla versione slava delle opere, effettuata con ogni probabilità tra l’Athos e i monasteri di Paroria, quando l’autore era ancora in vita.

Una ricognizione della tradizione delle opere di Gregorio permette di distinguere tra i manoscritti che presentano collezioni di opere dello stesso e quelli che invece conservano scritti isolati. La formazione delle collezioni appare successiva e sembra databile con una certa approssimazione.

Grazie alle testimonianze esterne, prima tra tutte la Vita di Gregorio il Sinaita scritta dal patriarca Callisto I, sappiamo che egli rielaborò in momenti successivi alcuni di questi suoi scritti.

L’attenzione è qui rivolta in primo luogo alla tradizione manoscritta greca di due opere, la Breve notizia sulla hesychia e i Capitoli sulla preghiera.

I manoscritti greci che contengono il primo di questi scritti testimoniano titoli, rubriche di capitoli e destinatari diversi. Ci troviamo evidentemente di fronte a rielaborazioni successive della stessa opera.

I manoscritti greci dei Capitoli sulla preghiera attestano l’esistenza di due redazioni successive dell’opera, delle quali l’ultima presenta in più i capitoli finali. Alcuni elementi presenti in quest’ultima sezione consentono di datare con una certa approssimazione questa seconda e definitiva redazione.

La tradizione manoscritta slava dei Capitoli della preghiera consente di seguire ancora più nel dettaglio lo svolgersi di questo processo redazionale, testimoniato da manoscritti che vanno dagli anni ’30 agli anni ’60. Possiamo osservare in essi il progressivo formarsi di questa operetta del Sinaita.

In una prima fase, testimoniata da due manoscritti degli anni ’30 (Moskva GIM Uv 510-4° e Sofija BAN 77 cui va aggiunto Moskva GIM Chlud 237, degli anni 40), quando Gregorio è appena arrivato definitivamente a Paroria, sono presenti solo i primi tre capitoli.
Alla fine degli anni ’40 (Sankt-Petersburg RNB Pogod 1054, cui va aggiunto Paris BnF Sl 8, che testimonia la recezione all’Athos di questa traduzione alla fine degli anni 50) risale la testimonianza che ai primi tre capitoli ne sono aggiunti altri tre, che nella numerazione finale saranno i capitoli 5-7. Infine, soltanto negli anni ’60, all’interno della raccolta delle opere complete di Gregorio, troviamo tutti gli otto capitoli (Sank-Peterburg RNB Gil’f 47, Sofija NBKM 1036, Sank-Peterburg RNB Gil’f 35, Sofija NBKM 672, Sofija BAN 80), e solo in alcuni manoscritti i Capitoli sulla preghiera sono presentati insieme, uno di seguito all’altro, come un’unica opera.

La storia del capitolo 8 è particolarmente complessa nei manoscritti slavi. Lo ritroviamo dapprima, fin dagli anni ’40, come un testo a sé stante, assieme a testi dello pseudo-Macario (e in effetti si tratta della rielaborazione di un testo di questo autore). Soltanto successivamente, quando i Capitoli sulla preghiera vengono presentati raccolti in un’unica opera (dallo stesso Gregorio o dai suoi discepoli), anche questo estratto è unito agli altri come capitolo 8.

Attraverso lo studio di queste successive fasi redazionali è possibile ricostruire anche il metodo di lavoro di Gregorio (e forse anche dei discepoli che in alcuni casi ne sembrano trascrivere l’insegnamento).
L’élaboration de l’Ekthésis Néa.
Retour sur la tradition manuscrite d’un manuel de la chancellerie patriarcale de la fin du XIVᵉ siècle

Au cours du patriarcat de Nil (1380-1389), la chancellerie de la Grande Église élabora un véritable manuel à l’usage de ses fonctionnaires, connu sous le nom d’Ekthésis Néa, contenant des indications pour la rédaction protocolaire des lettres (pittakia). D’après Jean Darrouzès, auteur de la dernière édition, il s’agit d’un document unique en son genre. Toutefois, sa compilation doit être mise en rapport avec d’autres efforts entrepris à la même époque au sein de la chancellerie patriarcale, visant à réorganiser et à élargir ses compétences. Nous sommes là dans une période d’importantes transformations institutionnelles dans l’Empire, visant à redéfinir les formes d’encadrement de la société et d’exercice de l’autorité politique.

Ce manuel de chancellerie a été copié dans un grand nombre de manuscrits, témoignant de la diffusion de ce document, y compris en dehors de la chancellerie patriarcale. Dans son édition, Jean Darrouzès fournit un examen exhaustif de tous les témoins connus, constatant les nombreuses transpositions, additions et interpolations, qui rendent difficile la reconstruction d’un stemma. Il parvient néanmoins à établir deux familles, en fonction des titres et de l’ordre des paragraphes. Selon Darrouzès, ce sont les témoins rattachés à la famille A qui apparaissent comme les plus acceptables et proches du prototype.

Le Genavensis graecus 23 appartient à la famille B. Outre l’Ekthésis Néa, ce manuscrit contient notamment le nomocanon de Matthieu Blastarès, une liste des dignités (offikia) du patriarcat et, surtout, la seule copie du célèbre Livre du préfet, rédigé à l’époque de l’empereur Léon VI (886-912). Dans son catalogue, Henri Omont le date des xivᵉ-xvᵉ siècles, mais Darrouzès considère qu’« il n’y pas lieu de remonter au-delà du xve siècle », c’est pourquoi il ne l’a guère utilisé pour son édition et son étude. Toutefois, le relevé des filigranes, ainsi qu’une note relative au calcul de la date de Pâques de l’an 1380, ne laissent aucun doute sur le fait que ce codex fut élaboré au cours du dernier quart du xivᵉ siècle, soit à l’époque de la compilation de l’Ekthésis Néa. L’étude de ce manuscrit permet, en outre, d’attribuer son élaboration au milieu de la chancellerie patriarcale de cette époque, ce qui incite à reconsidérer non seulement la place de ce témoin dans la tradition manuscrite, mais dans le contexte de rédaction de cette œuvre.
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The present round-table can be considered as the sequel to the session ‘Sacred Space’ chaired at the International Congress of Byzantine Studies in 2006. The paper presented then to the international community of Byzantine scholars introduced them to a new concept and research field of **hierotopy**. A number of monographs and studies have been published since then. Among them we can mention large collections of articles based on the papers given at various symposia dedicated to the subject of hierotopy, such as: *Hierotopy. Comparative Studies of Sacred Spaces; New Jerusalems. Hierotopy and Iconography of Sacred Spaces; Spatial Icons. Performativity in Byzantium and Medieval Russia; Hierotopy of Light and Fire in Byzantium and Medieval Russia; Holy Water in the Hierotopy and Iconography of the Christian World* (most of them are available via the link: www.hierotopy.ru). Most speakers of the upcoming round-table actively participated in these research symposia, and made a considerable contribution to the development of the research field of **Hierotopy**. Thus, we rely on the already existing scholarly collaboration and discussions stemming from it, which have their own history. This time, we would like to discuss a number of methodological issues along with the new hierotopic concepts and the correlation between the hierotopic approach and the traditional realm of iconographic studies.

The issue of terminology and the linguistic research apparatus appears as crucial one due to the fact that most of our terms were elaborated to describe flat pictures, and are not adequate for the phenomena dealing with sacred spaces. The three new notions – **Hierotopy**, **Spatial Icons** and **Image-Paradigms**— were offered in the course of the recent fifteen years since 2001, when I coined the term **Hierotopy** and launched the research programme exploring this field. These three concepts have been gradually taking their shape since then. They are interrelated while at the same time separate and very specific. The term **Hierotopy** stands for the entire framework, intending to intellectually register a special stratum of historical phenomena, which have previously eluded scholars’ attention due to the absence of a specific terminology apparatus. The neologism **Hierotopy** (or **ierotopia**), consists, obviously, of two Greek roots: **hieros** (sacred) and **topos** (space), following the pattern of many other already established over the last hundred years scholarly terms, ‘iconography’ being one of them.

The definition of **hierotopy** given 15 years ago ran as follows: **Hierotopy is the creation of sacred spaces regarded as a special form of human creativity, and a field of historical research which reveals and analyses specific relevant examples of that creativity.** The term **Spatial Icons**, designating iconic imagery presented in space, was conceived to describe the most important part of hierotopic phenomena, existing beyond flat pictures or any combination of art objects. The term **Image-Paradigm** is an **instrumentum studiorum** for the analysis of this specific category of images which appeared as visions in space and differed radically from common depictions on panels and walls.

Several other terms and notions emerged following these three proposed by myself. Nicoletta Isar suggested that the term **chorography** might be very useful especially in description of the circular movement as the basic principle in the organization of Byzantine sacred spaces. Peter Brown
invented the term *chorotopos*, inspired by Bakhtin’s *chronotop*, which seems a helpful *instrumentum studiorum* for studies of imaginary spaces in written sources (Brown explored, as an example, such type of space described in the *Life of St Theodore of Sykeon* as compared with the actual archeological site). Nicolas Bakirtzis introduced a very practical term *hierotopos* to reveal the phenomenon of a particular monastery and its sacred environment. We can also refer to other terms but the ones already mentioned here seem to be sufficient to demonstrate the process of the ongoing formation of the new research language.

Let me turn to specifics now, addressing the most powerful Byzantine example – the view of the ‘Great Church’ of the Empire – the cathedral of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople dating back to 6th century A.D. Even in its current state of preservation, when we are able to see only the material shell of the building, it is clear that we are not only dealing with a masterpiece of the world architecture or a mystical place of divine presence, but with a particular project of spatial imagery, which was created by concrete people in concrete historical circumstances. The project included immovable architectural forms and sacred images, as well as changing of liturgical vessels and ritual gestures, dramaturgy of lighting and olfactory effects (various incenses), resounding words and recollections of miracle-stories - all woven together into one single whole. This specific creativity consisting in formation of spatial imagery has been called *hierotopy*.

Characteristically, whole aspects and types of creativity could not be properly discussed outside hierotopic framework, which is not linked to positivist classifications of objects. For instance, such considerable phenomenon as the dramaturgy of lighting occurs beyond the boundaries of traditional disciplines. As recent studies have convincingly demonstrated, within the space of Justinian’s Hagia Sophia, which originally did not have any figurative images, the image of God was created by the most sophisticated system of lighting, including natural light of the sun, moon and stars, reflected by the golden mosaics, marble decorations, silver furnishings and vessels, as well as by the fire burning in innumerable, sometimes moving, lamps and in thousands of candles visible through the transparent smoke of incense.

There also existed a complicated system of artificial lights, which is now being reconstructed with the help of various archaeological and written sources. If we summarise the results of the most recent studies, we would see that the entire environment of Hagia Sophia was conceived by Justinian and his genius master builders as the most powerful spatial icon of the Lord made of light. Moreover this was a fundamentally performative icon – that is, it existed in continuous fluidity and dynamics, its movement never solidifying or arresting itself. In addition, this ideal iconic image was not flat but fundamentally spatial.

Thus, the most complicated system of natural light was conceived here: it woke the imaginations of present day architects and conceptual artists. A living, changing and unbelievably rich environment of light was created within the church through the system of mirror reflections. Anthemios of Tralles and Isidoros of Miletus (by the way, not professional master-builders but the best optical engineers of that time) developed the system of reflections for the first cupola of Hagia Sophia, which was notably flatter than the cupola we see today. They used the mosaic window sills in the drum as reflectors, which refracted the light into the cupola and, more importantly, also lit up the cupola at night. When there was no sunlight, they reflected the light of the stars and moon, thus, creating the effect of a continuously illuminated cupola of the nocturnal Hagia Sophia. In other words, a glittering and blinking cloud of light hung over the cupola.
How can we understand the revealed phenomenon, what was the meaning of this luminous cloud? I have argued elsewhere that it was a visible embodiment of the famous biblical notion and symbol, the so-called Kavod in Hebrew, or Doxa in Greek, or Slava Bozhia in Church Slavonic (literally meaning “Glory”). According to the Bible, God reveals himself to the people in the form of a luminous cloud which hovered over the Ark of the Tabernacle, or led Jewish people through the Desert (Ex.16,10; 24,12-18; 34,5; 40,34). To the best of my knowledge, nobody has suggested before that it was an original Judeo-Christian proto-icon which did not break the Second Commandment and, therefore, was the ideal image of God. As it seems, it made a great impact upon the Christian visual culture. We all remember that this luminous cloud appeared in the Gospels at the moment of Transfiguration, descending upon the Apostles in attendance.

In the Early Christian imagery the luminous and fiery cloud was combined with the anthropomorphic image of Christ. The characteristic example is the six-century mosaic in the altar apse of Sts Kosmas and Damian basilica in Rome, where we are able to see not just a merely triumphant image of Christ clad in the golden robe, but the luminous and fiery clouds resembling the Divine Ladder and the Sacred Way appearing with Christ from Heaven, as another image of God revealed in the Second Coming. So, the idea of the luminous cloud was significant and quite alive in the minds of the sixth century people, when Hagia Sophia of Constantinople was being created.

There are some earlier examples when we are able to witness the process of formation of the subject in the Early Christian iconography which adopted and reflected the more powerful spatial imagery. The ‘Hospitality of Abraham’ from the early fifth-century mosaics of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome provides an eloquent example. There are three different images of the Divine Light in this composition: the luminous clouds in the left part, the mandorla of light around the central angel in the Meeting of the three angels in the upper right segment, and the golden background behind three angels at the table, which will later become commonplace but at that moment looks experimental, occupying only a small part of the image. The artist used three possible devices to represent the idea of the Divine light.

In the lesser known but very instructive fifth-century floor mosaic from the Louvre (originally, from the Near East) one may notice the same not established formative process. The luminous cloud is represented over the altar in the ciborium which itself is shown as the Tabernacle. The image of the mandorla with the Cross appears in the centre of the fiery cloud, thus, indicating the origins of the mandorla motif.

In the sixth century, for the first time, we are able to see how the mandorla of light was established as the core of the Transfiguration scene – the earliest known example extant in the altar apse of the Sinai basilica. The idea of the Divine Light had already been fixed iconographically but even then the image was still an element of the hierotopic project. Above the apse there is a window from which the light streams into the church at morning liturgies; this naturally performative ray of sunlight appears in the space as visually proceeding from Christ in the Transfiguration, deliberately displayed beneath the altar window. In the church the sunlight comes through the fumes of burning incense and touches the heads of believers in the naos of the Sinai basilica, recreating the sacred moment when the luminous cloud covered the Apostles at the Transfiguration. It is noteworthy, that an echo of this practice can be experienced in the modern day Orthodox churches: during morning liturgies, at a particular moment when the luminous cloud (made of light and burning incense)
comes out from the Royal Doors of the sanctuary to the congregation in front of the iconostasis as mystical appearance of the Divine Glory, certainly without any understanding of the Jewish origins of this performative image and the symbolic meaning of the Kavod-Doxa.

So, the luminous cloud in the cupola of Hagia Sophia was a most powerful and important spatial icon of the Empire which cannot be explored by the traditional iconographical apparatus. At the same time this spatial imagery was reflected in and adopted by flat pictures on the walls – sometimes it survived in a form of common icons. Since Early Byzantine period one may witness gradual decline and diminishing of spatial effects. However, even on a limited scale, they played a great role in the church space revealing some unique iconographic motives. Among others, the so-called Whirling Disc comes to mind. As I have argued elsewhere, this was a symbolic image of the Byzantine Church as the Spatial Icon of the Whirling Light.

I have mentioned just one eloquent example of spatial icons in the Byzantine world. The recent study, in which the speakers of our round table actively participated, revealed several other phenomena in the Christian East and West. Many more should be explored in future, for this is a vast field of research lying ahead of us. Most of these spatial icons were overlooked, neglected and excluded from the art history, or the history of culture in general, due to the lack of necessary concepts and terms, and the absence of hierotopic vision. The methods elaborated in the context of positivist ideology and directly shaping the studies of material objects, such as the much revered stylistic or iconographic analysis, were inadequate in the case of performative spatial iconic imagery, which played a considerable role in the Byzantine world. As a natural conclusion to this statement, the notions of Hierotopy and Iconicity should be introduced into the research field and receive their legitimate status in the art-historical education, especially in the field of Byzantine studies. Spatial icons might be studied along the iconographic devices and stylistic phenomena. However, we should also be aware, that such introduction would require general revision of the art history as a discipline.
Sacred Spaces vs Holy Sites:  
On the Limits and Advantages of a Hierotopic Approach

It should be acknowledged that the hierotopy notion, first proposed by Alexei Lidov in 2001 and later developed in an international congress held in Moscow in 2004 as well as in a number of later publications, has the merit of having elicited a number of questions that became a matter of scholarly debate at an international level in the last decade. Critics have laid emphasis on Lidov’s reluctance to provide a wider and more grounded theoretical frame to his approach, which, I assume, should be basically interpreted as an intentional choice and a way to manifest distinctiveness vis-à-vis the often artificial scholarly trends that became so modish in the last years. Instead of launching a new label – why not a “hierotopic turn” after so many analogous turns (iconic, spatial, liturgical, material, etc.)? – he preferred to make use of a neologism that may draw the attention of art historians and invite them to shift their focus to an hitherto neglected field of interest – namely that of the ways in which Christian sacred spaces happened to be shaped by the interaction of different elements, not all of which belonging to the traditional categories of art history, such as liturgical rites, music, lighting effects, and fragrances. This indication proved to be fruitful, given that many subsequent studies have dealt with the performative aspects and multisensory devices associated with Byzantine and Medieval buildings.

I assume that Lidov’s primary concern was with showing an alternative way, a direction that was worth following after the first years of enthusiastic rediscovery of long underestimated fields of research that came after the publication of such ground-breaking books as David Freedberg’s The Power of Images, Hans Belting’s Bild und Kult and later on Alfred Gell’s Art and Agency. In many respects, both of these works can be now at least partly understood as monumental attempts at making sense of the digital globalization of images in its very beginnings and the enormous change in cognitive praxis and communication processes it engendered. Religious, and more specifically cultic and miraculous images, were redeemed from their well rooted perception as artworks intended for the illiterate and came to be used as key-arguments for the principle that images, far from being mere outcomes of historical and cultural processes, also play an active role in the shaping of human groups, their self-awareness and their approach to both the social and the supernatural dimensions.

For many readers of these two books, anyway, their innovative character lay in their legitimization of the art historian’s right to show interest in images previously seen as devoid of sufficient aesthetic qualities: icons, wax statues, ex-votos, advertisements and political monuments came to the fore as the primary, or most fruitful, focus of art-historical research. Increased emphasis on the cultic dimension of images elicited a number of new studies which gradually shifted their interest to other material objects being involved in cultic phenomena: these included both the foci of worship – tombs, bodily and contact relics, holy mementoes, loca sancta, and miraculous icons – and the various performative manifestations associated with them: rituals, liturgical and...
extra-liturgical ceremonies, processions, forms of private and collective veneration, votive offerings, meditation practices and so on. The liturgy itself, viewed as shared technique to produce a sense of collective belonging and to mediate a group’s relationship to God, also became a privileged topic. In this connection, sacred space started being investigated as something distinct from its architectural frame and came to be regarded as a context of interactions between multiple factors, including officiating priests, attending laypeople, images inhabiting the decorated walls of a church, the multifarious ephemeral and permanent furnishings, and the divinity itself, which is made present by both the performative power of rites and different strategies of monumental “mise-en-scène”. This shift from a static to a dynamic view of Christian, and especially Byzantine, sacred spaces paved the way to a much increased interest for the latter’s most ephemeral aspects, namely elements of church decorum, veils and textiles, carpets, lamps and lighting devices, light effects, fire and water, sounds and scents.

On account of all this, I think that Alexei Lidov will agree with a definition of the hierotopical approach as focusing on the different strategies by which the divine, supernatural dimension is spatially, visually, and materially evoked in specific ritual contexts. The evocation of the sacred in material contexts has been rightly understood as a hitherto neglected form of human “creativity” that deserves being investigated from an historical perspective and cannot be underestimated by art-historians: it would make no sense to reconstruct the art-historical meaning of single elements of a sacred space – such as lighting devices or frescoed cycles embellishing a church wall – without considering the latter as a whole. In anthropological terms, hierotopic creativity can be described as a set of specific techniques that enable the shaping of religious alterity and their materialization in a number of privileged spaces shared by single human communities. From a psychological viewpoint, it might be said that such techniques basically aim at exciting the beholder-believer’s emotional perception of a material space as imbued with supernatural, otherworldly, and meta-human qualities: in this sense, they seem to be much akin to the techniques of “enchantment” that Alfred Gell attributes to magicians, shamans, priests, and artists.

Such an emphasis on hierotopy as a form of human creativity is perfectly legitimate, provided that its limits and conceptual boundaries are taken into account. One of the basic risks is that of substituting the traditional art-historical fascination for the Renaissance notion of an artist’s invenzione, with a hypostatization of a new category of creators, including promoters and concepteurs. Secondly, one should be aware that the shaping of sacred spaces can be hardly thought of as exactly mirroring a well-structured, systematic project ascribable to the ingenuity of specific individuals: just on the contrary, it could consist in a long-standing, sometimes even centuries-long process, involving an uninterrupted compromise between the intentions of the original planners, those of the clergy officiating a church and other agents, and the specific needs of viewers and believers, which lead to frequent alterations and change.

Moreover, if our aim is to understand the dynamics by which divine “otherness” is made present in material contexts, it is important that we work out a specific terminology that may be helpful for a more conscious analysis of the religious, social, and anthropological phenomena we are dealing with. In his 2004 programmatic study, Lidov manifested his indebtedness to Mircea Eliade’s definition of sacred space, based on a reading of the Biblical episode of Jacob’s dream at Bethel (Gen 28, 12-22) as a portion of natural environment that a community perceives as distinct from that of ordinary life inasmuch it comes to be invested with “hierophanic” qualities that manifest
its belonging to a separate, divine sphere. In this way, Eliade described the sphere of the divine as something thoroughly alternative to what he designed as the “profane” dimension. Yet, this definition proves to be limitative for our understanding of the multifarious religious phenomena which, in Byzantium and the Middle Ages in general, associated the terrestrial and the divine worlds. In order to better understand our research topic it proves necessary to overcome the classical distinction between “sacred” and “profane” and introduce a number of more factors.

Indeed, the religious-historical discourse stands out for its rather indeterminate use of the word “sacred”. This is largely due to the influential work by the German theologian Rudolf Otto, who made use of the German term *das Heilige* to generically hint at the divine/supernatural dimension, even if he was the first to point out that the latter can assume a great many forms in human experience. Most notably, given that the German adjective *heilig* can be used indistinctly to translate both “sacred” and “holy” or “saint” or “hallowed”, Otto’s work did not take into account the semantic shift between these two expression, being characteristic of most European languages (cf. Greek ιερός/ ἅγιος, Latin sacer/sanctus, Russian священный/святой). Recent studies (M. Souza, D. Iogna-Prat) reconstructed the etymological developments of such expressions and their use between Roman antiquity and their rediscovery and transformations in early 20th century anthropological literature and pointed out their semantic shift, which remained valuable in Medieval times regardless of their occasional, yet certainly not infrequent use as synonyms: if “sacred” seems to imply an access to the divine that is mediated by some sort of human activity – such as a ritual of consecration that transforms an ordinary thing into something invested with religious meanings – “saint” basically indicates a divine attribute associated *per se* with a material object, which enables therefore a more immediate, direct contact with the supernatural sphere.

The distinction between “sacred” and “saint” can be investigated against the background of yet another conceptual shift, that between “space” and “site”. Critics of hierotopy pointed out that a term including an explicit hint at the notion of “site” (according to the meaning of the Greek word *topos*) was used to describe a methodological approach that basically concerns sacred spaces, i.e. spatial contexts being instrumental to the performance of liturgical rites. In order to properly describe this research approach, the use of such expressions as, say, “hierochorology” would probably be much more accurate on etymological grounds but also admittedly much uglier from a pretty stylistic viewpoint. It is therefore not a matter here to criticize the term “hierotopy”: it can be considered as one of many scholarly conventions which prove to efficaciously summarize the complexity of a methodology, whose limits and advantages deserve being more accurately evaluated, especially as concerns the distinction between “sacred spaces” and “holy sites”.

It should be namely stressed that, with these two expressions, we are speaking of two basically distinct phenomena. Churches, synagogues, and mosques can be rightly described as “sacred spaces” inasmuch they work as meeting places intended for the performance of rites, individual and collective prayers, processions and ceremonies, yet they are not, or not necessarily, also holy sites. In Christian tradition, the latter emerge since the third/fourth century as specifically site-bound manifestations of both individual and public worship: they take the form of martyr’s tombs and memorial sites working as visual witness to some major events of both the Gospels or the saints’ heroic lives. In such places the spatial element plays a minor or accessory role and, in some specific cases – for example, the rock of Moses on the top of Mount Sinai or the stone marked with Jesus’ footprints in the Garden of Gethsemane – it can be even thoroughly absent. The worship of
both tombs and memorial sites can take place only in situ and cannot be efficaciously transported elsewhere. Unlike the evocation of Christ's body in the Eucharistic rite, the “locative” experience of a holy site cannot be repeated or multiplied throughout the Christian world: it is associated with cultic foci, that unlike objectified bodily relics or icons are grafted onto the soil. This is true with the Palestinian loca sancta but also with empty burial places, such as that of Saint Stephen in the Zion Basilica in Jerusalem: even if the first martyr's relics were housed there for a very short period – between 415 and 439 – his sarcophagus was made the object of the pilgrims' veneration until the Crusader period.

In her 2009 book Saints and Church Spaces in the Late Antique Mediterranean, Ann Marie Yasin made efforts to nuance André Grabar's and Richard Krautheimer's distinction between “martyria” and “basilicas”, by pointing out the numerous architectural strategies that, between the 4th and the 6th century, aimed at physically associating ritual spaces with holy sites. In my view, this process indicates, on the contrary, that both functions kept being perceived as distinct until very late. The diffusion of the practice of inserting relics into altars and other architectural elements did not really transform churches into loca sancta: relics were then used as objectified bodily remains that contributed to enhance the prestige of some specific ritual spaces, but this was not enough to turn them into cultic foci and goals for pilgrimages. Holy sites and ritual spaces could be variously juxtaposed, connected, located one close to or above the other, but they rarely merged. The various ways in which they happened to be associated should be considered as a fundamental topic for hierotopic investigation: for example, it would be promising to understand how the sumptuous appearance of the Nativity church in Bethlehem established a visual dialogue with the unappealing, dark and tiny appearance of the underground grotto, axially located under the main altar and its elevated bema.

The site-specific quality of loca sancta implies that their worship could take place independently from any definite strategy of spatial or architectural arrangement. Yet, a spatial “mise-en-scène” could be used to orientate and mark the physical experience of a site-bound, locative manifestation of the holy. In such contexts as the early Christian martyria or the Jerusalem Holy Sepulchre architecture worked as a monumental frame whose function was not to delimit the boundaries of the Christian ecclesia participating in the Mass and communicating with God, yet rather to structure the pilgrims’ access to holy sites deemed to be grafted onto the soil. A number of “hierotopic” devices could be used to manifest the “placedness” of the divine in the holy site: for example, the accumulation of ornaments and votive offerings, the presence of specific lighting devices, the use of baldachins and frames to enhance and stimulate the contemplation of the holy site. In some contexts, “hierotopic” strategies could contribute to lay emphasis on the site's diminutive size and unattractive appearance: the lack of ornaments and a scant illumination could turn out to be a most efficacious way of evoking the holy per absentiam. A case in point, among others, is the rock of Golgotha, which originally stood in an open-air context, in a corner of the triporticus laid between the Anastasis and the Martyrium basilica. It looked like a thin, vertically standing dark stone whose red veins could be interpreted as traces of the blood poured out from Christ's side during the Crucifixion. Its exposition in a public space was instrumental to its use as a cultic focus and an object of contemplation.

In the course of time, a number of ornaments contributed to orientate its perception: the monumental crux gemmata erected on its top by Theodosius II visualized the triumph of Christ (and Christianity) upon death and the glory of Resurrection. Later on the cross was included within a
marble baldachin and a number of precious mementoes, including the horn used for the unction of King David and King Solomon’s ring, hanged from it. This sort of “installation” enabled viewers to associate Golgotha with eminent figures of the Old Testament and immediately acknowledge the role of Christ as the real King of Israel. Finally, the erection of an altar in its vicinity was not so much instrumental to the use of the nearby space as a ritual context, yet rather to its perception (as witnessed by the Piacenza anonymous around 570) as a memorial site marking the very place where Abraham had tied his son Isaac: this contributed to make visible the characterization of the rock of Golgotha as the new stone of Alliance. The subsequent step was the transformation of the site, on the initiative of Patriarch Modestos in the early 7th century, into a chapel working as an architectural frame to the top of the rock, made accessible via a flight of steps carved in its surface. When the Crusaders reconstructed the Holy Sepulchre, between 1100 and 1149, the whole stone was hidden within a massive, elevated, two-storeyed building, that worked as a simulacrum of the holy mountain it encircled and evoked, in its use of two double arcades, the appearance of yet another holy landmark of Jerusalem, the Porta Aurea of the Temple Mount. In this way, visual and spatial devices were combined to efficaciously evoke the very site-specific qualities of Mount Golgotha.
The Iconicity and Tropes of Spatiality: When architecture/iconography dissolves into transparency

The Byzantine Church is the mystical body of Christ – a figure of the Incarnation. The church walls separate the outer from the inner space in which the liturgical service takes place in circular dynamism. The presence of a vast iconographical program, usually painted inside the church wall, on the external walls of the Post-Byzantine churches from Moldova (16th c.), is unique in the Byzantine tradition. It generates a semiotic break in the understanding of the architectural space, reflected in the response of the human agent facing such an unexpected vision. This paper aims to revise, and adjust the concepts to address this unique phenomenon in the Byzantine studies.

Vision of the Sacred

In his semiotics of the icon, B.A. Uspensky insists on the fact that the Byzantine icon is defined by the look of an internal observer, that is to say, a viewer imaginarily placed within the image. His perspective is that of God, or of the iconographer. By contrast, Renaissance painting is conceived as a “window to the world,” a vision projected in the eyes of an external observer, who is the non-participative viewer of the painting in the transfigured world of image. While the Renaissance perspective is constructed as a means of separation between the image and the spectator, the reverse perspective operative in the Byzantine icon does not separate the icon from the viewer. It allows instead the participation of the viewer (the faithful) in the icon, and even invites him to partake in the experience of the image.

In assessing the unusual external decoration of the Moldavian churches, one should note that, at first sight, its perception seems to be dictated by the internal logic of perception of the monument, which requires primarily to be read as architecture. In order to perceive the quasi-totality of the architectural volumes looming in the space, one needs a dynamic point of view continuously rotating around the walls. To look at the architecture and the decoration while allowing the eyes to slide on the surface of the walls is a specific Byzantine attitude. Each object of vision has its own perspective, so that the eye cannot rest upon what one sees, it cannot freeze the vision. The habit of staring at the decorated surface is, perhaps, mostly Western. Byzantine ekphraseis, descriptions and panegyrics repeatedly emphasize that the look should not be fixed on its object of vision, excluding the existence of a detached spectator, but it must wander, scanning the image. The intention of the designers of the Moldavian decorated walls to encourage the wandering gaze upon the architecture and the decoration is evident. From near, as well as, from afar, the decoration of the walls constantly challenges the eye to move in a continuously circular manner: from inside to outside, and from outside to inside. This ritualized vision, which involves the viewer and the energy of semiosis, could be seen as a first degree in the reading of this image.
We may thus conclude that the specificity of the semiotics of the image of the Moldavian exterior painted walls seems to consist in bringing simultaneously two perspectives, belonging to an outside viewer, and to an internal observer. This juxtaposition of two positions relative to the image which requires two specific modes of perception derives from the premises and the novelty of this project: on one hand, the vision of the architecture viewed as painted surface, and on the other side, the vision relative to the vast decoration that covers the walls viewed as mass-volume painted architecture. But the exterior painting is inseparable from the architecture; it manifests itself as both surface and mass-volume, from the depth of which another world is made visible. Once painted, the wall “disappears” as architecture, in semiotic terms. We do not see it anymore in its first materiality. The wall is, as it were, set into the abyss. This apparent physical dissolution of the church wall suggests the abolition of the dividing wall, the body of Christ, evoked by St. Paul.

**Iconography.** Viewed from the east, the outside image of the main apse of the choir shows striking similarities with the image represented inside the altar. The iconographical composition of the apse follows the disposition of the iconostasis displaying a series of superimposed friezes hierarchically articulated: angels, prophets, apostles, bishops, monks and martyrs that converge in procession to the central axis the apse. The procession of the bishops on both sides of the image of Christ Child lying on a paten (*Amnos*) is the most sacred image usually represented within the sanctuary on the hemicycle, marking the centrality of the apse. The open Gospels carried by the bishops display inscriptions which transcribe the secret prayers of the liturgy. At the church of Sucevita (1599), as a concrete example, the inscriptions represented outside the apses correspond to the liturgy of the catechumens (the incipits prayers, the three antiphons, and the Little Entrance) and the beginning of the liturgy of the faithful; one of the prayers at the end of the liturgy is also reproduced. Following the liturgical ceremonial, the reading of the secret prayers would begin outside the church, and continue inside the sanctuary, ending outside the apses on the north and south counterforts, where the last bishops display the secret prayers at the end of the liturgy. The disposition of the prayers of the inscriptions is circular, according to their placement, present sometimes outside, sometimes inside the church.

What interests us here is the presence outside the protective church walls of the procession of the bishops carrying the mystical prayers, pronounced secretly within the altar where they are also represented on the walls, but hidden from the audience’s eye. This is, no doubt, a major shift in the horizon of the image. The liturgical center, normatively placed inside the sanctuary, is now displaced outside the church. The space of the main apse once concealed by the opaque walls of the altar and the iconostasis is now revealed in full light. The liturgical prayers, of which some are silently proffered, are exposed now beyond the walls of the church. The consequence of such situation is vast, on a liturgical level, as well as on the level of perception. The walls seem to dissolve into transparency, letting something of the mystery flare-out from the interior of the sanctuary. The effect of this image is overwhelming. It creates the illusion that the wall has been de-materialized. Like a vast transparent veil, the eastern façade of the church reveals on its exterior surface the hidden mystery performed behind the altar, which results into a liturgy without walls. The choral (boustrophedon) disposition of the secret prayers suggests metaphorically a “perichoretic” movement. Unlike the ancient veil or the *katapetasma* of the Byzantine iconostasis which conceals the sacred vision, allowing only on certain occasions for the holy image to be revealed, here, in this remote part of Christianity, an open and lasting vision is offered to the eyes. The outside eastern apse displays the Mystery in full light.
This unprecedented iconographical project in the history of Byzantium, the Moldavian external decoration, illustrates perhaps for the first and only time that which has been theologically viewed as the Christian aim: the definitive abolishment of the middle wall. That is to say, there should be no more ‘sacred space’ or ‘sacred time’ for all time and space has been sanctified in Christ. The novelty of such iconographical project consists in showing how the liturgical mystery performed inside the church could permeate the physical wall, breaking it, and undoing with the traditional architectural principle which divides the inner from the outer space, thus offering a new vision by which sacred image sanctifies the whole cosmos. But such a project shows also the limits of iconography itself; the limits of the iconographical discourse to assess this overwhelming space image. It finally shows that in order to fully assess such phenomenon one needs a new trope of spatiality to define it. Henceforth the question: Iconography or Hierotopy? This is where the concept of sacred space Hierotopy seems to be instrumental as a tool of research to assess this iconography in act, or architectural enactment of iconography as sacred space.

There is however one more aspect concerning this unprecedented Moldavian project to be addressed, and one more question to be asked, in our search for tropes of spatiality in post-Byzantium. What’s happen when the external wall carries on its outer surface the mystery in its written form, suddenly exposed outwardly? What are the consequences of such visual statement in linguistic and theological terms, or in terms of the iconicity of sacred text? At this point, I believe, the iconography will reveal once more its limits.

**The Iconicity of the Sacred Text.** The language of the written inscriptions on the bishops’ Gospels carried in procession outside the walls of the sanctuary will lead us towards the problematic of the iconicity of the text, and eventually to the iconicity of space of their representation. One should agree that in the wall paintings, as in the icons, one could distinguish a figurative image (a pictorial, or an iconic sign) and a written text or inscription (a verbal sign). There are basically two types of inscriptions in the field of the image: the inscriptions of identification (the name of the saint represented, or the Biblical event); and the inscriptions of representation, painted on different objects such as the scroll (phylactery), the open book (the Gospel), or the clothing. It should be said that the inscriptions present on the Moldavian walls are written in Old Slavonic, which is a liturgical language, distinct from the vernacular language. While some monks, perhaps even all of them, could read Old Slavonic, it is certain that the ordinary viewer did not comprehend this language. Yet, inscriptions were displayed on the walls, inside and outside the church, to the eyes of those who could read them, and of those who could not comprehend this language. What was then their function? Why were they there?

As the linguists know well, a so-called “dead” language exists only in its written form. Nothing is known about its phonetic qualities. The conviction that its script brings us to the “voice” who speaks refers only to a “living” language, that is to say, the language in which spoken words mediate between people. By contrast, the function of the “dead” language is strictly hieratic. Written signs do not represent the natural words, they do not have the function of reproducing the speech. This type of sign is similar to what could be called “iconicity.” For most art historians, following the traditional principles of iconography, the inscriptions of identification are instrumental, they help classify the figure or the event represented. But the inscriptions of representation may be secondary and redundant in the image. For them, iconography provides no entry; neither are they taken as manifestation of the iconicity of writing.
This paper aims to go exactly beyond these limits of iconography in the attempt to examine the iconic function of these inscriptions. The function of the inscriptions might be apparently determined by the distance from the viewer. From far away, it is difficult to even distinguish the inscriptions; one could only perceive the ground on which they are depicted, the scroll or the book, which appears as a white space. When one is near enough to read the inscriptions, one is too close to be able to reconstruct the iconic figure. We could talk about a bi-focalization in the viewer's perception. While the scientist – to take the present situation of the visitors in the monasteries – wants to come close to the image, the tourist and the aesthete keep their distance, essentially “illiterate” in liturgical matters. Although all these speculations appear to belong exclusively to contemporary thought (structuralism and semiotics), as performed by Saussure, Greimas, Barthes, and Derrida, we must point out that such ideas were somehow familiar to the Byzantine and post-Byzantine civilizations. These cultures were able to maintain the parity between word and image, to understand that linguistic sign and graphics were identical, as opposed to Western Europe. The Old Slavonic, as a sacred language, was the instrument of divine revelation. Consequently, the graphic signs of the Scripture have been seen not only as symbols of the Truth, but also as components of the Truth. Graphic sign did not bear the language, but itself incorporated it.

The relationship between the written text and the spoken language is essential to understand the conception of the sacred in the monastic (hesychast) environment in which our images have been conceived. There was a disjunction between the spoken language and the language of the Church, which was the language of the inscriptions as well. For the hesychast monks the written text alone was able to carry the sacred Word and the revelation of Light. This puts us in the context of a culture in which the graphic sign, its nature and function, could be explained only from the point of view of the iconicity of the language. From this perspective, the inscriptions appear to be the immanent divine presence. On this matter, B. A. Uspensky has something interesting to say, which is relevant for the status of the inscriptions written in an incomprehensible language for the viewer. Although they are not designed specifically to be understood, argues Uspensky, the inscriptions are there precisely to establish an internal identification, mystical, and to affirm the ontological connection between the image and the name. This seems to be true for the inscriptions represented on the walls of the Moldavian churches: their function cannot be separated from the monastic linguistic conception, showing a mystical reverence to the letters, perceived as icons and as “written incarnation.” This externalization on the façade of the church of the holy Word must be read in this monastic key, in which the inscription of the holy Word is transferred from the acoustic to the visual register. The secret prayers stood there in front of an audience that did not understand them, yet, just as the Gospel was revered, praised and kissed by the people, these inscriptions had to be there in order to establish and affirm the ontological connection between sacred image and sacred text, between figure and word. It was at this point that the iconicity of text was manifested. While remaining incomprehensible, the inscriptions were contemplated and revered in the pure materiality of their graphic sign performing thus their iconic function. The immanent presence of the sacred letter is perhaps illustrated here in the most provocative way. From this new perspective, the hierotopic vision of the transparent wall, membrane-like proves to be a hierographic vision as well, where the parity between word and image was maintained, the linguistic sign and graphic sign were both iconic and identical. From the dilemma “Hierotopy or Iconography” we moved already into a new possibility: Hierography.
One thing remains however clear about the Byzantine and post-Byzantine mentality and spirituality in that which concerns the conception of sacred space. This conception, modernity seems to have forgotten, namely, that there was no sacred text as such before its “tongue” takes the shape of an icon; and there was no truly definition of sacred space in all its manifestation unless one could go beyond the confines of the traditional iconography, making room for the iconicity of sacred text. This was invested as a new trope of spatiality in its full rights.

As a contemporary thinker astutely observes, it is modernity that separates the text from the image. Only modernity operates with a fixed distinction between image and text, reading the text without being able to perceive the image. This has not been always the case, as we have tried to show in this paper. Text and image have both been designed to be “read,” as they both were probably intended to be written and looked at as images. In this regard, the Greek *graphein* admits little distinction between what is painted and what is written; there is absolute unity of what we now take for separate activities, writing and graphing, the pictorial, the textual. In its exemplary form illustrated by the Moldavian outside painted walls, the post-Byzantine image shows how text and image merged into an undivided whole that has not been restored since. Its vision still provides us with a glimpse of what has been once a hierotopic vision, iconic in its manifestation, as well as “hierographic” in its spatial inscription in which the walls dissolved into transparency. Falling down around the church like a curtain, its transparency drapes the body of the edifice, as well as it unveils a spectacular vision of the Church symbolically imagined as the mystical body of Christ. In the experience they share, the peoples of the community could imagine how the whole universe become the stage of sacrifice and redemption, how the whole world was created as a temple of God where nothing could remain anymore profane in the Creation.
The Iconicity of Byzantine Architecture: Iconography or Hierotopy?

The interpretation of Byzantine architecture, or rather the search for the meaning of Byzantine architecture, has relied heavily on the methodological approaches used in iconography and iconology as branches of art historical research. Both iconography and iconology are critical as they shift studies of Byzantine art from investigations of the unstable stylistic features as carriers of meaning to analyses of specific works as icons. Framed by the modern intellectual discourse rather than by the medieval devotional or religious context, icons can be identified with signs that physically (visually) resemble what they stand for. In Byzantine art almost without exception icons are equated with religious icons, visual images that represent holy figures (such as the Mother of God), sacred events (such as the Baptism of Christ), or holy objects (such as the True Cross). Iconography provides sophisticated tools for describing Byzantine icons and interpreting them based on their specific content, which usually stems from biblical references and the life of the Byzantine church. Iconology, as established by Erwin Panofsky, further aims to give meaning to such works by examining them through the lenses of history. In that context, iconicity provides the conceived similarity between art accomplishment as a sign and its meaning.

Speaking of the iconicity of Byzantine architecture raises at least two critical issues. One, that architecture is likened to signs, two-dimensional images, i.e. icons. Second, that it is possible to “read” architectural accomplishments in the way we “read” or interpret the icons by using the tools of iconography. By extension, if we extend the visual context of Byzantine architecture to its spatial, physical qualities, we could examine Byzantine architecture as “spatial icons” by using “spatial iconography” with expanded tools essentially based on the traditional approaches of (visual) iconography.

This paper highlights the shortcomings of the iconographic approach that insists on a singular reading, i.e. the meaning of architecture and the potentials of hierotopy that allow for the multiplicity of meanings and investigations of architecture not only as an image dependent on visual physical properties. The assumption that buildings are means of conveying meaning is not new. By focusing on architectural form, we may successfully use iconographical approaches to give meaning to specific accomplishments. For example, the domed basilica of Hagia Sophia conveys the meaning of “Heaven on Earth” as the dome represents the heavenly realm and the box-like basilica, the earthly realm. Yet, it has been shown how due to the complexity of architecture as a process and object, architectural meanings cannot be simply likened to the process of decoding by “reading” specific forms—a dome or an oblong-planned box-like basilica in case of Hagia Sophia. Architectural meanings change from the conception of the structure through its construction, and then various interpretations, as both the intention of the creator(s)—architects and donors—and the meaning comprehended by the interpreters—churchgoers, pilgrims, visitors, and other beholders—may change in the process.
Addressing questions of architectural formalism William Whyte has already proposed that instead of “reading” architecture, it seems more appropriate to speak of various “translations” or series of transpositions of meanings related to each of the media (images, sound, light, construction), which are used to organize an architectural structure. Hierotopy—the creation of sacred spaces, as defined by Alexei Lidov—most closely merges the tools of iconography and innovative interpretation methods for searching for the meaning of sacred space through a series of meaningful relations between created sacred spaces (buildings or the larger settings) and users/interpreters. In that context, meanings are derived from the relations between the physical objects, which gain their significance also through the non-physical aspects of built structures, as well as the changing dynamics of the rituals (the performative and rhetorical capacities of specific settings when they are in use). Hence, Hagia Sophia becomes a “spatial icon” of the holy land when pilgrims venerated the miraculous icon of the Mother of God or the relics of the True Cross displayed in the church. It also becomes Jerusalem and Rome, when, for example, the chains of St. Peter were displayed for veneration. Then again, it can be the space of primordial creation and the parting of heavens, earth, and waters as described in Genesis when the priest delivered the words of God from the ambo. The ambo structure of Hagia Sophia was originally set within the church nave as a mountain-tower; its raised platform, from which the priest would perform the segments of the Cathedral service, enhanced the acoustics, visibility, and various evocative meanings as it was set in the mid-air—below the glittering golden dome, representing the heavens, and the floor covered in Prokonessian marble with veins, which the Byzantines likened to the sea. Numerous other meanings emerge from the specific place-making based on the establishment of other evocative relations between the sacred space of the church and its users in specific historical or ritual contexts.

This paper highlights the potential interpretation of Hagia Sophia and a few other examples of sacred architecture as “spatial icons” in the Byzantine context. Within the discussion at the round table, it aims to investigate the limits of iconicity of Byzantine architecture by asking question as to whether simplified, generic, or monumental (iconic) forms of architecture are preconditions for considering specific Byzantine accomplishments as “spatial icons.” Another question this paper aims to raise are the potentials of both iconographic and hierotopical research tools to better understand the transposition of meanings of individual architectural accomplishments in denoting accomplishments of the same or different types and scales. In other words, how we can properly analyze the spatial networks when, for example, an individual church or its memorable architectural elements, such as an ambo, visually (spatially) denote the same or different type of a setting—another ambo but also a tomb or a tower depending on the given expanded context of the service and the setting; or how can a church with its memorable architectural elements within a given service denote entire architectural frameworks on different scales, for example cities or essentially un-built environments such as Jerusalem or the holy land. Last but not least, this paper also aims to instigate discussion on the spatial relations between the beholders and “spatial icons” of monumental scale, i.e. thoughts on beholders’ perceptions once in front of them (such as when in front of an ambo) or within them (such as when inside the church).
The Great Palace as an “Icon of Space”?
On the iconicity of the spatial representation of power in Byzantium

According to Procopius, the imperial palace of Constantinople rebuilt by Justinian after 532 was indescribable (De Aed., I.10.10). Words could not possibly render its enormous dimensions and magnificence, this being a conception shared by Libanius in his fourth-century oration on Antioch (Or. XI, 206-207). This impossibility to describe the palace results in a paucity of information about the appearance of its structures. Subsequent Byzantine and foreign writings are equally scant of information regarding the palace of the Byzantine emperors. Occasionally, certain halls are celebrated in poems or ekphraseis that give evidence of the great building activity of new emperors, but generally, palatine rooms are mentioned as a setting for ceremonies, events, and stories linked to members of the court. With a few rare exceptions, within written sources the imperial spaces of the palace remain in the background of what happens between their walls. Similarly, the visual evidence is sparse, stereotyped, and repetitive. Architectural representations of what we have ascertained to be the imperial palace are especially found in manuscript illumination, and these appear formed by basic and anonymous elements, which are of little help to the modern viewer in visualizing the appearance of the Great Palace of the Byzantine emperors. Even the remains recently brought to light of a small percentage of the palatine structures give us only a glimpse of its great dimensions and grandeur. Being that the internal apparatus almost totally disappeared, the modern eye confronts an immense loss: that of the Great Palace, which today can be imagined only through vague mentions or pictures in sources. As a series of conferences and miscellaneous books demonstrate, in recent years the scholarly community has shown an increased interest in the Great Palace, or more generally in the imperial palaces of Byzantine Constantinople, clarifying its image, internal disposition and conceptual role through studies that are mostly based upon written sources.

This contribution will attempt to show that, although few and not detailed, the ekphraseis and visual representations of the imperial spaces of the Great Palace are images with a strong iconic character. This is due to the fact that the palace itself was conceived as an iconic space of power representation – especially in the period between the age of Justinian (527-565) and the end of the eleventh century. Here, ceremonies expressing the Christian context of the earthly basileia as a power endowed to the emperor by God were enacted and found their natural location. Furthermore, the palace iconicity entailed that, within its premises, different kinds of “icons” – such as as imperial images and saintly panel portraits and even “living icons” – cooperated in the expression of the earthly basilica and of the palace itself as a material realization of the imperial power.

In the past, I have demonstrated that in Late Antiquity the perception the imperial palace equated it to an image of the heavenly kingdom of God. As part of the representation of the holy Roman basileia, the palace was conceived as a sacred place mirroring on earth the Heavenly Jerusalem. Such a conception appears to have spread during the Middle Byzantine period, both in terms of the imperial propaganda of the Byzantine state and in common thought. If the palace as a
whole was conceived as an earthly reflection of the heavenly kingdom, its structures and apparatus vivified and realized its sacrality through the use of materials that reproduced to the eyes of the viewers those characters commonly attributed to the Heavenly Jerusalem: above all, its brightness. Starting from John’s Revelation and continuing through hagiographical visions of the otherworld, heaven was characterized by its resplendent light. Similarly, in the imperial palace metals and precious materials had a high reflective power that amplified the resplendent effect of its structures, impressing the viewers with the brightness of its interiors – especially when enlightened by the presence of the emperor – and even of its exteriors, such as on its roofs. The brightness of the palace is one of its major characteristics, emphasized by poets and orators, and can be considered as an iconic element of the imperial palace. In fact, it is not only a major attribute consistently celebrated in relation to the palace but a visual feature bearing meaning: through its brightness, the palace conveys its sacrality – the light being a manifestation of God, from the Scriptures, in a long tradition absorbed by Byzantium – to the viewers.

Precious materials were themselves constant features of all the imperial spaces, where they had functions other than embellishing and decorating. As Procopius clearly states, materials served to honor the emperor. In his ekphrasis of the decorative programme that adorned Justinian’s Chalké, we are told that the cubes of mosaic “bestowed upon the emperor honors equal to those of God” by their gleaming colors (De aed., I.10.18-19). Similarly, but in reference to the church of the Anargyroi restored by Romanos IV (1034-1041), in the eleventh century Michael Psellos recalls the wonderful mosaics and paintings which enlightened the church, adding that there images “filled the sacred edifice with glory” (Chron. IV.31). Thus, materials and eikones were believed to glorify the emperor and the imperial spaces. The exalting power of precious stones and materials was well known to Niketas Choniates, according to whom the emperor Isaac II (1185-1195) adorned the icons of the Theotokos with gold and jewels, to show his devotion and to offer them to public veneration. It is not a coincidence that visual sources often depict the imperial palace as a compound of structures – hence emphasizing its great dimensions – with colorful decoration, reproducing gold and marble architectural components (e.g. Madrid Skylitzes, f. 206v). The great treasures housed in in the palace were evidence of the wealth of the empire and of the pomp of the imperial house, if not of the greed of certain emperors. However, gold and precious stones had also an intrinsic power: they glorified the space and, according to the belief on their inherent magic properties, they bore metaphysical and prophylactic powers that might express further meanings depending on the context.

Furthermore, in the eleventh century Psellos lists the major elements of the rooms of the palace, referring to thrones, scepters and purple hangings (Chron. III.15). Indeed, these elements are also mentioned in other texts and commonly found as basic components of miniatures representing the palace or the court in scenes set within the palace. Although materials and objects typical of the court were used by Psellos in a kaiserkritik, simply as characteristics of the courtly wealth, the visual evidence attests to their meaning as attributes of the basileia and of the imperial palace. Indeed, if the emperor and the imperial palace were deprived of such elements, they would lose their very essence. In the artistic evidence they work as visual convectors of the idea of basileia. Hence, they become iconic elements of the manifestation of the imperial power.

However, instead of describing the appearance of the palace’s rooms, court writers often focus on works of art that adorned them. Descriptions of the pentapyrgion, a towered piece of furniture housed in the Chrysotriklinos during the reign of Theophilos (829-842) or of the fountains decorating...
the gardens of the *Mesokeption* at the time of Basil I (867-886) are among these. Particularly, while describing the building activities of the emperors, court writers often draw attention to imperial representations. The idea that the very act of depicting someone signified honoring him or her was recurrent since Late Antiquity, when it also served to thank the person depicted in a memorial for posterity. Conversely, the Theodosian Code clarifies that images of the emperor were *ornamenta*, a Latin term that implies the concept of glorification (*Cod. Theod.* XV.4.1). Thus, imperial images were not meant to embellish or decorate the places in which they were set, but to augment their value as glorious spaces. Procopius repeats this conception in his *ekphrasis* of the mosaics representing Justinian and Theodora together with their court and the generals, in the vault of the *Chalké* (*De aed.* I.10.15). Later, in the tenth-century the *Vita Basilii* reports that a portrait of Basil I and his family was set into the ceiling of the emperor’s bedchamber, around a golden cross. An inscription declared the meaning of these images as a thanksgiving of the imperial family to God. Clearly, the royal bedchamber of the palace was intended to present the imperial family as a dynasty of rulers worthy of administering the empire in the name of God. While imperial images set in the palace entrance or in spaces reserved to the court ceremonies reminded the court of the power and grandiosity of the imperial house, the private bed-chambers could not be accessed by all members of the court and were the most private spaces in the imperial palace.

Therefore, there imperial portraits may be intended to remind the viewer – but in this case the reader of the *Vita Basili* and perhaps the emperor himself – that Basil, a man of non-imperial origins, reached the empire in the name of God, and that it is precisely in the name of God that his family was destined to reign in the future. The *De Cerimoniis*, makes reference to an icon of Basil I, depository of a cult set in a chapel within the premises of the *Nea Ekklesia* (*De Cer.* 28 (19) and 29 (20)). The icon of the emperor was venerated during the ceremonies for the celebrations of St. Elias and the anniversary of the *Nea*’s dedication and included a specific step before the icon, during which emperors had to light candles. Although the cult of this imperial icon appears to have had a short life, and was probably undertaken only by Constantine VII, it reveals the importance of dynastic membership and the need to elevate the status of certain imperial figures by instituting and formulating a cult within the imperial court. Later in the twelfth century, a series of poems mention several imperial representations that were probably set in the spaces of the Great Palace or of the Blachernae palace, which at that time started replacing the Great Palace as the major setting for courtly life. Among these were portraits of victorious emperors and religious images set in judicial rooms that included the emperor as a figure within the scene. Thus, imperial images may be intended as reminders of the long-lived *basileia* and of its Christian origins: they served to perpetuate the glory of past emperors, and at the same time to glorify new dynasties.

Furthermore, the iconicity of Great Palace had an even more important expression as the palace itself constituted a tridimensional background for the stage of the imperial *basileia*, which happened through the development of ceremonies. As it appears from the *De Cerimoniis*, the spaces of the palace were the setting for strictly regulated rituals. The structure and style of the text gives evidence of the careful formulation of ceremonies, where attendants, dress and apparel, objects and movements had to follow times and modes of imperial protocol, the long tradition and symbolic meaning of which transformed these events in rites. From this source – a handbook of regulations – the spaces of the palaces may appear as the mere stage of the rituals, deprived of content. In reality, the
function of each space added further significance to the ritual and its appearance worked together with the carefully orchestrated rites to show inherent meanings of the performative expression of the *basileia*. This is clear for instance in Corippus’ poem celebrating the reception of Avar ambassadors at the court of Justin II (565-578). In the throne room furnished in the greatest pomp everything was carefully prepared and when Justin appeared before his audience, this happened as a heavenly epiphany, where everything from the location, position and apparel of the courtiers, to the opulent and stately room combined to create a lasting image of a heavenly appearance (*In laud. III.151-270*).

The same impression is evidenced in the tenth-century accounts by Liutprand of Cremona, where the astonishment of the foreigner ambassador before the exoticism of eastern habits does not miss perceiving a certain heavenly character in the staging the *basileia*. However, it is perhaps an epigram of the Greek Anthology that, while describing the new decoration of the *Chrysotriklinos* by Michael III (842-867), succeeds in rendering the function of the staging of the *basileia* in the palace and, more importantly here, of the relationship between the iconic space of the palace and ritual. In the mosaic programme, the image of Christ was placed directly above the emperor’s throne, the Virgin was depicted above the main door, Michael III was also portrayed along with Patriarch Photios, among apostles, martyrs, and saints (*Ant. Gr. I.106*). Here the location of the main Christian figures, Christ and the Virgin, above the throne and the door expressed the ideology of a divinely-protected *basileia*, as well as symbolized the benevolence of God to the Christian emperor through Christ and the heavenly court. Considering that the emperor would have appeared in the *Chrysotriklinos* on his throne, underneath the image of Christ, then the real imperial ceremony took place amidst the imperial court and the heavenly court represented on the ceiling. At once, the *Chrysotriklinos* would have showed the Christian order of the empire, where the earthly court mirrored the heavenly kingdom. Here, the earthly *basileia* acted by will and under the protection of the heavenly one. Indeed, in the performativity of imperial ritual the palace was not only a background, but due to its decorations and apparatus, was conceived as the fundamental location of the expression of the *basileia*: it was part of a living icon. Without the space of the palace, the courtly ceremonies would have lost their meaning: in this resided the fundamental iconic character of the palace, a space of great pomp, a repository of treasures, which was conceived as an earthly expression of the heavenly kingdom and as such was meant to convey such an image.

Certainly, the Christian character of the earthly *basileia* was expressed in the palace also through the great number of churches, included within its great extension hosting relics and holy icons. Already in the fourth century, Constantine the Great worshipped God by praying in the sacred rooms of his palace (*Eus. LC IX.11*) alongside members of the imperial household (*Eus. VC IV.17*) or on his own within secret places within his royal palace chambers (*Eus. VC IV.17*). Thus, even the first nucleus of Great Palace, the *Daphné* of Constantine, included sufficient capacities – such as chapels and churches – to allow both the private Christian practice of the emperor and communal religious ceremonies attended by the members of the court. In later centuries, starting with the Theodosian dynasty, these places of worship greatly increased in number as a demonstration of the pious religiosity of each emperor, culminating with the construction of the church of the Virgin of the Pharos and the *Nea Ekklesia*. Although the rites performed before the icons and in the churches appear just as canonized ritual stops, obligations determined by the protocol in *De Cerimoninis*, this might be due to the strict structure of the text that, while formulating procedures and paths through the palace, was not meant to clarify their meaning. Private devotional practices of the emperors are
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still recorded in later centuries and the *Nea Ekklesia* continued to mark the greatness of the imperial palace even in the fourteenth century, when the latter was in a state of unstoppable decay. All this attests to the iconic value of churches and Christian worship in the palace: the first were physical structures of great splendor conveying the religiosity of the emperors and destined to testify their great building activity, the latter was part of the celebration of Christian virtue of the holy imperial *basileia* that was enacted in the ceremonies performed there.

In conclusion, playing with the title of this session, the palace was an “icon of space” full of “icons in space”: within its premises, materials and objects with high symbolic meaning cooperated with images of the emperors and of the heavenly court, enacting the Christian character of the imperial *basileia*. While it was described in words and images by precious elements that became constant features of itself – expressions of its iconicity – inside its walls the stage of rituals created a “living icon” of the imperial court, which within the protocol of ceremonies had to be repeatedly staged, thereby activating the space of the palace. The Great Palace with its stratification of structures and memorials to past emperors was itself an icon of power, that of the sacred imperial *basileia*. 
Rapture, Ecstasy, and the Construction of Sacred Space: Hierotopy in the Life of Symeon the New Theologian

Overview. Architectural imagery, with all its attendant spatial properties and perspectives, so abounds in Byzantine religious literature that its scope and application are not easy to assess. In both the Old and New Testaments, the figure of the building is an important human symbol of achievement, whether it is the temple of Solomon, the visionary temple of Ezekiel, or the celestial Jerusalem. As sites of access to the deity, these symbolic structures were mapped onto the body of Christ, understood to be the par excellence temple of the divinity (cf. John 2:19). As the “corner-stone” of a “living spiritual edifice” (Mat 21:42; 1 Pet 2:5), in which “the fullness of the divinity dwells bodily” (Col 2:9), the mystical body of Christ was a structure extended to include the body of the mystic as the site and edifice of mystical encounter—a living, representational space paradoxically contained by the divinity and simultaneously containing it.

This paper applies a broad spatial perspective to Niketas Stethatos’s Life of Symeon the New Theologian (scr. ca. 1055), attending to parallel passages in the writings of Symeon the New Theologian (ca. 949-1022). Such a perspective has the advantage of expanding reductively epistemological and/or narrowly linguistic conceptions of mysticism, permitting the incorporation of multiple levels of objects and discourse, including Symeon’s physical and social environment, his individual mystical experiences, and their spatialized exterior representations. In exploring the juxtaposition of space and mysticism presented in the Life, this paper endeavors to reveal new insights into the understanding and production of sacred space. The mystical experiences described in the Life are always embodied experiences that unfold within a particular space or place, which is the multifaceted place where mystical experience converges with its subsequent social, textual, iconographic, and architectural representations.

Space as Light. In the Life’s complex hierotopy, the density of the mystic’s body and its surrounding spatial structures are transformed through the medium of light, which renders them ambiguously fluid, and transposes them to a mode analogous to the spatial forms of an icon. While it is perhaps taken for granted that a “mysticism of light” was a characteristic feature of Byzantine spirituality, no writer before Symeon had emphasized the phenomenon of light to such a degree, nor with such emotional intensity. Dozens of his pages are devoted to his encounters with the divine light, many of which he construes in distinctively spatial terms, to which the Life remains faithful. The juxtaposition of space and light described in the Life of St Symeon will be framed within the larger context of Byzantine Neoplatonism, with particular emphasis on Proclus’s doctrine of space as light, and related themes in Dionysios the Areopagite and Maximos the Confessor.

It is unlikely that Symeon was directly familiar with Neoplatonic metaphysics, and any philosophical elements in his writing are likely to have been mediated through the Platonizing Christian authors he is known to have read (e.g., Evagrios of Pontus, Gregory the Theologian, and, perhaps, Dionysios the Areopagite). On the other hand, Symeon’s reformulation of Plato’s
“Allegory of the Cave” (ED 1.12), with its distinctive juxtaposition of space and light, would appear to indicate familiarity with the Platonic corpus. The celebrated myth, however, had long been absorbed into Christian discourse, and we can safely assume that Symeon's thought was informed by the general Christian Neoplatonism of middle Byzantine Constantinople, which would soon experience a renaissance associated with Michael Psellos (d. ca. 1078) and John Italos (d. ca. 1082), along with the contemporary publication of the “Constantinopolitan edition” of the works of Maximos the Confessor. Symeon himself did not participate directly in the Neoplatonic revival of the early Komnenian period, although his disciple and biographer, Niketas Stethatos, was exactly contemporary with it.

The Neoplatonic metaphysics of space as light provide a suggestive, if somewhat remote, philosophical framework for the spatial dynamics of the Life of Symeon the New Theologian. At the same time, it is clear that Symeon's self-understanding of his visionary experiences—which was shared by Stethatos—is deeply rooted in the tradition of Paul's rapture and ecstatic transport to the third heaven (2 Cor 12:1-4), a tradition supported by a millennium of patristic and early Byzantine exegesis of the corpus Paulinum.

Paul's Rapture. The influence of Paul on Byzantine spirituality has not yet been fully appreciated, although the apostle has rightly been called the “model mystic for Symeon the New Theologian” (Golitzin 1995, 117). Symeon's visions are systematically modeled on the “rapture” (ἀρπαγή) of Paul (2 Cor 12:1-4), an event that in the Byzantine tradition had long been identified with Paul's conversion on the road to Damascus (Act 9:1-19; 22:6-11; 26:13-14). Two elements in this dramatic experience were at the fore of Byzantine spirituality: the perceptually overwhelming manifestation of divine light, and the ambiguous spatial location of the body, for at the time Paul confessed not knowing “whether he was in the body or out of the body” (2 Cor 12:3). In the Life, Symeon's mystical experiences are explicitly aligned with Paul's rapture, which is equated with the mystical experience of “ecstasy” (ἔκστασις)—a word that means “to stand or be outside of one's self or place”—so that Symeon's cell is flooded with light, which “flashes around him just as it once did with Paul,” and “catches him up” (i.e., in rapture), alluding directly to Acts 26:13. Moreover, Symeon's mystical experiences both signal and require the displacement of the body, so that, like Paul, he enters an ambiguously liminal space, which is paradoxically both embodied and disembodied. The simultaneous embodiment and disembodiment of mystical experience reflects philosophical conceptions of space in which the body is at once a spatialized receptacle and the negation of any bounded containing localized within definable space.

The Architecture of the Self. Throughout the Life, the cloistral space of the saint's cell is the basic structural unit that is both an extension of the saint's body and a microcosm of the physical world. As the body is enclosed within its cell, the body itself is a cell containing the soul, which in turn contains the uncontrollable divinity. Correspondences between the monastic body and its cell were not new, and Symeon would have known of them from multiple sources, including John Klimakos's Ladder of Divine Ascent 27: “Strange as it may seem, the monk is a man who fights to keep his incorporeal self enclosed within the house of the body—the cell of a monk is the body that surrounds him, and within him is the dwelling place of knowledge.” The cell/body analogy could, moreover, be extended to include the furnishings of the cell, which are themselves the spatialized forms of the cloistered body projected outward. The simple triad of floor, stool, and mat, for example, makes spatially and therefore steadily visible the collection of postures and positions the
body moves in and out of. These furnishings objectify the locations of the body that most frequently hold the body’s weight; they objectify the body’s continual need to shift within itself the locus of its weight, as well as its need to become wholly forgetful of its weight, and to move weightlessly to a larger mindfulness.

Spaces and physical structures are thus endowed with spiritual meaning, and the spiritual structures or states of the soul are provided with cognate physical symbols. In this way, the mystic’s body and its enclosing cell give spatialized, observable expression to his inward spiritual states. As the invisible empties itself into visibility, the spatial dynamics presented in the Life enable the translation of spiritual undertakings and achievements into tangible, hierotopic forms. And so closely does the Life identify Symeon’s body with the space of his cell, that when the latter is dismantled by Symeon’s persecutors, Stethatos notes that the “inanimate cell underwent a punishment equal to that of its owner” (Life 98). Thirty years after the saint’s death, an epsilon—the fifth letter of the Greek alphabet—mysteriously appeared on a piece of marble in the saint’s cell, foretelling the translation of his bodily remains during the Fifth Indiction (Life 129). Similarly, Symeon’s restoration of the monastic church of St. Mamas is described by Stethatos as an outward image of Symeon’s efforts to reform and renew the inner lives of his monks, a spiritual project spatialized in the physical rebuilding of fallen and dilapidated monastic structures.

Ecstasy and Displacement. Mystical experience does not simply generate the emplacement of the body, but brings about its transcendence, the ecstatic displacement of the mystic into a realm outside the limits of the body’s proper spatial location. In the Life, this transcendence is typically expressed through the attenuation and even disappearance of the physical space of the cell. As Symeon’s cell is “flooded with light from above,” the physical space of his cell is “dissolved” (ἀφανισθέντα), while the saint is “caught up into the air” and “completely forgets his body.” Afterwards, in reverse order, the saint is “contracted back into himself” (συσταλέντος πρός ἑαυτό), back into his body, and back into the space of his cell (Life 5). This is a formula that Stethatos repeats throughout the Life, so that later, while Symeon is praying in his cell, the “roof of the house is lifted away” (τῆς στέγης ἀρθείσης τοῦ οἴκου), as a “cloud of light” descends from heaven and settles above his head. During another visionary moment, while the saint is standing at prayer inside (ἐνδοῦ) his cell, he “seemed to be outside in the open air” (ἀθρισσος ἔξω), and “the building and everything else disappeared, and he seemed no longer to be inside” (ἡ οἰκία καὶ πάντα παρήρχοντο καὶ ἐν οίκῳ οὐδόλως ἐνόμιζεν) (Life 69). These experiences are corroborated by Symeon’s own writings, which are described in the same language and using the same images. Two examples will suffice: “I was not aware I was within the house; it seemed I was sitting in the dark open air, and I was utterly oblivious even of my own body” (οἰκίας ἡμεθησάθη ὅτι ἐντὸς ὑπάρχω, ἐν τῷ δοκεῖν ἄερι δὲ τοῦ σκότους ἐκαθήμην, πλὴν καὶ τοῦ σῶματος αὐτοῦ λήθην ἔσχων εἰς ἃπαν) (Hymn 25); and: “Light appeared to me, and the walls of my cell immediately vanished, and the world disappeared, and I remained alone in the presence of the Alone. And I do not know if this my body was there, too; I do not know if I was outside of it” (φωτισθή μοι ἐκείνο τὸ φῶς, ἤρθη ὁ οἶκος τῆς κέλλης εὐθὺς καὶ παρῆλθεν ὁ κόσμος, ἐμενά δὲ μόνος ἐγὼ μόνω συννά τῷ φωτί, οὕκ οἶδα δὲ εἰ ἦν καὶ τὸ σῶμα τούτο τηνικαύτα ἐκεί, εἰ γὰρ ἔξω τοῦτου γέγονα ἄγνοο) (ED 5).

The Saint as Icon and Iconic Space. These literary descriptions of a sainted figure standing in a ground of light devoid of architectural framing are analogous to the artistic forms and compositional features of Byzantine icons. In this way, the saint or mystic is an icon, a model or image of sanctity.
for others, becoming a sacred site for the faithful and a visible example of liminality, existing visibly within the world but nonetheless representing something beyond it. It is worth noting that Symeon himself was directly involved in the design and production of icons, particularly of his spiritual father, Symeon the Elder. The icon proved to be popular, and local religious leaders requested copies of it. It also proved to be controversial, and when the cult of Symeon the Elder came under attack, resulting in the theft of the icon and the slandering of the saint, Stethatos deemed the affair a “new Iconoclasm,” and its proponents were naturally compared to Iconoclasts (Life 92-93). During his lifetime, Symeon the New Theologian, while in his cell, was observed to be suspended six feet in the air, rising to the “same level as a large icon of the Deesis” hanging close to the ceiling. A bright and radiant light emanated from Symeon’s body, and his hands were raised in prayer, like a figure in an icon (Life 117; cf. 126). After his death, Symeon himself was depicted in an icon, the face of which was seen to glow a “fiery burning red” (Life 143). These passages suggest that the form of space envisioned in the Life, the “place” of the sainted body, is a fully iconic space, at once a hierotopy and a heterotopia, virtualizing the inherent liminality of the icon.

The Life of St Symeon the New Theologian is a rich, and in many ways unique, source for the understanding and production of sacred space in the middle Byzantine period. While the Life has been studied from various perspectives, its sophisticated juxtaposition of space and mystical experience remains largely unexplored. In studying the spatial dynamics put forward by the Life, especially the abolition of spatial perspective in the ecstatic vision of the divine light, this paper will argue that accounts of such visionary experiences influenced, or at the very least encouraged, the depiction of space and spatial perspective in Byzantine iconography.
Speaking Icons: The Mediation of Inscriptions in Byzantine Sacred Space

The omnipresence of inscriptions in Byzantium has long been underestimated. There is, of course, a decline in the production of stone inscription after the sixth century; it has, however, been overlooked that after Late Antiquity inscriptions were less frequently displayed in public spaces, but rather in enclosed areas. Churches and monasteries are the kinds of places in which the epigraphic habit found its new domain. The walls of churches were equipped with painted inscriptions serving as captions and labels; this is attested very early: the frescoes of the Santa Maria Antiqua church at the Forum Romanum at Rome testifies to this practice. In addition, from the seventh century onwards, and especially after Iconoclasm, inscriptions were applied to various objects, primarily in the ecclesiastic and monastic milieu: painted inscriptions on portable icons, engraved or incised inscriptions on metalwork, ivory, glass, wood etc.

Byzantine inscriptions fulfill several tasks, but the main purpose is to convey a “message”. This message can be manifold: the content can refer to a person who is “responsible” for the inscription, e.g. a patron in the case of a donor inscription. On the other hand, inscriptions can also convey a spiritual content, e.g. a text on the scroll of a saint depicted in a church. Either way, inscriptions interact with their beholders, regardless of whether a literate, semiliterate or illiterate audience is looking at them (James 2007; Rhoby 2012; Eastmond 2015). As can still be seen today, inscriptions in churches, both painted on the walls or preserved on icons and liturgical objects, are embedded in the (sacred) space of their surroundings.

Unfortunately, most of the Byzantine icons and objects are no longer displayed within their original context—the environment of St Catherine’s monastery on Mt Sinai might serve as a rare exception—, which makes it rather difficult to reconstruct their primary impact within the church or monastery space. However, some detailed analysis of the inscriptions preserved on these objects may help to gain a better understanding of the original setting.

A possible case is the famous Bulgarian icon of the Theotokos Eleusa with its bronze and silver cover, which also includes enamel plates. While the original icon is lost, the cover dates to the fourteenth century (a. 1341/42), namely to the reign of Tsar Ivan Alexander (Beševliev 1964, no. 160; Grabar 1975, 26–28; Čimbuleva – Gjuzelev 2003, 28–29; Vanev 2013, 35–36). For a long time it was attached to the iconostasis of St Stephen’s (new Metropolis) church in Nesebăr (Byzantine Mesembria) (Vanev 2013, 35). Although this church dates back to the middle Byzantine period, the icon’s original site was the katholikon of the Theotokos Eleusa monastery, which is no longer preserved. However, remains of this complex, the so-called Bazilikata na morskija brjag in the north-eastern part of the city, have been found in the course of excavations since the early twentieth century (Soustal 1991, 358). The history of the Theotokos Eleusa monastery is mainly told by the inscriptions preserved on the icon cover. Today the icon is kept in National Institute of Archaeology (and in its museum respectively) in Sofia (inv. no. 125).
Before commenting on the original impact of the icon's inscriptions in the sacred space of the church, their position on the icon and their content must be described. Two inscriptions, written in large and easily decipherable letters, are placed very prominently on both sides of the Theotokos' nimbus and next to and above Christ's nimbus respectively. The inscription to the right of the Theotokos (and to the left from the perspective of the beholder) refers to the donation of the icon cover during the reign of Tsar Ivan Alexander (his son Michael Asanes is also mentioned), whereas the inscription to the left of the Theotokos (and to the right from the perspective of the beholder) states that the church of the Theotokos Eleusa was renewed under the uncle of the aforementioned Tsar. Both inscriptions are composed in the first person, the latter one from the perspective of the uncle, the other perhaps from the artist responsible for the icon cover or from the uncle as well. The inscription written in tiny letters displayed in the right-hand corner of the icon cover is of very curious content: it is a detailed inventory list of the items belonging to the church ranging from decorated books to church clothes and liturgical objects. At the end—in a manner very similar to tomb inscriptions—those who might assault the church's property are cursed. This inscription, too, is composed in the first person, and the agent is most likely the uncle of the Tsar mentioned above. A fourth inscription is hardly legible, and one has to know that it is there in order to see and decipher it: it is preserved on no fewer than 17 tiny enamel plates which form the bottom end of the Theotokos' veil. Written in the third person, it states that the uncle of the Tsar commissioned the “hanging crown” (αἰωρητὸς στέφανος) of the Theotokos. The inscription is not fully preserved but there is some evidence that the uncle's name is Samoel.

Further inscriptions on the icon cover are the labels of the Mother of God Eleusa, of Christ and of the two archangels Michael and Gabriel. In addition, inscriptions are also to be found on the small plates showing scenes from Mary's life on the right-hand border of the icon (Grabar 1975, 28). There is good reason to believe that originally both the right and the left border of the icon were fully covered with these small plates depicting scenes from the Mother of God's life. This practice is well attested elsewhere, such as on the fourteenth-century cover of an icon kept in the Batopaidi monastery of Mt Athos (Tsigaridas – Loberdou-Tsigarida 2006: 306–319).

Since the cover and its inscriptions are directly connected to the renovation of the church under the reign of Tsar Ivan Alexander, who was a generous patron and sponsor (e.g. of the richly illustrated Bulgarian version of the verse chronicle of Constantine Manasses [cf. Boeck 2015]), it is safe to assume that the icon also formed the new “center” of worship in the church. As was the case in St Stephen's church, where it was later displayed, the icon certainly had a similar prominent place either on the iconostasis or another central place in the church's sacred space. The icon and its cover must even have acted as a symbol of the new church as a whole: all important information regarding the church's state is given in the inscriptions on the icon cover. Attaching the inventory list to the icon is a further means of ensuring that the state of the church is preserved: it is reminiscent of the similar practice of painted inventory lists and charters on church walls likewise attested in fourteenth century churches in the Byzantine and Slavonic world.

How were the visitors, beholders and the Theotokos Eleusa’s worshippers involved in the presence of the icon, which formed both the material and the spiritual center of the church? Some of the inscriptions on the cover are—as mentioned—easily decipherable: however, what was much more important than reading was being aware that the inscriptions were there. There is evidence
that dedicatory inscriptions, tomb inscriptions and perhaps even inscriptions on the scrolls of saints were read aloud on certain occasions (e.g. on the commemoration day of the church’s inauguration): this might also have been the case for the inscriptions on the Theotokos Eleusa’s icon cover.

In addition, research has proven that Byzantine works of art, especially icons, attract different senses (Pentcheva 2010). Such an important icon as that of the Theotokos Eleusa most certainly had the capability to perform in various ways (Pentcheva 2006): one gazed at it, one read its inscriptions, one listened to the text of the inscription when they were read out aloud, and one could see the light coming from outside and being reflected on the silver-bronze cover.

In the case of the Theotokos Eleusa church—and this might be true for other churches as well—the sacred space focused on the icon. However, it also consisted of the various objects mentioned in the inventory list attached to the icon. The removal of the icon and the church objects would have destroyed this sacred space—the curse at the end of the list has to be understood in this sense as well. When the icon—supposedly after the destruction of the Theotokos Eleusa monastery—was moved to a new church, the aforementioned St Stephen’s church, it again certainly formed a place of worship, simply due to the fact that the icon was (and still is) an important piece of art for the tradition of Mesembria/Nesebăr. However, it definitely could not take full effect as it did in its original setting.
This paper responds to the years-long sustenance that Alexei Lidov's idea of hierotopy has given me, not so much in the phenomenology of ritual or display, but in keen attention to those occasions when I can encounter an object in its own place, in a sense topically, as it settles into a matrix of attention within its own setting. This paper is also offered as a tribute to Dr. Gordana Babić, whose work and memorably lively presence have been a steady source of ideas and insights for me over many decades. In recent years, I have returned again and again to her articles on the subject of toponyms in icons, following her determination to push beyond mere nomenclature to see how the very use of place names altered the icons' modes and degrees of signification. Few situations allow one to watch toponyms emerge and function, but a moment in situ this summer seemed to focus the question that her articles had asked: “what does a toponym do to an icon?”

The site in question was the village of Pyrgos on the far northwestern coast of Cyprus. I was there on a Kykkotissa pilgrimage, because the site is permeated with the legend of the miracle-working icon of the Mother of God at the monastery of Kykkos, high in the mountains behind Pyrgos. It is in the tranquil bay here that the imperial ship bearing the Kykkotissa from Constantinople is supposed to have arrived; the trees bent in veneration as the icon passed on its way to the monastery, and even the sea creatures followed it until Kykkos' saintly abbot, Isaias, told them to stop, for seashells still on the slopes today show how fragile they were on dry land. The frescoes in the village church acknowledge its embeddedness in Kykkos' legend, with depictions of the imperial ship's arrival, and the procession from it bearing both the icon and the monastery's chrysobull. I had reached the church just as the Sunday liturgy was ending, and watched the congregation gather with one accord to venerate the icon. Their veneration was sincere and moving. The icon comes from a fierce little pilgrimage church nearby, known as the Galaktiste, where milk offerings to the Mother of God were thrown on the walls; it was discovered there embedded in an outer wall, restored at Kykkos, and then placed in its own throne in the village church, where it is known as the Galaktiste. It is a heart-meltingly beautiful icon, of the 14th century, and has the type of the icon of Kykkos. The Kykkotissa assumes visibility as a major icon in the 14th century; this is among the very early iterations of its type on Cyprus.

Notable to me here was the independence of the icon from the identity of the Kykkotissa despite both its identical type and Pyrgos' deep immersion in the Kykkotissa's legend. For far too long, I had believed that there was a degree of finality in the emergence of a toponym—that it established ownership of a type—and in lockstep with art historical habit, I had called all the examples of the Kykkotissa's type by its name. In fact, I was well aware that number of the big, early icons of the Kykkotissa's type had gone on to develop names and even cults of their own. They were not Kykkotissas: they had identities of their own. The Galaktiste was a visible example. The degree
to which it had enjoyed special veneration already at the Galaktiste Church is not clear; it does not have a biography. But its identity is compelling. A comparable example is the Panagia Theoskepastē, in Kalopanagiotis. Among the largest of the 14th-century icons of the Kykkitissa’s type, and often closely aligned stylistically with the Galaktiste, the Theoskepastē resided until 2004 in a tiny shrine, probably of the 18th century, fully hidden by a huge live oak tree a kilometer above the monastery of St. John Lampadistes. The shrine’s site is densely woven into local legends, but the icon itself does not figure in them, and its earlier history is unknown. But its name is a very powerful one in Kalopanagiotis, invoked with deep reverence. The Salamiotissa, in turn, now the title palladium of a new convent, was a long-venerated miracle-worker in the village of Salamiou according to ethnographers of the early 20th century. When these icons assumed their names is unknown. On the other hand, the very largest of the early icons of this type, a bilateral icon with the Deposition on its reverse, had unquestionably assumed its own identity by the 16th-century, since a 16th-century repainting of its obverse includes the name Athanasiotissa.

All of these icons are or were on poles, and in fact fully half of the 17 pre-Ottoman instances of the Kykkitissa’s type in Cyprus were on poles, thus designed to take a place in the life of the church and community which they served. This is plain in this 16th-century icon bearing the name, Kardiovastousa, of its church in the village of Kaminaria, and others of the panels, too, must in time have borne the name of their place. Thus these icons—for all our propensity to call them Kykkitissa—were never designed to be Kykkitissas, but rather to work like the Kykkitissa: that is, to be prominent icons. While they do, for this purpose, adopt the image of a miracle-worker—and so are in this sense icons of a great icon—what a great icon is, is a great image. The icons that adopt the image don’t invoke a concrete bond to the physical model; they adopt a great image, and that image settles into and gives energy to the material and place that it occupies. The fact that their model has a toponym does not disturb this process: the replicas don’t take on its identity; they draw upon its image to lend particular power their own panels and their own places, as avenues to the Mother of God. A benign amnesia settles over the image’s past as it assumes its new life, helping to explain why it has been so hard to trace favored image types back in time. Reference is not part of the replicas’ brief; performance is.

Acquisition of a name, then, would seem to have little impact on the ensuing life of an image. If the name does not assert ownership of the image, however, it presumably must indicate ownership of the particular panel or place where the image has proved potent. It belongs to the panel. What, then, is one to make of the placement of the name on another panel? Is this, as Gordana Babić suggests, offering the image of a man-made thing for veneration? In fact, the replication of toponyms on panels is fairly rare. The toponyms have been most extensively studied not on painted panels, but on small objects, especially seals and coins. The names must assume magic powers of association in these cases, linking the seal or its owner to a holy site, but they do not accompany images offered for veneration. The earliest instances of panels with toponyms that I know of offer contrasting ways of understanding the response. On the one hand, the exceptional and abraded condition of the Hodegetria—among all the named images on the famous Five-Virgins panel at Sinai—suggests that where the original panel was well-known, its named replica functioned not as a reference, across space to another place, but as a performance, making the original present in this place. The Hodegetria is the toponym most frequently found on panels by far; it is by far the panel most frequently represented in icons as an icon-of-an-icon for veneration; and the instance cited
by Nicolas Oikonomides in the Peloponnesos of an icon named Hodegetria that was transmitted in a will as a source of income, suggests that the toponymic did make the replica a site at least of anticipated special powers. The toponymic in these cases seems to have functioned to manipulate sacred space, making the image identified as being in one place present in another.

A different pattern of response appears in the Hagiosoritissa icon at Makhairas monastery on Cyprus itself. It must belong to much the same date as the Sinai panel of the Five Virgins, and was labeled with one of the toponyms that appeared also on the Sinai panel. This icon, too, reveals in its altered condition that it assumed exceptional potency, but its alteration is of a different kind: it shed its original toponym, and assumed a new place name, the name of Makhairas itself. Apparently, the panel had assumed heightened energy in this place, becoming the name icon of Makhairas. This suggests that when an icon begins to make its own miracles, it doesn't do so under the name of another place, manipulating space by making somewhere else present; it assumes as its own the name of the place where it is.

We don't know when the Kykkotissa acquired its name. Neither the Chronicle of Leontios Makhairas from the 1430s nor the core of its Diegesis supposedly dictated before 1422 uses the name, and one has to wait till after the Ottoman conquest to encounter it in a text. Of its 17 surviving pre-Ottoman replicas, however, four do carry the label, E Kykkiotissa. As Babić had said of toponyms, the examples are all within the region of Kykkos' authority, where the name was meaningful. Three of the four named examples were produced in the years around 1500, and a good half-century or so after the first extensive cluster of replicas attributable to the middle of the 14th century, and in this sense seem to reflect a "second phase" of replication, after the icon's cult had settled into tradition, or perhaps in response to a new wave of miraculous events. These are less slavish in their repetition of the image—the Pedoulas icon allows the red and gold veil to become blue; the fresco at Letymbou shows the Kykkotissa as a standing figure, accompanied by two full-length female saints; and the Moutoullas icon elides a number of details. This looseness suggests an easier familiarity with the type.

The fourth example is more problematic. You see it here before and after restoration. Its iconography, pastiglia patterns, and even Morellian details of the figures are those of a mid-14th-century panel of the Kykkotissa's type. Its style, however, even after recent radical restoration, remains at odds with this date, making its attribution difficult. I think it is significantly earlier than the other three labeled icons, though, and so is very probably the first known instance of the name. Thus it does stand out among them. It is, moreover, the only one of the four for which we have any sense of a biography. It was first brought to light in 1992 by Sophocles Sophocleous, who managed to get it removed—reluctantly, given its reputation for special sacredness—from metal and fabric covers that had hidden it in the iconostasis of its church. The icon at Kykkos is a hidden icon, and the occlusion of this icon could imply an effort to make its place into a Kykkos. But occlusion is not unique to the Kykkotissa on Cyprus, and if anything, the situation suggests the opposite. At the end of the Frankish period, the icon was clearly a Kykkotissa. When it re-emerged in the 1990s, it brought with it a reputation of special sacredness, but also a different identity: it is the Panagia tou Kivotos, the Panagia of the Ark. As its own powers matured, it assumed its own name. As with the icon of Makhairas, the name of the old miracle-worker was displaced when it assumed its own power. They suggest that one really doesn't ask one icon to do the miracles of another; they do their own.
But if one doesn’t ask one icon does not do another’s miracles, then what to the icons with another’s toponym do? That they are tools in the manipulation of institutional power is true, but not sufficient: rather few of the many icons labeled Hodegetria can be declarations of the hegemony of the Hodegon, or in any specific way a declaration of allegiance to Constantinople. By the same token, few are known as miracle-workers in their own right, though many—like the one cited by Oikonomides—were expected to be effective intercessors. I don’t know of instances of their performing miracles of the Hodegetria, nor do I know of instances in which toponymic icons literally are set into contexts that repeat the features of their home place. Instead, a degree of reference, of pointing across distance, remains. Rather than collapsing space, making one place another, they must have made a relay. Like an icon-within-an-icon, the toponymic icon invites veneration of its subject through the referenced icon. Such “veneration through” is layered, in that it affirms the process of veneration through an image as well as performing it. In the painted icons-in-an-icon, one venerates Mary through her painted icon; in the toponymic icons, one venerates Mary through her miracles performed at the named site. It is not so much that a man-made object is offered for veneration, as that a relay is acknowledged. In the past spoken of named icons as self-referential, in that they announced their identities, as if self-aware. A similar self-awareness characterizes their veneration, in that the worshipper affirms the process of veneration through an icon, and in doing so, makes an affirmation of his or her faith.

In the Ottoman period, Kykkos would build a veritable empire on the basis of its miracle-working icon, harnessing for this purpose the faith that through the icons of its icon the devotee could gain access to the miracles of Mary herself in the icon at Kykkos. Affirmation of faith both in icons and through icons was woven into the texts that supported this effort. Ephraim the Athenian proclaimed in his publication of the Kykkotissa’s story that the veneration of icons was a worthy act, affirming our faith and leading to miracles. Serapheim of Pissidia, in reissuing of the story, was even more direct: venerating icons affirms miracles, and so is the very basis of our faith. The carefully tailored circuit from faith through icons to miracles, and from the miracles back through the icons to faith, was an Ottoman one shaped to the needs of the era. Yet the very earliest narration of the story had already emphasized the importance of icons as an affirmation of Orthodox faith:

You see, my brothers, how through images and the senses and vision everything happens for our salvation? In order that we would not be orphaned when they had left us and gone to Heaven, the Virgin and the apostles...made available the holy icons to us pious ones for the joy of our souls...so we could see the great and innumerable miracles and good works of the holy icons and be confirmed each day in the Orthodox faith.

And a version of the relay, through her icons to Mary, must also have been present already in the slowly broadening use of toponymic panels.
The Adoration of the Magi: From Iconic Space to Icon in Space

It has often been postulated by scholars that the central Byzantine Marian iconography, representing the Virgin seated on the throne with Child Christ on her lap flanked by attendants, derives from the visual rendering of her figure in the compositions of the Adoration of the Magi. The principle consideration in favor of this hypothesis is usually connected to the question of iconographical similarity between the seated pose of Mary and Jesus and the general solemnity of their figures – very much in line with imperial imagery and representations of ceremonial receptions. However, purely iconographic investigations have not been able to fully substantiate this idea or demonstrate the gradual evolution of this visual formula. Moreover, no convincing attempt has been made to explain the transition of the Mary with Child image from its original appearance in narrative compositions to its later place as the primary iconic image of Christian worship. As will be demonstrated in this paper, the only way to solve this problem is to apply the method of hierotopy, which privileges the spatial dimensions of Byzantine art production and its attempt to transmit the power of the divine over apparent schematic similarities.

The Adoration of the Magi is among the most popular themes in Early Christian art. It was reproduced in almost all media with a great number of late antique artworks serving as examples. The surviving material indicates that the arrival of the Eastern wise men and their encounter with the new born King was represented more often than the Nativity feast with which it was usually associated. The only canonical Gospel that mentions the event is that of Matthew (Mt. 2: 1-14). Hence, it is not surprising that from the start visual renderings of the Adoration relied heavily on the Apocrypha for further details on the context of the incarnation, such as the cave space, the active participation of the angels, the presence of midwives and so forth.

When a late antique viewer looked at a composition of the Adoration his memory would evoke the story narrated by the sacred texts, while his internal gaze would be directed to the Palestine and Bethlehem as the site of these events. The church of the Nativity in Bethlehem was one of the earliest foundations in the Holy Land, second in importance only to the church of the Anastasis. The Nativity basilica was closely associated with the Virgin’s role in salvation, and became a model for subsequent ecclesiastical buildings. Built in the fourth century on the initiative of either Constantine or his mother Helen, the church was situated right above the cave believed to be the location of the Nativity. The actual natural site was transformed into a specific Christian shrine on two levels with the man-made structures built on top of the sacred space thought to have been sanctified by God’s incarnation. Interestingly, the Apocrypha, in particular the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy of Christ, when narrating the events in Bethlehem already compare the cave of the Nativity to the temple: “Then came shepherds; and when they had lighted a fire, and were rejoicing greatly, there appeared to them the hosts of heaven praising and celebrating God Most High. And while the shepherds were doing the same, the cave was at that time made like a temple of the upper world, since both
heavenly and earthly voices glorified and magnified God on account of the birth of the Lord Christ”. For a new religion in search of an identity and objects of devotion, the claiming of sites such as the Nativity cave was of crucial importance. As with other early sites of pilgrimage, the sacred space of the cave enclosed within the church became the focus of veneration, inviting travelers from abroad to reconnect to the sacred events through the physical experience of a mystery made accessible and contextualized by the church’s architectural frame.

The Letter of the Three Patriarchs (9th c.) mentions the existence of a mosaic image set at the church of the Nativity in Bethlehem: “Moreover, Helen of blessed memory, the Godly-minded empress in the process of discovering the life-giving Cross, embellished and decorated with sacred icons the holy and revered places, among which was the holy and famous Bethlehem. There she built a very great church in honour of the Mother of God and on the outer wall on the west side she depicted an artistic mosaics the holy birth od Christ, the Mother of God holding the life-bringing infant at her breast and the adoration of the gift-bearing Magi” (Munitiz et al. 1997, p. 42) The passage is followed by the famous remark that during the conquest (612-629) the Persians did not destroy the church since they recognized in the magi the representation of their countrymen.

Various hypotheses have been made as to the dating and location of the mosaic, as well as to the validity of the source and its relevance for the discussion of early material. The creation of images on façades was not unusual in the Early Byzantine period and evidence survives for similar practices in Rome, Poreč and others cities. Neither the phenomenology of external visual introductions to the sacred spaces of given churches, nor the question of the religious use of the façade compositions have yet received proper scholarly attention. We can assume, nevertheless, that a similar image on the entrance wall of the church would have had a strong effect on viewers, and in the case of a Bethlehem basilica, on many pilgrims.

Over time the images decorating the Bethlehem church, either on the west wall or in the apse, could have easily become associated with the site itself. If that is the case, then the sacred space enclosed within the building would have found expression in an artistic image with rather different dimensionality, capable of suggesting on the outside the sacred content hidden inside the church’s walls. This quintessential visual formula, as mentioned in the Letter of the Patriarchs, could show the Nativity, the Virgin and Child and the Adoration, and could have become a sort of embodiment of the site built to commemorate these events in historical and liturgical terms. In this manner, the ‘body’ of a concrete space could be assimilated with the more abstract ‘body’ of God given lasting corporeality in an image. Unlike the building, however, this visual expression of the site was portable, and could be taken to distant locations as a memento of the believer’s long journey and successful pilgrimage, as well as a reminder of the spiritual prototype.

Russian art historian Dmitry Ainalov was the first to suggest a link between the representation on the Adoration on the Monza ampulla and the late antique murals that once decorated the Bethlehem basilica. The container for sacred liquid represents Mary seated frontally on a throne together with Christ child, on one side adored by three shepherds and on the other by the Magi. Two archangels appeared behind the back of the throne and there is a large star above Mary’s head. According to Ainalov’s interpretations, the composition in the Bethlehem became known through pilgrims’ tokens and small-scale images that travelled all over the Christian world. Due to the lack of other sources and any material evidence, Ainalov’s suggestion has remained only an attractive
hypothesis. In spite of this, the impact and overall significance of the artistic legacy of the Holy Land and its sites on subsequent artistic tradition should not be omitted from research solely on the grounds that little, if anything, has survived. Recent studies demonstrate the crucial role that Jerusalem and the Holy Land played in the formation of the earliest cult practices in the capital cities of the Eastern and Western parts of the Empire. In these studies, the legendary and historical allusions made to the earliest icons and relics brought to Constantinople from Palestine finally receive further substantiation and are taken as reflections of the real transmission of patterns, liturgies, feasts and artworks, and thus no longer as mere mythical references intended to grant authority to the mentioned artifacts.

Since they were originally celebrated on the same day, the Adoration and the Nativity regularly appear together in art, but the Adoration often acquires a somewhat more privileged position. Exemplary in this respect are two ivories from the British collections, bearing almost identical iconographies. One of them is kept in the collection of the British Museum (inv. 1904,0702.1) and represents an image consisting of two registers. In the upper part the Virgin is portrayed seated frontally on the throne holding Christ Child on her knees. At the sides of the throne four figures are shown standing symmetrically: the three Magi and an angel holding a cross on a long staff. The solemnity of the scene is underlined by the architectural frame composed of an arch, forming a sort of ciborium, and two spiral columns on top of which two crosses were originally carved. The lower zone of the plaque is occupied by a narrative composition of the Nativity rendered on a much smaller scale, depicting, on the left, Mary, at rest after the birth on a large and irregularly shaped mattress; on the right, baby Jesus in a masonry crib, in front of which the figure of the midwife Solome is seen prostrating her withered hand.

The ivory from Rylands library in Manchester (inv. 6), which once formed the central piece of a five-part ivory Gospel cover, reproduces the general scheme of the British Museum plaque almost identically. The differences in style, original function and carving techniques, however, indicate that the contexts and locations of production of these two ivories were not the same. Noteworthy is the position of Mary's arms on both ivories. They are oriented downwards and create a mandorla-shaped space around Christ. This feature differentiates the ivory images from the iconography customary in Early Byzantine art, where Mary is usually portrayed with her hands positioned differently, with one arm bent so that her hand can rest on Christ's shoulder. There is a series of early representations of Mary in which the symmetrical, embracing gesture of her arms is reproduced, with the Panagia Kanakaria apse mosaic providing important evidence for monumental decorations (6th c.). Whether or not this specific rendering derives from a particular prototype and whether this prototype should be identified with the image that once decorated the Bethlehem church are topics for future investigation.

The scene of the Adoration dominates the composition of the ivories and refers to the historical event itself. The setting and general rendering of the scene, however, indicate that beyond its narrative function, the Adoration scene in this case was designed to inspire devout contemplation in the Christian viewer. The ivories do not only represent the image of the Christian deity in the form of Mary with Child seated on the throne – the iconography that would be so central to the Byzantine artistic tradition – but also record the transformation of the narrative scene into a cult image.

The various steps in the passage from narrative compositions to iconic representations, and consequently to the principle image of the Byzantine church that crowns the altar space inside the
apse, can be detected in a number of Early Byzantine artworks. One of them is an eighth century decoration of Deir el-Surian monastery in Egypt, in which a side apse represents the Adoration scene. The decoration illustrates how similar narrative compositions could be adapted to the semi-spherical shape of the conch. This mural is distinguished by the placement of the Mother and Child in the very center, where Mary is depicted flanked by two groups of attending worshippers, the Magi on the left and shepherds on the right. The position of her arms is the same as on the two ivories discussed above, confirming once again that this element should be taken as an indicator of a particular type of representation. This iconography follows almost precisely the image on the Palestinian ampulla from Monza. As with the British Museum ivory, here the narrative component is secondary to the visual impact of the representation, since the viewer is led to focus on the figure of the Virgin, and is even able to make eye contact with the frontal gaze of Mary.

Another example is the famous golden enkolpion from the Dumbarton Oaks collection, its circular surface divided in two parts. In the lower zone, the elements of the Nativity scene with a seated Joseph and Jesus in cradle merge almost seamlessly with the Adoration composition. Several figures shown within this narrative direct their gazes and gestures upwards. Although the attention of these figures is justified contextually by the presence of a star in the sky or image of Christ above, the direction of their gazes also creates an impression that they point to an emphatic representation on the top with the Virgin Mary and Christ seated on the throne and turned frontally toward the viewers, flanked by archangels. Through the sequence of these moments in the story of Incarnation, the subject becomes a more comprehensive image of eternal power and glory, with the illustrations of the Gospel story dedicated to a single event evolving into an icon that could be worshipped in the hands of object’s owner. The token’s key image would in turn make its way to the central position of the apse of the great majority of Byzantine churches, where the viewer could become, in a manner of speaking, one the Magi coming to worship God and bearing gifts of devotion.

This association between the members of the Christian church and the Magi was often implied in the writing of the early church fathers. In fact, the Adoration scene apparently functioned in Early Christian art as a vehicle for transmitting the idea of appropriate worship, propagating in visual terms reverential conduct before the image of God and his Mother. The latter aspect is closely related to the importance and profound religious significance of gift giving, which still forms a significant part of Christian life in a church, in which gifts take the form of candles lit before the images of saints, and votives, both considered small but meaningful offerings. The most vivid attestation to the fact that this parallelism was intentional in the Early Byzantine period is found on the ornament of Theodora’s dress in the mosaics of San Vitale in Ravenna. The emperor and empress are portrayed facing each other across the space of the sanctuary holding gifts in their hands, in the hope of worshiping the Lord in imitation of the three Magi whose silhouettes are visible on the lower edge of Theodora’s cloak.

The appearance of these references within the space of the sanctuary is also not occasional. Beginning with the interpretations of John Chrysostom, the altar space of Christian churches was regularly compared to the cave of the Nativity and more direct references to Bethlehem were drawn in connection with the sanctuary and the Eucharist. This tradition continued in later centuries and received its most richest formulation in the writing of the Patriarch Germanos (715-730): “the church is an earthly heaven in which the super-celestial God dwells and walks about. It represents the crucifixion, burial, and resurrection of Christ...The apse corresponds to the cave in Bethlehem
where Christ was born, as well as the cave in which he was buried...”. These liturgical interpretations of the space indicate that such associations became common understanding within the complex sacred topography of Christian shrines. The mystical experience of the altar space as a cave of the Nativity with its concrete prototype physically present in the Holy Land created the necessary premises for the placement of the image of the Mary and Christ inside the conch. Via this visual connector, which attracted the attention of all the worshippers, the reality of iconic space was made present in real time for the congregation and vice versa, the visual icon became the quintessence of an absolute model of a sacred space, revealing the true nature of the Byzantine image making.
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Introduction

Narrative plays a crucial role in all cultural expression, and Byzantium was no exception: narrative strategies shaped Byzantine literature and art, but also the Byzantines’ worldview and faith. In this session we shall consider Byzantine aspects of narrative and narratological readings of Byzantine literature, but also the significance of narrative for the way in which we – and others – understand Byzantium. Part of the discussion will focus on the much discussed relation between fiction and historical ‘truth’, taking a point of departure in the Byzantine historiographical adaptation of ancient mythology (Goldwyn), moving on to the Byzantine perception of the human ‘need for stories’ and a cognitive approach to fiction (Pizzone) and the search for an overarching plot and meaningful narration in Byzantine chronicles (Bourbouhakis). Similar concerns are discussed in the case of hagiography and the ‘romancing’ of Lives that took place in the late tenth century (Høgel), but also in relation to illuminated manuscripts and the way in which readers understood not only textual narratives but also stories told in images (Crostini). The identity-building potential of narrative, along with the implicit longing for a meaningful narration, is a recurring theme in the session, also when we step out of the Byzantine context proper and look at the story of Byzantium told by ‘Others’, here represented by Islamic historiography in the medieval period (Heilo) and exhibitions in our modern time (Kimmelfield). We hope that our discussion might not only shed new light on the significance of narratological tools to Byzantine culture, but also foster a wider and deeper reflection on contemporary views on Byzantium in and beyond Byzantine Studies.
History or Myth? Anti-Poetic Narrativity in John Malalas’ Chronicle

In Book 2 of the sixth century Chronicle of John Malalas, a universal history from creation to the author’s own time, Malalas recounts the founding of Kadmeia, the city which would later become Thebes. Having established himself as ruler there, Kadmos “recalled from exile Teiresias, a Boiotian philosopher, a hunter, a man well-endowed with wealth, rank and wisdom. It was he who brought to the Hellenes the belief that all things move of their own accord and that the world is without design” (2.23). Presumably because of these atheistic and controversial ideas, the priests conspired against him, and he was exiled to the temple of Apollo Daphnaios charged with having an effeminate mind and with too zealously enquiring how a woman conceives after intercourse with a man, how the nature of blood is divided into bones, flesh, veins, nerves and blood, and how a child is given life and is born. The most learned Kephalion has written these things.” (2.23)

Kephalion was, like Malalas, author of a universal history, and the surviving fragments of Kephalion’s work seem to suggest that he was interested in rationalizing the pagan aspects of Classical literature. This seems to be confirmed by what Malalas writes next: “The most learned Sophokles wrote a play and said poetically that Teirisias saw Pallas bathing and became a woman.” (2.23). This seems to be a conflation of two well-known myths about Tiresias: that Hera turned him into a woman for striking two copulating snakes, and that he was blinded by Athena for watching him bathe. What I am concerned with, however, is not Malalas’ butchering of the myth, but with how Malalas rationalizes the mythological material, narrating it in a way more suitable to the genre of chronicle writing. Malalas weighs two versions: Sophokles’ mythological version, which relies on the exercise of miraculous powers by pagan divinities to enact a biology-defying sex-change, and Kephalion’s version, which relies on human agency, familiar political and religious conspiracies by rival human power centers, and a metaphorical rather than literal interpretation of Teirisias’ sex change: he is not, as in Sophokles, literally a woman, rather he is metaphorically a woman due to his over-eager investment in understanding the female reproductive cycle. Malalas comes firmly down on the side of Kephalion: through its adherence to easily understood rational motivation, it is credible, and it gives the episode verisimilitude: by removing the irrational and the pagan divinities, the scene looks realistic in its depiction of human interaction in the past. Malalas wants to narrate in a truthful and believable way, and so he narrates first a historically rationalizing version of the story, then offers and dismisses the Sophoklean version. This is what I want to call Malalas’ anti-poetic narrativity, a strategy at the levels of style and narration that transforms poetic mythological material into credible prose history. In her chapter “Malalas’ Sources,” Elizabeth Jeffreys suggests that “one of the most striking characteristics of Books I-XIV is the way in which Malalas frequently cites an authority for one of his statements. These citations refer to poets and historians indifferently” (Studies: 169). I would argue, however, that the use of poets and historians is not indifferent at all, rather, it is key to understanding how Malalas conceives of authority, credibility and verisimilitude.
Indeed, I would go further and say that, for Malalas, the word “poetically” is synonymous with lying, while “history” is synonymous with truthful.

The debate between narrating according to the aesthetic and psychologically insightful superiority of poetry or the factual accuracy of history has its origins as far back as Thucydides, who says he wrote his history in part to counter the fictionalizing and sensationalizing tendencies of contemporary poetry. The clearest assessment of this argument, however, can be found in Elizabethan England, when Sir Philip Sidney wrote in 1579:

if the question were whether it were better to have a particular act truly or falsely set down, there is no doubt which is to be chosen, … But if the question be whether it be better to have it set down as it should be or as it was, then it is better to have the feigned Æneas in Virgil than the right Æneas in Dares Phrygius. (Sydney: 116)

That is, history offers us what is true, but history can be improved upon by poetry, and this fictionalizing process can, though at the expense of historical veracity, offer us some insight into the human condition, heighten our emotional response, or develop our aesthetic sentiments. So this debate about how to narrate the past, which method of narration is most beautiful or most credible is one that Malalas neither initiated nor resolved. But it is certainly one in which he participated, and so I would like to spend the rest of my talk today detailing Malalas’ intervention in this debate, examining his “anti-poetic” narrative method.

The word “poetically” (ποιητικῶς) appears 15 times in the Chronicle, and in almost every instance Malalas uses it to distinguish between the traditional mythological explanation for an event and a historically rationalized account. The most frequent reference to poetry concerns epic and tragedy, and in particular Homer and Euripides. Aeschylus, for instance, does not appear at all in the Chronicle, and in addition to the passage with which I opened, Sophokles is mentioned only one other time, when we are told when he lived (6.16). Euripides, by contrast, is mentioned 13 times, and in most of the cases, it is to cast doubt on the veracity of his version of events.

In Book 4, for instance, Malalas tells the story of Hippolytos and Phaidra. The incredibility of the Euripidean version of the narrative is stated in no uncertain terms at the outset: “At that time there were false rumors in Thessaly about Phaidra’s passion for Hippolytos, her stepson and Theseus’ son by a concubine” (4.24). In claiming that the rumors about Phaidra’s passion were false, Malalas negates the central motivation of the Euripidean version. It further negates the divine elements of the tragedy, since Phaidra is made to fall in love with Hippolytus by Aphrodite and Hippolytus, by Malalas described as simply “chaste and peaceable” [σώφρων δὲ καὶ ἰσχυρός] (4.24) is no longer sworn to Artemis. The divine jealousy which motivates the plot – Aphrodite’s jealousy about Hippolytus preferring Artemis – is removed from the narration, and instead we get a king making a bad decision regarding his son and wife based on false rumors. The role of Poseidon is similarly negated: in Euripides’ version, Theseus all, Poseidon for revenge, and so Poseidon sends a bull from the ocean to spook Hippolytus’ horses, who then throw Hippolytus and he, tangled up in the reins, is dragged behind them to his death. This miraculous – and, to Malalas at any rate, highly improbable act of divine retribution is recast in more human terms: the bull appears as a sacrifice to Poseidon, which sixth century Byzantines would have had no problem accepting as a religious pagan practice, and Hippolytus’ horse simply stumbles and throws him while on a boar hunt, a version of events which also would be credible.
Malalas’ narration not only removes the divine aspects and other ideologically unsuitable material, but also removes the tragic aspect. As readers since Aristotle have known, tragedy relies on sudden revelations, and tragic situations arise when such revelations require characters to make impossible choice between two equally held values. In the case of Hippolytus and Phaedra, the sudden revelation of Hippolytos’ and Phaidra’s innocence is brought into conflict with their sworn oaths to say nothing. And this is why I call Malalas’ narrative decision making “anti-tragic.” It is not enough to remove the divine elements, Malalas also smooths out the narrative in a way that the sudden twists and reversals and the hard psychological insights that arise from them are elided. The psychologically charged and emotionally fraught chain of events that lead Phaidra to commit suicide to cover her lie and Theseus’ revelation that he had condemned his son in error are thus all concentrated into a few lines of dry narration. In Malalas’ version, Phaidra outlives Hippolytus, and Theseus sends her into exile: “Phaidra, who was very chaste, was distraught because of the false accusation made by those in the town and the country, and she was ashamed of her rejection by her husband, so she committed suicide, dying at the age of 39” (4.24). Malalas then says that he followed not the poet but the historian Kephalion, who “said that the story of the chaste Phaidra’s desire for Hippolytos was a false invention of those who wrote poetic stories about her” (4.24). Here we can see quite clearly the synonymous nature between “poetically” and “false,” which stand in contrast to the implied truth of the historical method.

Given that his subject is the distant past, and that Malalas devotes so much space to the Trojan War, it is perhaps no surprise that Malalas takes issue with Homer on several occasions as well. In Book 2, he recounts a scene in which the Egyptian emperor Helios, son of Hephaistos catches an adulterer:

He was informed by someone that an Egyptian woman, one of those who enjoyed wealth and rank amongst them, had fallen in love with someone and was committing adultery with him. When Helios heard this, he wanted to catch her, because of his father Hephasitos’ law [enforcing monogamy], so that it should not be broken. He took soldiers from his army, having discovered that her adultery took place at night. (2.2)

He catches her, tortures her and parades her through the streets, while her lover is put to death. So this scene, as presented, seems merely to be a summary of a scene from a euhemerized version of the Greek gods Hephaistos and Helios. But then Malalas adds this:

the poet Homer tells this story poetically: Helios, he says, condemned Aphrodite for having intercourse at night with Ares. He used the name Aphrodite for the desire for fornication condemned by the emperor Helios. The truth, as it has been written above, was written by the most learned chronicler Palaiphatos. (2.2)

We now see that the source of this narrative is Odyssey 8.265ff., when Hephaistos catches his wife Aphrodite sleeping with Ares. Malalas then offers an allegorical interpretation of Homer’s scene: Aphrodite is the desire for fornication, and Helios, now as the sun, finds the lovers when as sunrise, he casts light upon them. It is not that Malalas is disinterested in myth, poetry and allegory: he had no need to mention the Homeric source of the story at all if he weren’t, but part of his literary strategy is to be a debunker of myths in order to make the story more credible by, first, removing the divine pagan aspects of a story and, second, replacing them with a story prioritizing human agency and human motivations. But Homer, a revered source in Byzantium, can’t be discounted entirely, so Malalas uses allegory to explain how Homer’s account can still be true: it must be read allegorically.
Malalas uses a similar strategy in his description of the famous scene of Odysseus’s arrival at Kirke’s island in *Odyssey* 10. In Malalas’ telling, Odysseus and his men arrive on Kirke’s island and, recognizing some of the men from the Achaian army when they approached him, he questioned them, saying “What is your reason for living on this island?” They said to him, “We are from the Achaian army and we were driven to this island by the force of the ocean waves. We drank a magic potion offered us by Kirke and fell terribly in love with her, and how this is our home.”

Hearing this, Odysseus tells his men not to eat any of her food, and she, so impressed at his restraint and wiles, invites him to stay with her through the winter until they can sail again. So, again, Malalas begins with a narrative featuring only human characters doing believably human things, with believably human motivations, and he attributes this narrative to the reliable historians Sisyphos of Kos and Dictys of Crete. But then he continues: “The most learned Homer related poetically that through a magic potion she transformed the men who had ben ensnared by her, making some into the shape of lions, giving others dog’s heads, making others into pigs and others into bears with pigs’ heads.” So he again attributes to Homer a story that is motivated by the supernatural or marvelous rather than by human agency and or rationally explicable things, a story that is both generically unsuited to chronicle writing and historiography – hence the emphasis on “poetically” – and one that is also not credible as an accurate description of the past.

As in the previous example, Malalas must find a way to both tell the historical truth about the past, and thus cannot use the divine pagan machinery that motivates human agency and thus the plot. But neither can he – nor perhaps does he want – to reject Homer entirely. Allegory provides a way of synthesizing these two aims: if read allegorically, a different kind of truth can be gleaned from Homer, one that no longer puts his narrative at odds with a method of historical narrative that eschews pagan gods. So, Malalas, as previously, turns to another source to explain the Homeric allegory:

The learned Pheidalos of Corinth, mentioned above, wrote out this poetic composition and interpreted it as follows: he said that to turn men into animal forms in no way corresponded with Kirke’s desire for a large army, but the poet was referring to the habits of men in love, and Kirke made them grind their teeth and rage and go mad with desire, like beasts, on her orders. For it is a natural habit of men in love to cling to the woman whom they love and die on her behalf. This is the way of men in love: they become like wild beasts in their desire and are incapable of rational thought; their appearance is changed and they come to resemble beasts in body, appearance and manners … Some are like dogs in their approach to sex and have intercourse frequently; others are like lions … pursue only their impulse and desire exclusively … others are like bears and copulate in a foul way.

Allegory here offers a way of maintaining the Homeric material as a credible source for narrating the past even though the story being told is not credible on its own terms: the allegorical interpretation salvages the truth value of the “poetic” – that is, lying – source.

On yet other occasions, Malalas takes issue with a certain mythological story without reference to the original author. In re-telling the story of Ganymede, for instance, he reimagines the famous abduction of the boy by Zeus in the form of an eagle in much more mundane terms: Ganymede is sent to make sacrifices at a temple of Zeus, but is mistaken for a spy and “Ganymede became sick with cowardly fear” and died three days later. He was buried at the temple of Zeus beneath an
inscription which reads: “Tros, emperor of Asia, has dedicated to Zeus, together with this sacrifice, his son Ganymede who lies here. … The most learned Didymos, the historian and chronicler has written about this” (4.15). This is Malalas’ typical method of dealing with mythological material: he rationalizes the divine element and retells the story in a way that offers a mundane explanation for supernatural events. But then he also offers an allegorical explanation for the myth: “Some people say that Ganymede was seized by an eagle, because death came to him very suddenly” (4.15).

The “some people” to whom he attributes this narrative are presumably the ancient poets. Both Homer and Euripides mention Ganymede several times, but as far as I know, neither of them address the particular mytheme of his abduction by Zeus as eagle. Perhaps Malalas is implying them as the authors, but I think it just as likely that the myth was well-known, but then, as now, there was not a particularly canonical written version, hence the attribution to “some people.” Nevertheless, the essential allegorizing aspect remains: the speed of the fatal disease is compared to the speed of the eagle which carried him off in the myth, and his burial at the temple of Zeus replaces his residing with Zeus in Olympus.

An axiom of narratological analysis is that the choice of events to include or exclude is a fundamental narrative choice, and thus reveals an author’s larger methods and purposes. This is particularly true of a work of such vast scope as Malalas. Unlike, say, a tragic playwright, who is limited by the generic constraints of the unities of time and place, the chronicler’s work spans thousand of miles and thousands of years. Chroniclers like Malalas had not only all of biblical and Classical history to choose from, but also all of their mythological sources. Perhaps some events, say, Creation or the Trojan War, were of such monumental importance that they couldn't be ignored. But these much smaller events – the doomed love triangle of Hippolytus, Theseus and Phaedra or the adulterous affair thwarted by Helios – are essentially superfluous to the grand narrative arc of history as the chronicler conceived it. That Malalas included these elements, then, must be regarded as a conscious literary choice made for some specific purpose. A second, corollary, axiom, is that the way in which an event is narrated is equally a conscious choice revealing larger methods and purposes.

What conclusions, then, can we draw from the fact that Malalas chose to include these elements from epic and tragedy, and that he did so in a way that first engages and then negates the mythological explanations given in these original sources? First, judging by how often he draws from them, we can safely assume that he thought they were central sources for understanding the distant past. We can equally understand that he thought that, while accurate in a broad way, the information contained within them was corrupted by ancient tendencies to attribute to pagan gods motivations and processes for historical change better attributed to decidedly more mundane forces and easily explicable human motivations. Thus Malalas’ habit of allegorizing, rationalizing and citing alternate, more historically appropriate sources as counterweights. This choice goes to the issue of credibility. History without certain events or without the citation of certain authors would not be credible. But this second element, the choice of how to narrate these events, goes to the question of verisimilitude. Orthodox Byzantines simply would not have believed the supernatural elements of the story, and the narration of those events in a dramatic way would have called into question the veracity of the story they told. In narrating mythological in a dry and unadorned literary style stripped of divine machinations in accordance with the generic constraints of chronicle writing, Malalas made otherwise incredible events both credible and true to the Byzantine understanding of historical causation, while at the same time creating an avenue for the preservation of pagan mythological narratives.
Works Cited


Storytelling and pleasure: the gratifications of seriality

Lately scientists have devoted a great deal of attention to storytelling. Psychologists like Steven Pinker have more or less successfully tried to shed light on the cognitive and evolutionary advantages of fiction (Pinker 1997). Neuroimaging has been used to identify the areas aroused by narratives. Neuroscientists have suggested that stories, much like dreams, help rewire the brain through implicit memory and therefore have an adaptive function (Gottschall 2012). Anthropologists have pointed out that storytelling, just like religion and more broadly performance, helps release endorphins or endogenous opioids, that is the same neurotransmitters involved in eating and love-making, acting on the body as a sort of drug (Wulff 1991). Even gossip seems to have an evolutionary function (Dunbar 2004). Admittedly, many of these ‘new’ findings just give scientific backing to self-evident and long-acknowledged truths. Way before the discovery of mirror neurons, Plato pointed to the dangerous psychological transformative power of myths. And yet, these new clues about the workings of our naturally storytelling minds can help us in our approach to pre-modern uses and conceptualizations of narratives. A better – if still and perhaps necessarily incomplete – understanding of the underlying processes can help us grasp how pre-modern texts tried to make sense of them and at the same time clarify some apparent contradictions. Along these lines, in my paper I will take into consideration the issue of narrative pleasure (what is it? how to create it? how is it experienced? how to manage it?). I will take my cues from a little studied text penned by John Chrysostom, which shows a distinctive awareness of the psychological processes involved in the performance/reception of narratives and of the gratification associated to them.

My starting point is John Chrysostom’s address On Vainglory and the Right Way for Parents to Bring Up Their Children (on the context see Malingray 1972, 7-50). Although well-known, this homily has been addressed in scholarship mostly as a testimony of the way late-antique Christian public figures negotiated classical culture, in the vein of Basil of Caesarea’s pamphlet To Young Men on Greek Literature. However, this work turns out to be crucial to understand how early Byzantine elites construed the role of narratives within Christian culture. In the central paragraphs of the work, John Chrysostom shows how to train the senses of young children - their “gates” to the world – so as to make them good Christians. When it comes to the sense of hearing, John Chrysostom turns his instruction to parents into a handbook on how to use storytelling and biblical narratives in everyday life. Thus, he provides a strikingly detailed description of the psychological effects which διηγήματα, complete with their most entertaining aspects, have on young listeners. Needless to say, John Chrysostom aims to praise the moral value of Christian narratives. And yet, he ends up highlighting what makes storytelling pleasurable and compelling to the hearer, disclosing important details about the taste of contemporary audiences. In modern terms, John Chrysostom’s describes in detail the process through which the brain of the listener is rewired by stories. What is more, Chrysostom’s address On Vainglylor provides invaluable theoretical backing to the attempts
of scholars to both unravel the narrative aspects of spiritual communication in Late Antiquity/ Byzantium and work out the continuity between ancient – fictional and non-fictional – narrative and Byzantine hagiographic production. I refer in particular to Claudia Rapp’s seminal paper from 1998 on *diegesis* in late-antique spiritual literature (Rapp 1998), whose conclusions are in many ways backed by John Chrysostom’s text and the to the project “Novelsaints” currently run by Koen de Temmerman in Gent, whose research hypothesis been recently reinforced through textual evidence by Stephen Trzaskoma (Trzaskoma 2015).

John Chrysostom begins his exposition with a Platonic flavor, stressing the need for stories children naturally feel and introducing the age-old image of the “old wive’s tales” to describe fictional and pleasurable stories (38-39):

> Therefore let them not hear frivolous and old wives’ tales: “This youth kissed that maiden. The king’s son and the younger daughter have done this.” (…) Let them not hear such tales. Do not let them hear these stories, but let them hear others simply told with no elaboration. But when the boy takes relaxation from his studies – for the soul delights to dwell on stories of old – speak to him, drawing him away from all childish folly; for thou art raising a philosopher and athlete and citizen of Heaven. Speak to him and tell him this story: “Once upon a time there were two sons of one father, even two brothers.” Then after a pause continue: “And they were the children of the same mother, one being the elder, the other the younger son. The elder was a tiller of the ground, the younger a shepherd; and he led out his flocks to woodland and lake.” Make thy stories agreeable that they may give the child pleasure and his soul may not grow weary (Καὶ καταγλύκαινε τὰ διηγήματα, ὥστε τινὰ εἶναι τῷ παιδί καὶ τερπνότητα καὶ μὴ ἀπεκάμψαι αὐτῷ τὴν ψυχήν). “The other son sowed and planted. And it came to pass that both wished to do honor to God. And the shepherd took the firstlings of his flocks and offered them to God.” Is it not a far better thing to relate this than fairy tales about sheep with golden fleeces? Then arouse him — for not a little depends on the telling of the story — introducing nothing that is untrue but only what is related in the Scriptures (Οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἀντὶ τῶν χρυσομάλλων προβάτων καὶ τῆς τερατείας ἐκείνης ταύτα διηγεῖσθαι καλόν; Εἶτα αὐτὸν καὶ διανάστησον— ἔξει γάρ τι καὶ ἡ δίψησις — μηδὲν ψευδές ἐπιφέρων, ἄλλα τά ἀπό τῆς Ἰραφῆς) (transl. Max J. W. Laistner).

“Old wive’s tales” is traditionally a polemical label – to discard opponents’ ideas – but in Graeco-Roman times it also becomes somewhat synonymous with fictional literature. This is especially clear in the Apuleius Roman’s novel, where the most important of the embedded narratives – the tale of Cupid and Psyche – is told precisely by an old woman (Graverini 2009; Tilg 2015). Indeed, the opening lines quoted by John Chrysostom could aptly, if sketchily, summarize the content of erotic narratives. Surely enough they evoke archetypical, traditional – and transcultural – narrative patterns, widespread in folk-tales. Following the Arne-Thompson-Uther Classification of Folk Tales, we are here close to the cluster 850-869 (The Young man marries the Princess), belonging to the category “Realistic Tales”. Not surprisingly, a little later John alludes to the story of Jason, which belongs in the same cluster (854A The golden Ram). Along the same lines, John Chrysostom contrasts these fictions with an equally traditional narrative pattern, the rivalry between brothers. Although Chrysostom is very careful in stressing the simple character of the stories to be told to the young Christian (ἁπλότης, 38), he clearly emphasizes the importance of narrative elaboration when it comes to retaining the attention and stimulating the hearer’s
psychological involvement. A move we find also in more or less contemporary spiritual literature such as Theodoret of Cyrus’ *Historia Religiosa* (cf. Prol. 11, Canivet 144, 22–23 with Rapp 1998, 443).

According to John Chrysostom, biblical narratives are received in the first place as fairy tales and internalized as such, thus replacing the stories of Greek mythology (39):

“What happened next? God received the younger son into Heaven; having died he is up above.” The child also learns the story of raising from the dead. If in pagan legend such marvels are told, one says; “He made the soul the soul of a hero.” And the child believes and, while he does not know what a hero is, he knows that it is something greater than a man. And as soon as he hears, he marvels. Much more will he do so when he hears of raising from the dead and that the younger brother’s soul went up to Heaven (transl. Max J. W. Laistner).

Internalization is achieved through frequent retelling of the same narrative by different relatives (father, mother) and significant persons in the child’s life (nurse, servants etc.). Those are invited to use images and comparisons taken from the young listener’s experience, in order to enhance his/her empathic participation in the tale (39). Finally, John Chrysostom exhorts to turn the listener into a narrator, by having the kid retell the same tale and finally memorize it. Once this goal is achieved, parents can move to the next stage, letting the child hear the story in a different context, belonging to the public and ritual sphere, that is in church. John Chrysostom stresses plainly that the young listener will then be hooked first and foremost by the narrative pleasure, which lies in recognition and anticipation (40):

This is not all. Go, leading him by the hand in church and pay heed particularly when this tale is read aloud. Thou wilt see him rejoice and leap with pleasure because he knows what the other children do not know, as he anticipates the story, recognizes it (Ὄψει γὰρ αὐτὸν γαννύμενον καὶ πηδῶντα καὶ χαίροντα, ὅτι ἀ πάντες ἀγνοοῦσιν οἶδεν αὐτὸς, καὶ προλαμβάνοντα καὶ ἐπιγινώσκοντα), and derives great gain from it. And hereafter the episode is fixed in his memory (transl. Max J. W. Laistner).

Gratification allows for the tale to be remembered and for the holy text to be internalized. Internalization of the moral values, moreover, succeeds through implicit memory, which, at some point ought to be made explicit (40: “And when he has memorized it thou wilt also tell him how it profits him. The soul indeed, as it receives the story within itself before thou hast elaborated it, is aware that it will benefit”). The listener is thus truly and fully “rewired”.

Yet another detail needs to be stressed. The listeners’ enjoyment does not lie in novelty, in the unexpected or in suspense, but in anticipation and recognition. John Chrysostom almost anticipates by some thousand years what Umberto Eco has dubbed as the aesthetics of seriality. In a seminal paper published in 1985, Eco singles out the “pleasure of repetition” as the principal hallmark of post-modern aesthetic, aptly reminding the reader that such a phenomenon is truly post-post-modern in that it revives aptitudes well known from the pre-modern world. According to Eco, the viewer of modern tv-series does not behave much differently from Chrysostom’s young boy:

With a series one believes one is enjoying the novelty of the story (which is always the same) while in fact one is enjoying it because of the recurrence of a narrative scheme that remains constant. The series in this sense responds to the infantile need of hearing again
always the same story, of being consoled by the “return of the Identical,” superficially
disguised. The series consoles us (the consumers) because it rewards our ability to foresee:
we are happy because we discover our own ability to guess what will happen. We are
satisfied because we find again what we had expected, but we do not attribute this happy
result to the obviousness of the narrative structure, but to our own presumed capacities
to make forecasts. We do not think, “The author has constructed the story in a way that
I could guess the end,” but rather, “I was so smart to guess the end in spite of the efforts
the author made to deceive me” (Eco 1985, 168).

Of course the discourse of authorship is excluded from Chrysostom’s exposition, just as the
implicit need for novelty. However, the idea of serialization is very much present in his address.
Indeed, after introducing the young boy to the re-performance of the tale of Cain and Abel in
church, the parents are advised to present him with more stories, following the same “token”, to
borrow Eco’s definition (43):

When this story is firmly planted in the child’s understanding, introduce another, again
about two brothers, and speak thus: “Again there were two brothers, an elder and a
younger. The elder was a hunter, the younger dwelt at home.” Now this story, insofar
as the reversal of fortune is greater (περιπέτεια) and the brothers are older, gives more
pleasure (ἡ δονήν) than the former one (transl. Max J. W. Laistner).

Once again the accent is put on gratification and the use of the Aristotelian term περιπέτεια
(Poetics 1452a) points to the fact that John Chrysostom reads biblical tales from a quintessentially
narrative perspective, using the tools provided by ancient hermeneutics. In fact, περιπέτεια indirectly
introduces the theme of novelty in the guise of unexpected reversal or surprising turn of event.
However, such reversal does not come completely as a surprise: it is more a matter of gradient (it is
greater than in the previous story) and is embedded in an already known pattern. Enjoyment comes
here from a more complex articulation of the core theme of the rivalry between two brothers (Saul
and Jacob in this case), with the recurring theme being somewhat serialized. Such serialization is
again of paramount importance in the process of internalization. Indeed, at some point Chrysostom’s
kid is asked to repeat the story “about the two brothers”. He starts with Cain and Abel, but his father
tells him that he wants to hear the other one, thus stimulating his readiness to remember and to re-
perform the story. As well known, repeated consumption was considered a major requirement with
holy texts or, more broadly, spiritual literature. Repetitive readings enhanced the transformative
power of the texts, as stressed by Rapp (1998). Rapp recalls the story of Abba Zosimas who was very
fond of the Sayings of the desert Fathers and “loved to read them always, and he almost breathed
them” (Zosimae Abbatis Alloquia 10, PG 78, 1693C). Chrysostom’s text shows us that such love
was not determined by the moral content of the stories alone, but also, and in the first place, by a
taste for repetition, by the pleasure of anticipation and recognition. Serialization, moreover, as we
have seen, is strictly connected to ritualization: we have the re-performance of the story in church
through readings of the holy text and, we can assume, homilies. The narrative becomes integral to
the ritual. Psychology of religion has long acknowledged the physiological processes triggered by
rituals and leading to gratification through the production of endorphins (Wulff 1991). As we said,
these processes are similar to what we experience when we enjoy the food we are eating. It comes
therefore as no surprise that narrative consumption and food consumption are often metaphorically
coupled, both in secular and religious texts (Mullett 2002, 139–64; Krueger 2004, 144–46; Pizzone
2016 forthcoming). According to the conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980), this is clearly how language (and its more refined literary modulations) tries to make sense of shared experiences and of the physiological mechanisms underlying them.

When dealing with seriality in post-modern aesthetics, Eco lists five different forms of repetition: the retake, the remake, the series, the saga, intertextual dialogue. Today the first one would rather be labeled as sequel: “In this case one recycles the characters of a previous successful story in order to exploit them, by telling what happened to them after the end of their first adventure (…). The retake is not strictly condemned to repetition” (Eco, 1985, 167). Intriguingly, Chrysostom’s story-telling father also uses this technique to keep his kid hooked (45-46):

When he has told you all, spin the sequel of the yarn, and say: “Hear what occurred afterwards. Once again the elder brother, like the brother in the former story, was minded to slay his brother, and he was awaiting his father’s death.”

To sum up, the notion of “seriality” can help us understand much of the narrative and aesthetic principles underlying Christian and non-Christian narratives in Byzantium. The concept of remake perfectly subsumes the many rewriting of saints’ life characterizing hagiographical production and culminating with Symeon Metaphrastes’ enterprise (Høgel 2002, 2014). On the other hand, the new clear-cut secular fiction produced later in the 12th century is a perfect blend of remake and intertextual dialogue. At the same time, seriality is tightly intertwined with ritualization when it comes to Christian narratives. Both trigger mechanisms of reward and gratification, which are now studied from a scientific point of view but whose effects were very clear also to pre-modern late-antique and Byzantine observers.
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Reading for the Plot in Byzantine Historiography

The banner under which we gather, “Byzantium – a changing narrative”, may of course be read in more than one way, an ambiguity I suspect the organizers of this round table intended for us to exploit. Our own narrative(s) about Byzantium have been subject to significant change in the course of the last thirty years, no small measure of which is owed to our evolving estimate of the nature and quality of the narratives the Byzantines created and consumed. Ingela Nilsson and Roger Scott suggested as much at the last large-scale discussion of Byzantine narrative, now over a decade ago, by noting that a new narrative of Byzantine history might profit from new approaches to Byzantine story-telling (Byzantine Narrative, 2006). Bearing out their estimate, a markedly increased interest in the formal attainments of Byzantine story-telling in recent years has greatly expanded our sense of the one faculty so often denied to Byzantine authors, namely, imagination. If it is a truism that societies discover themselves in their own stories, then Byzantine narrative form should be regarded no less a historical “source” than any other cultural artifact.

While disciplinary efficiency demands that we divide story-telling in Byzantium according to genres, we do well to acknowledge from the start that narrative form itself knew no such boundaries. Among the more significant lessons of modern narrative studies has been the recognition that the grammar and syntax of narrative are shared inside, and perhaps even across, cultures. Stories are always stories before they are about anything. This recognition, that narrative form is a priori to literary content, including historiographic and therefore ostensibly ‘true’ content, has rightly unsettled us from our late modern epistemological complacency. If narrative form itself should be reckoned always in the singular, regardless of genre or content, need that mean that all narrative is alike in its effects? In the case of historiography, does all narrative yield similar knowledge about the past? Long since matured and expanded beyond its origins in modern fiction and Structuralist linguistics, narrative theory is no doubt indispensable to any inquiry about Byzantine narrative. However, we should not simply aim to bring the now formidable apparatus of narrative theory to bear on Byzantine literature, but to consider whether Byzantine story-telling can yield new insights of its own into narrative.

Nowhere has the rehabilitation of narrative in historiography proven quite so promising, and its repercussions at times quite so tendentious, as in the study of pre-modern history. The stakes here are inevitably higher because our reliance on pre-modern historical texts for knowledge of their time is disproportionately greater than for modernity, with its parish records and diaries. But narrative analysis has yielded new understandings not just of what medieval societies believed they knew about their past, but perhaps more significantly, how the credibility and authority of such knowledge derived from its literary form. In short, if you pursue narrative systematically enough, sooner or later you will arrive at the frontier of epistemology: how individuals and societies think they know what they know; which may be the most promising, and for that reason, the most controversial aspect of narratology. For at issue is literature’s rôle in the shaping and perception of reality, as Auerbach rightly suggested in the subtitle to his famous work on Mimesis.
To paraphrase the title of Hayden White's well known collection of essays on historical narrative, how much content of its own does the form of narrative bring to Byzantine historiography? Bearing in mind a textual tradition spanning more than a millennium, whose longevity may be attributed to equal parts conservatism and adaptive innovation, it would appear implausible that we should not meet with significant variation in narrative form and, by extension, alternate conceptions of the past itself. And yet Byzantine historiography has been repeatedly treated as a single tradition, whose various texts contribute to a single stream of knowledge about the past. Nowhere is this quite so conspicuous as in the treatment of Byzantine universal chronicles, possibly the most enduring, and certainly the most widely circulated, form of medieval Greek historiography. Notorious for the economy of its storytelling, occasionally even frustrating the very desire for story it arouses, as both Roger Scott and Iakov Ljubarskij have noted (Scott, “Byzantine Chronicles,” 2009; Ljubarskij, “Theophanes’ Literary Technique,” 1995), the Byzantine universal chronicle may nevertheless prove an ideal testing ground for the still untried lessons of medieval Greek narrative form.

Ever since Hans Georg Beck’s landmark refutation of the monastic authorship of most chronicles (Beck, “Zur byzantinischen Mönchschronik”, 1965) the once categorical distinction between chronicles and what used to be regarded as history proper, sometimes revealingly characterized as ‘literary’ or ‘narrative’ history, and more recently as ‘classicizing’ history, has eroded to the point where no scholar seems willing to defend the idea of chronicles as an independent genre of historiography. Beck’s demonstration that authorship cannot serve to partition off chronicles exposed the latent formalist or aesthetic prejudices in the way Byzantine historical works were classified, with chronicles supposedly compiled by inferior minds. No longer able to sustain the syllogism “the chronicle is simple and uncritical, so its author must be as well,” universal chronicles are now routinely treated as part of a single, continuous historical genre, along with the remaining works of Byzantine historiography, as Karpizilos and Treadgold have done most recently in their magisterially comprehensive inventories.

If after the (now largely abandoned) social scientific experiments in non-narrative historiography, we agree that all history is necessarily narrative in form (making the pairing ‘narrative history’ redundant), then as a historical text the Byzantine chronicle, too, must be narrative in conception and not simply contain narratives. But no genre of Byzantine literature at once invites and resists narrative analysis like the universal chronicle. To maintain its narrative character, therefore, it is not enough to point to the individual stories interspersed within entries, like the story of Theodosius II’s gift of an apple to his wife Eudokia reported by Malalas (cf., R. Scott, “From propaganda to history to literature: the Byzantine stories of Theodosius’ apple and Marcian’s eagles,” 1985). Often read by scholars as telling anecdotes or moral allegories, such self-contained narratives do not warrant designating the whole of the chronicle a narrative form; more importantly, such analysis rarely touches on the genre’s conception of the past qua history. What is there to distinguish the universal chronicle from a treasury of historical anecdotes and discontinuous historical incidents besides the formal concatenation of chronological progression?

Paraphrasing Roland Barthes slightly, we may say that the universal chronicle represents the unfolding of history as consécution et non pas conséquence. Chronicle strongly implies that all events have an equal share in the order of meaning. That is why the chronicle is capable of accommodating any event, no matter how “trivial,” to employ Herbert Hunger’s disputed characterization of chronicles as Trivialliteratur. Chronicles can appear undiscriminating in their inclusion of events
because the events seem to bear no immediate or obvious relation to one another, such as narrative might require. A narrative without unity, however, risks becoming so diffuse as to cancel itself out. The story of all things at once, E. M. Forster observed, verges on the elimination of history.

Since Aristotle, who may have been the first to theorize narrative, it has been argued that placing events in the order of their occurrence is not enough to create an order of meaning. Narrative theory holds that such meaning requires a 'plot' (Aristotle's μῦθος), a controlling idea which may reveal the latent sequential logic of the events depicted. So firmly established is this idea that a plot-less narrative now seems an extended oxymoron. Without plot to enable what Louis Mink, in a seminal and brilliantly concise article on narrative as a cognitive faculty, calls the 'configurational act', the process by which serial events are 'grasped together' as part of a continuous whole, the merely episodic would rend the narrative apart. Thanks to the selfsame narrative theory, however, we are also no longer subject to the illusion of an organic sequence in the events of the past. Narrative form, we insist, does not inhere in the events it recounts, it is not a mimetic instrument or reproductive mirror subject to “distortion” (pace Mango), but a heuristic instrument, a means of interpreting the world. What, then, prevents the universal chronicle from being little more than a serial compilation of events? In other words, what is the plot of the universal chronicle which allows it to function as a narrative?

One way to answer the question is to compare universal chronicles to so-called ‘classicizing’ histories whose narrative credentials are beyond doubt. The first thing we may note are the strikingly incommensurate proportions of narrative text to story time. Where the chronicler recounts events from creation down to his own time (e.g., Malalas: Creation to 563; Theophanes/Synkellos: Creation to 813; George the Monk: Creation to 842; Kedrenos: Creation to 1057; Zonaras: Creation to 1118), the classicizing Byzantine historian narrates no more than a century (e.g., Nicetas Choniates: 1118 to 1207) sometimes even less (.e.g., Anna Komnene: 1069 to 1118; Pachymeres, 1261/1255 to 1308). This illustrates well the elastic relations between Time and narrative, neither of which, it turns out, is a finite or fixed quantity. As Paul Ricoeur observes in his monumental study of the dialectic between Time and narrative (Temps et récit, 1983-1985), narrative is the means we possess in language to give shape to formless Time. Historiography, and the universal chronicle more specifically in the case of Byzantium, assumes a special rôle in this regard as a literature charged with reckoning Time as history. Indeed chroniclers often seem to have regarded the particulars of any event as secondary to their place in Time. (cf. J. Beaucamp et al., « Le prologue de la Chronique pascale,” Travaux et Mémoirs 7, 1979). Eusebius’ chronographic tables, often cited as a formative precedent for the universal chronicle, set the example by employing a regnal year structure which records every year since the birth of Abraham, even those without recorded historical events.

Might this be why the chronicle, uniquely among narratives, is able to subsume its predecessors, and to be subsumed in turn by its successors, without seriously distorting the narrative structure or historiographic aim of the work? Thus Theophanes could pick up where Synkellos left off (prompting endless debate about how much Theophanes himself wrote and the relevant meanings of ἀφορμή), while George the Monk and Zonaras extended the historical timeline of existing chronicles without violating their existing structure. Can we imagine any author having taken up and extended the story of Anna Komnene’s Alexias or Eustathios’ History of the Conquest of Thessalonike without transforming the work? Neither history could have had a ‘continuator’, except in the nominal sense of historians who chose to narrate events from where their histories ended; in effect, however, telling a new and different story. Even Nicetas Choniates, who sets his narrative in the period
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after Anna’s *Alexias*, can nevertheless include the year of Thessalonike’s conquest described by Eustathios without being preempted by the latter’s account. Anna, Eustathios, and Nicetas do not narrate different periods so much as they tell different stories, built around different themes or plots. We may debate exactly what these themes or plots are, but not their necessity for setting narrative boundaries to their histories and supplying the means for the much touted ‘narrative closure’ (regardless of whether such closure was actually achieved). The universal chronicle, too, has boundaries, of course, but they are coterminous with Time and thus with all History. In this respect, the universal chronicle may be the only form of historiography which does not conform to Paul Ricoeur’s incisive and counter-intuitive observation that Time in historiography actually unfolds backwards, since the chronicler cannot bring his account into ‘retroactive re-alignment’ (to use Arthur Danto’s term) with the end of a story whose outcome he cannot know, except in the most general sense of history’s culmination in resurrection (Danto’s, *Narration and Knowledge*, 1985). The chronicle thus unfolds in a perpetual *medias res* of Time.

We might say that the chronicler’s view is not all that different from Fernand Braudel’s historiographic rationale for preferring to chart the *longue durée* of Mediterranean history, namely, that what really matters in history can only be discerned over the long course of time; in the chronicler’s case, the *whole* of Time. We thus find the author of an anonymous thirteenth-century universal chronicle preserved in *Marc. gr. 407* (ascribed by its editor to Theodoros Skoutariotes), explaining his decision to compose a universal chronicle instead of what we might call ‘classizing history’, by noting that while the latter may devote an entire book to a single imperial reign, a chronicle offers “a synoptic perspective on the multitude of events, uniting the accounts found in many histories into one, setting before itself a single objective: how each emperor governed and tended to his flock, either in piety, that is to say, with justice, or how each strayed from the correct path and neglected justice.” Like any author of a universal chronicle, the collator of the “Synopsis Chronikê” in *Marc. gr. 407* assumes his diachronic profile of rule and misrule of the empire to derive its full significance by being inserted into an enduring, providential scheme stretching back to Adam. This is harder to appreciate when modern scholarship dwells almost exclusively on the latter, contemporary instalments of chronicles (e.g., Theophanes on the period of Iconoclasm; Zonaras on the reign of Alexios I), dismissing the earlier periods as either legendary (biblical history) or more reliably narrated elsewhere (ancient Greek and Roman history). But if universal chronicles are “extended narratives”, as Roger Scott has correctly argued, in my view, then the events at the far end of the narrative would have been understood as being of a piece or following from those at its beginning; a fact borne out by the genre’s insistence on recapitulating all historical time by beginning with Creation. If we conclude with Scott that universal chronicles are indeed extended narratives, what then was the plot holding them together which could accommodate so long and as yet *incomplete* a narrative arc?

In what may be his most widely circulated essay, “The value of narrativity in the representation of reality,” (*Critical Inquiry*, 1980; repr. in *The Content of the Form*, 1987), Hayden White cited the strikingly laconic western medieval annals in a bid to illustrate by their extreme verbal economy that *all* historiography, even the seemingly primitive and rhetorically unsophisticated annalistic tradition is perforce narrative in conception and therefore demands or projects a plot. Against the view of the annals as still unformed historiography, White suggested that the severely abridged narrative entries of annals (and to a proportionate degree, of chronicles) “are products of possible
conceptions of historical reality, conceptions that are alternatives to, rather than failed anticipations of, the fully realized historical discourse” that we associate with culturally mature historical writing. If we proceed from White’s hypothesis, we must then account for such an alternate conception of reality embodied in historiographic narratives alien to our current conception of history.

One possible solution may come from the study of narrative form. Once regarded a strictly and narrowly ‘literary’ subject, more appropriate to the study of fiction than history, narrative theory has made dramatic inroads in nearly every branch of learning. As a consequence, it has evolved from a largely belletristic or aesthetic preoccupation of literary critics to a fundamental conceptual mode. Increasingly we speak of narrative as playing a formative role in structures of value and, perhaps most radically, in structures of cognition, which may ultimately put it beyond the exclusive reach of the humanities and find us seated at future round tables with colleagues in cognitive psychology and the neurosciences. Narrative increasingly seems innate to human understanding as the only form of discourse suitable to the experience (or “phenomenology”) of time.

As the genre charged with keeping its society’s record of the passage of time, the Byzantine universal chronicle holds out the promise of an alternate view of history. We treat chronicles and classicizing forms of historiography as complementary historical sources, and indeed for the historian wishing to reconstruct events, they may serve such a purpose. But we should not confuse our use of the chronicles with their historical function. Byzantine chronicles invariably produced knowledge of a different order from those of the classicizing historian, and not just alternate accounts of the same events. So while we may appreciate Scott’s juxtaposition of Malalas and Prokopios in order to gauge the actual and possibly evolving priorities of Justinian’s reign (Scott, “Chronicles vs. Classicizing History,” 2012), I would caution against assuming that Byzantine audiences sought alternate accounts of the same past in the two kinds of history. Classicizing historiography, with its narrative amplitude, was not intended to rival chronicles, or vice versa. If classicizing history offered an account, and possibly an explanation, of the changes experienced over a (relatively) brief period, the universal chronicle may be read as challenging the premise of historiography as a narrative principally of change. The exasperating discontinuity of the chronicle’s instalments, its seeming refusal to satisfy our desire for narrative continuity, stretching narrative time out instead of dilating it, spoke to different needs and anxieties, producing distinct forms of knowledge about the past along with a distinct notion of its relevance to the present and future.

Writing of our need for plot in narrative, Peter Brooks points to “the motor forces that drive the text forward, of the desires that connect narrative ends and beginnings, and make of the textual middle a highly charged field.” Unable to perceive Time in any way other than narrative, we are perhaps bound to look for “that which makes a plot move forward,” and makes us read the past forward, seeking in the unfolding of narrative “a line of intention and portent of design that hold the promise of progress toward meaning.” (Brooks, Reading for the Plot, 1985).
The common narrative universe of the Metaphrastic Menologion and the story of Barlaam and Ioasaph

Telling a riddle easily raises expectations that a solution will be given at the end. This paper addresses a riddle, which has kept philologists busy for decades, and it hopes to bring things further ahead, but unfortunately cannot quite finally solve the issue. The riddle concerns the interconnection between two central Byzantine texts/collections of texts – the Life of Barlaam and Ioasaph and the Metaphrastic Menologion. The connection between the two text bodies caught the attention of editors and scholars already in the nineteenth century, and with the recent work of especially Robert Volk, a much clearer image of the full interdependence of the two is now evident to the scholarly world. Yet, the exact background to the many verbal echoes between the two has still not been found.

The interest in this matter should engage us, for the Barlaam story and the Metaphrastic collection are among the most copied (and supposedly most read) texts in Byzantium. Volk’s new edition of the Life of Barlaam and Ioasaph lists 158 extant manuscripts and fragments. According to Albert Ehrhard, the transmitted manuscripts and fragments that are exemplars of a volume from the ten-volume Metaphrastic collection run up into more than 700. These were texts to be found in many places in the reading world of Byzantium, and even if they share a common hagiographical nature and dates of composition close in time, it is still surprising that they should also be interconnected. Both text bodies were – it now seems safe to confirm – produced at the end of the tenth century (the Barlaam possibly a bit later), and both had a peak of popularity in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Furthermore, both show clear signs of introducing a more romancing, perhaps even psychologizing, mode of narrative into Byzantine hagiography (on this, see Messis in Efthymiadis 2014). The Barlaam story – originally a life of Buddha that through a sequence of translations reached Byzantium from India – is the story of a slow conversion, the conversion of the young prince who is at first not allowed to see the evils of the world, because his father fears a prophecy saying that his son will then convert to some unwished faith. The conversion nevertheless takes place as the prince is first introduced to the bodily decay of individuals and is then – to put his worries to rest – allowed a teacher, who leads him to a true understanding of the world. All through the narrative, the story is furthermore enriched with inserted tales that reflect upon themes arising in the story, yet with their own life and dimensions. Similarly, the Metaphrastic menologion gave the Byzantine world a menologion (a liturgical hagiographical collection) of 148 hagiographical texts that in most cases presented readers and listeners with more refined versions of well-known stories. As the result of a massive redaction of more than a hundred older hagiographical texts, and with the additional inclusion of some unaltered lives, a general rhetoricizing of the hagiographical narrative mode was thus introduced, in many cases through the stressing central dramatic scenes and imagery. And both Euthymios the Iberian/Athonite, the Georgian translator of the Barlaam story into Greek, and Symeon Metaphrastes, the logothetes tou dromou, to whom the rewriting of the Metaphrastic collection is ascribed, clearly had solid rhetorical training behind them.
So if these two texts/text bodies are closely interrelated, as scholars have shown, it means that new narrative modes somehow arose through the meeting of an originally Indian text with a traditional corpus of late antique hagiography, replenished with some newer texts (though the Metaphrastic menologion contains surprisingly few texts on near-contemporary saints; see Hogel 2002a). But which came first? Which text(s) influenced the other? Or are there – given the close correspondence in the times of composition – more direct modes of interchange at work here? Could e.g. Euthymios, Symeon, or somebody close to them have been involved in both processes?

Common to both translation/rewriting processes are the romancing and the rhetoricization, but also the existence of several versions, a fact that has complicated discussions of the matter. The new edition of the Greek Barlaam story by Volk operates with two main versions, which he labels the families A and C (family B being an abridged version). Manuscripts from family A form the backbone of the edition, but as Volk himself acknowledges in his introduction to the edition, the C version is actually the older and more original translation from the hand of Euthymios the Iberian/Athonite (and Volk lays to rest all earlier discussions about John of Damascus as a possible translator/author of the Greek Barlaam, pace Dölger and Kazhdan). The C version was produced prior to 1021 CE, which is the year of production of the earliest manuscript from the A family. Both families, however, fall within the productive years of Euthymios, going from roughly 975 till his death in 1028. The extant manuscripts of the Metaphrastic menologion seem also to fall in two versions (see Hogel 2002b), a fact that will also affect us here. The activities of Symeon Metaphrastes are indicated in Georgian and Arabic sources to have reached some sort of attention in 982 CE. In this way, the probable years of production for the texts/collection of texts overlap, and from this dating it is impossible to say which is the earlier.

Now the real problem for judging the central contributions of Volk to the discussion of the interdependence between the Greek Barlaam version and the Metaphrastic menologion (acknowledging his contributions in giving us the true date and identity of the Barlaam translator, in demonstrating the C version’s priority, and in establishing the many verbal parallels between the Barlaam story and the Metaphrastic texts) is that his demonstration of the interdependence between the two texts dates back to the time when he still believed that the family A was the original version, and on the assumption that Symeon Metaphrastes was the one who had extensively reused passages from the Barlaam story to embellish scenes and descriptions in the new Metaphrastic versions of various old saints’ lives (Volk 1997 & 2003). As demonstrated by Grossmann, the reemployment goes the other way (Grossmann 2009). It is the Barlaam story that somehow reuses short and long passages from Metaphrastic lives. Grossmann publishes the demonstration of this (based on careful comparisons of text versions) in 2009, the same year that sees the publication of Volk’s introduction (Volk 2009). Both Grossmann and Volk seem most interested in how this may further narrow down the dating of the Barlaam, and less in the issue of the mutual interdependence itself and its importance for questions of working methods. One reason for this may be that the collected observations point towards a very complicated and seemingly rather muddled outcome. Concerning the interdependence, Volk’s original observations were that a substantial number of the Metaphrastic texts – 46 out of the 148 – have shorter or longer, in some cases extensive, passages in common with the Barlaam story, whereas 72 Metaphrastic texts show absolutely no correspondences. A further 30 Metaphrastic texts have vague and doubtful echoes. In a sense, one could therefore just suppose that – in accordance with Grossmann’s observations – Euthymios made substantial reuse
of Metaphrastic passages for his Barlaam translation. But least three aspects complicate this simple solution. First, the number and depth of the correspondences are in themselves surprising. Long, contemporary, almost verbal quotations linking one text with 46 others from one and the same collection would in many instances make us suspect a direct connection (same persons involved, texts coming out of the same scriptoria, etc.). Secondly, many of the passages that are refound in the Barlaam story are exactly the new passages that the Metaphrastic process added to the old texts. Why would Euthymios single out just these for reuse? The idea that led Volk to draw the conclusion that loans went the other way was exactly that these concerned new passages in the Metaphrastic texts (though reuse is also made from texts that entered unaltered into the Metaphrastic collection; their appearance in Volk’s list is in fact an oddity, since these lives were not really metaphrased).

A third point to complicate the question of the interrelation between the Barlaam text and the Metaphrastic menologion is that, given the high frequency of texts that Euthymios drew from, these seem to be surprisingly evenly distributed through the Metaphrastic collection, apart from among the first twelve texts. In the Metaphrastic menologion – as in all menologia – texts come in the order of the saints’ feast days, starting with 1st of September and running through the year until 31st of August. None of the texts from 1st till 13th of September was used by Euthymios, whereas, throughout the rest of the church year, texts with correspondences come very regularly intermingled with texts with no correspondences. Only in one instance are there five texts with no parallels in a row. The reason to highlight this is that there is good reason to believe that the process of rewriting/metaphrasing was done progressively through the church year, beginning in September and – possibly – coming to a halt before reaching actual completion (see Høgel 2002a).

The observation about even distribution could be taken as a mere product of chance, but taken in conjunction with the other observations all this adds up to a possible deep interconnection also on a personal level. A suggestion, which could hopefully be substantiated through further studies, is that Euthymios was simply part of the Metaphrastic team, that it was the training that he acquired through taking part in metaphrasing as part of the team of Symeon Metaphrastes that enabled him to translate the Barlaam story into high-style Greek. Despite much work on the Metaphrastic menologion, it has hitherto been difficult to find features that cut across all the many texts and thereby to reveal the ‘style’ of Symeon Metaphrastes. The findings of Volk are in fact among the most consistent features that can be pointed out across the menologion, namely that all these texts share expressions and passages with the Barlaam text. That they seem to form a pattern of being almost every other text in the sequence of Metaphrastic texts suggests that there were perhaps two teams engaged in the Metaphrastic process, one including Euthymios. Either during this time or soon after, Euthymios would have decided to have a go at the Barlaam text. Drawing from the rich material of new (and old) phrases and vocabulary employed to enrich old hagiographical texts, he would reuse much of this to turn the Barlaam story from his native Georgian into a proper Byzantine text, as Byzantine as the Metaphrastic menologion.

Even if this reconstruction model is not accepted, the many coincidences do not stop with the above-mentioned. In an autograph manuscript dated to the year 990, Euthymios announces in his own hand that he here offers the Georgian translation of the Life of George. As discussed by Volk, two different versions of a life of George appear in the Metaphrastic collection, a fact that confirms the observation that there seems to have been two “editions” of the Metaphrastic menologion (evident not least at the end of the tenth book, see Høgel 2002b). Volk demonstrated
that the version Euthymios is translating (BHG 677 inc. Ἄρτι τοῦ τῆς εἰδολομανίας νέφους) must be later than the other Metaphrastic version (BHG 676 inc. Διοκλητιανός ὁ Ῥωμαίων αὐτοκράτωρ). This means that Euthymios could already in 990 be translating what turns out to be the "second edition" of the Metaphrastic menologion. If it is true that Symeon lost favour at court (as suggested by Eprem Mtsire, see Høgel 2002a) and that the production of the Metaphrastic menologion came to a halt not long after 982, then the year 990 is very early for a second edition. So, again Euthymios seems to be close to both production and subsequent circulation of the Metaphrastic menologion. And this second edition of the life of George is in fact also among the texts from the Metaphrastic collection that Euthymios drew from in his Barlaam translation (Volk 2003).

Whatever conclusions we can draw from these many and close verbal and chronological links between the Metaphrastic menologion and the translation of the Barlaam text, the strong connections show that both meanings of *metaphrasis* – both ‘rewriting’ and ‘translation’ – were here closely linked. If Euthymios was part of the Metaphrastic team, he would have been a *metaphrastes* in both processes, though with a distinction in the accentuation between μεταφράστης, translator, and μεταφραστής, the usual ‘nick-name’ of Symeon Metaphrastes (see Θωμαδάκης 1953). And the new established process – that it was the Metaphrastic process that hugely enriched the translation of the Greek version of the Barlaam story – further underscores the literary importance of this major textual transformation in Byzantium.
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Images and Narrative: a Reading of the Joshua Roll

The tenth-century ten-meter long parchment scroll known as the Joshua Roll has been the source of wonder and puzzlement to scholars for generations. While Weitzman argued for its being a product of the Macedonian Renaissance, and as such placed it within the enterprises loosely connected with the “encyclopedic” interests of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (913-959), more recent studies have emphasized its practical role in perhaps being nothing more (or less) than a set of preparatory drawings for the execution of a triumphal column, similar to those celebrating triumphs in ancient Rome, to be connected (as had been previously also suggested) with the exploits of the Emperor Nikephoros Phokas (emp. 963-969) in the East, and immortalize his success both historically and symbolically by identifying it with the exploits of the biblical Joshua.

In this paper, I would like to bring the attention back onto the scroll itself, which Steven Wander did much to present in detail by transcribing and connecting the textual passages, written in an elegant distinctive uncial, with the drawings (whether or not originally colored) of the chosen scenes. I will take this biblical illuminated manuscript as a particular example of how narrative is made significant through display and presentation in images – the scroll format being the closest one can get to an ancient motion-picture, the sequence of narrative images being a subtitled short-hand for a whole understanding and arrangement of the faith, including in its presentation of the legitimation of images themselves. In fact, I would like to explore how the power of narrative underlies the defense of images, how it acts as an ordering principle for knowledge and as a tool for understanding, not only by providing a memorable sequence but also by offering intertextual connections to a web of significances which delineate a specific intellectual stance – in the case of the Joshua Roll, using Old Testament narrative to argue for an iconodule case. For an image is a still composition, a frozen moment, but in the understanding of the beholder it is not just a moment, a partial instance hanging loose and therefore meaningless; rather, through the power of ekphrasis, it comes to life by means of interconnected associations and, stretching beyond itself, it becomes part of a larger narrative.

A key moment in the story of Joshua is depicted in the sequence of the Joshua Roll. Joshua’s first defeat at Ai, despite the favour he had received from God, is caused by a sin that he needs to recognize and reject, before the tide can turn again in his favour. We can here follow the images and the narrative, before we set out to propose its possible larger resonances:

1. Joshua 7, 5: The defeat

“And the men of Ai killed 36 men, and they chased them down from the gate of Ai and they crushed them as far as the downhill.”

The image shows the routing of the Israelites, their victims and catastrophic retreat. Wander notes the tyche of the city with her cornucopia as a place-marker, though in this case without a legend identifying her (but the men of Ai (Gai) are labelled). He also emphasizes how the poses stress the steep downhill of the verse.
2. Joshua 7,6: Joshua's repentance

“And Joshua tore his clothes and he fell on his face upon the earth before Lord till evening, he and the elders of Israel. And they threw soil on their heads.”

Joshua 7, 10-11: Lord’s answer

“And the Lord said to Joshua: Stand up. Why have you fallen on your face? The people sinned and disobeyed my covenant which I made with them: and stealing from the devoted offering, they have added to their baggage.”

Note that Lord’s speech is placed close to heaven, above the following verses, thus inverting the expected narrative sequence that is adapted to the speaker’s position rather than fixed in a rigid and expected movement from top to bottom. Thus the words act more like captions in a cartoon (i.e. as a speech bubble) than as a text illustrated by drawings. Wander also notes that, unlike many symmetrical and balanced compositions of this scene in Octateuchs or ivories, “on the Joshua Roll the narrative moves deliberately to the right. The individual compositions are decidedly one-sided with the far edge more open”. This forward movement impresses a narrative force stressing action and progress in the story above the individual scenes.

3. Joshua 7, 19: Achan’s confession (ἐξομολόγησιν)

And Joshua said to Achar [form of Achan in LXX and in the legend here]: “Give glory today to Lord, the God of Israel, and give your full confession and report to me what you did or did not conceal from me”. And Achar answered and said to him: “Truly I sinned before Lord, the God of Israel”.

The typology of Achan’s sin was discussed in the commentaries on Scriptures by the church fathers. Its exemplary value is evident in these texts, which see comparable sacrilege in the actions of Christians who mix old customs with the requirements of the new religion. An important, near-contemporary commentary to the Book of Joshua was written by Claudius, bishop of Turin (fl. 812-827), who was an influential preacher and exegete at the court of Louis the Pious, Charlemagne’s successor, and contributed a peculiarly extreme iconoclast position in the West, which earned him the theological attacks of some of his Latin contemporaries. In his Commentary on Joshua, edited for the first time by Bouhol in 2002, Claudius does not cover all the passages of this book, but, among his selection, we find the passage just discussed through the Roll’s illustrations. Claudius gathers the received interpretations, offering that of Origen through Rufinus’ translation, which discusses Achan’s offense in terms of the following comparison:

Sont pareils à Acan ceux qui, tout en se disant chrétiens, continuent de célébrer les fêtes païennes ou de se livrer à des pratiques superstitieuses (comme l’astrologie ou la divination): [en cette manière], ils introduisent dans la sainte Eglise l’anathème idolâtre, [ils] souillent le camp du Seigneur et provoquent la défaite du peuple de Dieu. [They are similar to Achan those who, although they claim to be Christian, continue to celebrate pagan festivals and practice superstition (such as astrology and divination): by doing so, they bring into the church the idolatrous anathema, and pollute the place of the Lord and cause the defeat of the people of God].

So far, so good. We are reminded of Peter Brown’s essay, “Images as a substitute for writing”, which locates somewhere in the late sixth century the watershed between a condescending attitude
to superstition, seeing in images the presence of the divine (\textit{praesentia}), and a leap to more rational habits, where representation is mainly considered a function of communication (\textit{pictura}), free from ominous implications.

Claudius takes this pictorial turn, by adding his own iconoclastic interpretation to Achan’s curse:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Et illi enim qui insensatas imaginés sub nomine sanctorum venerantur, et colunt muta simulacra, anathema de Hiericho in aeclesia introducunt, et polluunt loca et castra sanctorum.} (Claudius, \textit{I.}, 38, 15-18)
\end{quote}

[De fait, ceux-là aussi qui vénèrent, sous le nom de saints, des images insensibles, et qui rendent un culte à des simulacres muets, ces gens-là introduisent dans l’Église l’anathème venu de Jéricho et souillent les lieux et le camp des saints. / But those who venerate empty images with the name of saints, and pay homage to dumb shadows, bring into the church the anathema from Jericho, and pollute the places and the fortresses of the saints. (cf. Rev. 20:8)

One could of course explain away Claudius’s iconoclast attitude here as the reaction of a refined intellectual who, having come down from the pure North of the post-Carolingian court, meets with the barbarian (or proto-Christian) habits of the provincial South (apparently we should think of Turin as a border-town where Claudius had been sent to represent the strong imperial hand). And of course one can easily parallel Claudius’s episcopal stance as the purger from superstition to that of his colleague at Marseilles, Serenus, made famous as the recipient of Pope Gregory the Great’s reprimand concerning his destruction of images. But the fact is that Claudius did not have such an immediate papal reprimand, perhaps also because debates about images had developed in a more refined manner, sharpened by Byzantine iconoclasm and the reaction of the \textit{Libri Carolini}, which, according to modern interpreters (cf. Noble), offered a \textit{via media} between the icon-freaks such as popes and Byzantine monks, and the hard-liners, such as Claudius and Byzantine emperors.

Here I would like to stress how this debated question of representation goes by way of illustrated narratives, or narrative illustration, best seen in examples from manuscripts, such as the Joshua Roll, but obviously also connected to similar such narrative cycles in monumental painting, the \textit{pictura} in the churches that Pope Gregory was referring to as an aid to instruction, as the “book of the illiterate”. Reading narrative cycles was his epistemological innovation: whether truly narrative or symbolic (such as the processions of male and female saints on the walls of Sant’Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna), it is clear that from an image – any image – one can extrapolate a story, and all the more from a narrative sequence – such as the stories of the New and Old Testaments in the nave of Santa Maria Maggiore, or images drawn from saint’s Lives, such as Martin of Tours – one can build knowledge and a foundation for the faith.

In fact, we have concrete evidence that the representation of the Joshua narrative was part of the Late Antique repertoire of images because Paulinus of Nola (4\textsuperscript{th} c.) celebrates this visual representation from his church at Cimitile, in poem 27:

par. 551: “Now I want you to look at the paintings along the portico, with which it is adorned in extended line. Crane your neck a little till you take in everything with face tilted back. The man who looks at these and acknowledges the truth within these empty figures nurtures his believing
mind with representations by no means empty. The paintings in fact depict in the order prescribed by faith all that aged Moses wrote in his five books. Then there are the deeds of Joshua, who was marked out with Christ's name; under his guidance the Jordan kept its stream stationary and its waters still as it is recoiled from the countenance of the divine Ark. An unknown force divided the river, a part stopped because of the water having flowed back and a part of the river, gliding on, rushed seawards and left the bed dry, and at the side where the river with powerful current poured forth from its source, it had held fast and piled high the waves and as a quivering mass a water mountain hung menacing, seeing beneath it that feet were crossing a dry bottom and that in the middle of the river-bed dusty human soles were speeding over hard mud without the feet getting wet (Josh. 3). [ekphrasis of the scene]


Not only the scene, which you can see also in the epic picture of the Joshua Roll, was represented at Nola; it was also immortalized and animated in Paulinus's verses, which are in turn embedded in one of the key texts about the justification for images which is quoted again at the time of the ninth-century debates. Note the use of the phrase “empty figures” in both Paulinus and Claudius. How can the relationship between viewer and image not be “empty” or vain? What determines its worthwhile content, what gives it a respectable and acceptable purpose, a value to justify the effort (and expense) of making pictures and the activity of looking at them (in sometimes uncomfortable positions, while “craning one's neck”)? One of the points Paulinus makes in the continuation of Poem 27 is that pictures are a form of entertainment that leads into deeper mysteries, a sweetening of the pill of religion for those who approach it from the outside and are quickened by worldly feelings. It is a sensuous path that involves different perceptions, appealing to a pre-existent sensibility, yet at the same time offering a programme that can order that new knowledge into a structure: a structure offered by a narrative sequence – a story –, but set, scene by scene, in an architecture, broken piecemeal for better consumption and retention by a large and diversified audience. This tool for catechetical outreach could not be easily given up.

In looking at the standard model for medieval learning as explained in the Rhetorica ad Herennium, but already outlined in the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, the mind works like a wax tablet whereupon imprints are left in the form of images that store up to constitute our memories. In this model, visual apprehension, and even the transformation of words heard or seen into images – at times, in the form of scenes or vignettes – are the key not only to learning, but to making available the very matter for thinking anything anew, where any novelty is based on a solid store of things. Mnemonic exercises that are advised in these treatises contemplate ordering one's material for learning by heart by setting it neatly against architectural backgrounds, distinguishing each space (precisely measured) through characteristic features and specific numbers, so that the mind can find its way to retrieving the stored information in an ordered fashion. One can easily see how these instructions apply to a set programme of Church decoration, or even, in the case of manuscripts, to the Eusebian canon tables, where the parallel Gospel passages are set within niches formed by arches, each made distinctive through different colours and decoration. It is also relevant to remark, in this context, how subtracting the use of images from this concept of learning is tantamount to negating the process of visualisation required for building up knowledge, given that vision, though occurring mentally, is never entirely abstract, but feeds and builds on experience.
Returning to the epic exploits of Joshua, who, for the Christians, was from his very name a type of Christ (Jesu/Joshua), we can now see how the pictorial narrative of the Joshua Roll strongly affirms this mode of apprehension. By juxtaposing selected biblical passages with striking characters, it underlines Paulinus’s requirement for *pictura* as mediation between ideas/beliefs and human understanding: these images are not empty, just as the Ark of the Covenant that is carried across the Jordan is not a vain simulacrum, but a powerful symbol of God’s presence among his people.

The Book of Joshua was the sixth book of the Hebrew Bible, creating a unit with the first five books of the Mosaic Law in the so-called “Hexateuch”. I would like to suggest that the unusual scroll format, as well as its strikingly illustrated narrative, giving unusual preeminence to the figures over the written word, were purposefully designed as a statement supporting the iconodule position of orthodox Christianity both in continuity with and in contrast to the Jewish Law, which was always written on parchment scrolls, and never – well, almost never – illustrated. The choice of the Book of Joshua to be presented in this elegant format was not only appropriate in terms of epic narrative and content, but also perfectly contextualized as the extension of Jewish law into Christianity and as an emblem in the debates concerning Christian narrative representation from early Christian times (at Nola).

But perhaps the scroll format was not as unusual as we might think. There are, for example, many depictions of the scroll-codices in the vignettes of a famous contemporary Psalter, the Utrecht Psalter, an intensely illustrated manuscript (pen-drawn, like the Joshua Roll) of the mid-ninth century also produced (probably) around the Carolingian court. Despite their flimsy looks – like thin scarves blown by the wind – these scrolls are not only those of the Law handed from heaven to Moses (f. 14r), but also the very proofs for doctrinal debates concerning the orthodoxy of the faith (f. 90v: illustration to De Fide Catholica, see http://objects.library.uu.nl/reader/index.php?obj=1874-
284427&lan=en&ga=1.124719882.1858299263.1460708854&page//10/92/109257965995273399149500140480579777361.jpg/mode/1up). Could we imagine the ponderous scroll now in the Vatican Library, with its pen-drawn images of Joshua’s story, acting as a proof text in favour of biblical illustrated narratives in one such conciliar context?

In conclusion, the relationship between narrative, illustration and books is closely connected to theories of learning and especially memorization in the medieval world. Separating out one component in this, or forbidding another, would entail the end of a complex epistemological construct wherein faith and culture can be transmitted and elaborated across generations.
The Eternal Byzantine: Islamic Historiography and the non-Muslim Other

Two particular features of the current “Islamic State” in Syria and Iraq ought to have caught the attention of Byzantinists, even if I am unsure whether that is the case.

The first is the flag. The flag of the “Islamic State” features two things: the Islamic shahhada or creed, and the alleged “seal of the prophet”. The seal can be found, in various forms, on a number of modern forgeries that purport to be letters sent by the prophet Muhammad at an early stage of his mission to all the rulers in the world. The Byzantine emperor Heraclius is one – if not the – main protagonist in this story, whose legitimising importance to the early Caliphate seems to be confirmed by the Umayyad frescoes in Qasr ‘Amra.

A second feature of the “Islamic State” that has a Byzantine background is the name of its monthly magazine, Dabiq. It is named after a Syrian village where early Islamic apocalyptic traditions expected the Byzantines to unleash a Reconquista of the lands that they had lost in the reign of Heraclius:

The Last Hour will not come before the Byzantines land at Āmāq or Dābiq. An army consisting of the best men of Medina will go out to meet them … They will fight, and a third will die fleeing – God will never forgive them – and a third, the best of martyrs for God, will die fighting, and a third, which will not give in, will win victory and conquer Constantinople.

By invoking these narratives, the “Islamic State” seems to use the Byzantines as some sort of Western proxies, and of course we should not expect too much differentiation from adherents of parties that have also banned the eating of croissants on the dubious premise that these were first invented during the 1683 Ottoman siege of Vienna. The “Islamic State” is – which is often forgotten – an apocalyptic movement that believes itself to pave way for the last battle between Jesus and the Antichrist, and apocalyptic movements regularly shoehorn and simplify facts in order to buttress their own arguments. This does not mean, however, that the Byzantine backdrop for the Islamic State can be discarded as a random or purely coincidental phenomenon. There exists – as I hope to show here – an intimate relationship between apocalypticism and historiography: they both try to narrate a meaningful past or future about purportedly real events, and what matters is not so much whether these events belong in the past or the future as how wide or narrow concepts of time they reveal.

First it might be necessary to disregard the narrative and focus on the narration as a phenomenon in itself. It presumes some sort of epistemological context where it is perceived to have a meaning, a “now” that is also conscious about the existence of a past or the future. On a more materialistic note, literary genres like historiography and apocalyptics both seem to indicate the existence of a world that can sustain writing, distribution and reception of texts. They may both strive to overcome time
and space by moving their readers into the past or the future, but in themselves they obliquely still indicate the existence of the realities they try to overcome. In order to move their readers closer to the predicted future apocalypticists regularly resort to the trick of writing themselves into a known past and including ex eventu prophecies of things that are generally accepted to have occurred among the contemporaneous audience for which they write; the historiographer who likes to stress the moral or edifying effect of history may be less dishonest, but he still writes with an imagined future in mind.

The jumble of oral traditions or hadiths from which the main bulk of Islamic historiography and apocalyptics would eventually arise are centered on the person of the prophet Muhammad, what he and his followers did, and what he predicted or they heard him predict would occur. At least for the apocalyptic predictions on the fall of the Roman or Byzantine Empire it is reasonable to assume that they have internalized expectations that circulated during the first century of Islam, when the Umayyads led several expeditions against Constantinople. But it is also worth noting the fragmented nature of the history that can be glimpsed from the hadiths, which are absent of any wider frameworks of interpretation, and whose epistemological context of narration seems to be a community that regards the world to be, if not heading for an immediate end, at least being in a constant state of degeneration. Whereas the scarcity of broad historiographical sources from this period has inspired various revisionist attempts at rewriting the early history of Islam, rather than criticizing an argumentum ex silentio the main anachronism here might be to impose a narrative coherence upon an era whose horizons of time and space were narrow – either because the upheavals of the era created a shaky environment for historiographers, or because expectations in the impending end of the world were running high. The world in these traditions is caught in a terrestrial now verging on the eschatological eternity.

Tarif Khalidi identified the two earliest contenders to hadith historiography as the ’adab, which had educational purposes and emerged in the late Umayyad period, and the hikma that flourished in the early Abbasid era and which integrated the rise and spread of Islam in the history of the civilizations that surrounded and preceded it. In both cases, the horizons of time have expanded forwards as well as backwards, leaving room for a world of terrestrial concerns and mundane points of orientation. In addition to the internal factors that enforced this development – the transformation of the Caliphate into a more conventional rule, the emergence of a civil hierarchy of power, the appropriation of the pre-Islamic heritage of the Middle East – at least one external factor seems decisive for the way in which the Islamic historiographers had to narrate their own history: the prevalence of the Byzantine Empire, which acted as a living contradiction of the apocalypse. All the other empires referred to in the Islamic apocalyptic texts had fallen; only Constantinople had prevailed, and this bestows an interesting dimension to the loss of prestige that the Umayyads seem to have suffered after the failure to capture the city in 717-18. The reluctance with which the expected fall of Constantinople was further pushed into an unspecified future is indicated by the propagandistic efforts of the early Abbasids to depict themselves as conquerors of the Byzantines and the notion of an impending Byzantine Reconquista that was still included in the early tenth-century history of Tabari.

Gradually, the scene changed. The Abbasid campaigns on Byzantine territory abated, and rather than demonizing the Byzantines their polemicists often resorted to deriding them. From a Middle Eastern horizon the religious as well as political significance of the bellicose confrontation
with the “Romans” was eclipsed by the rise of the Fatimids, the Seljuk invasions, the Crusades and eventually the Mongol conquests. In 1378 Ibn Khaldun rather dryly notes that the empire of the Romans lasted until Constantinople fell, probably referring to the 1204 Crusader sack. From now on, narrating Byzantine history from an Islamic viewpoint became intrinsically wound up with the rise of the Turks in general and the Ottomans in particular. And once again, the narrative seems to transgress past and future even to the point where the expected future becomes transfigured by the past it eventually becomes.

First we have the Turkish legends about Arab warriors that fought against the Byzantines. The most persistent case is the one of al-Battal, which lives on in the current Turkish villages Seyitgazi and Battalgazi, the former of which is also the site of his purported tomb and a former Bektashi tekke, founded in the Seljuk period. In the Medieval Turkish legends about al-Battal, Byzantine emperors like Heraclius and Leo III are blended into one person and the Arab warrior actually become his bane, even if the story receives a romantic twist in which al-Battal himself is accidentally killed by the emperor’s enamoured daughter during the 740 siege of Akroinion. Still in the 1970s al-Battal was the protagonist in a number of Turkish movies and played by the popular actor Cüneyt Arkın. These stories of past Arab warriors that tried but failed to conquer the Byzantine Empire seem to find their logical conclusion in the post-1453 Ottoman tombs to Arab warriors that had purportedly died during the Arab sieges in 661 and 717-18: the one in Eyüp dates from an early date after the conquest, the one in Yeralı from the eighteenth century. That the Ottomans put great emphasis on their historical role as the actual conquerors of Constantinople and redeemers of the apocalyptic promise – and in fact united the title “Roman emperors” and “Caliph of Islam” in one person – is a matter extensively studied elsewhere; here it will suffice to note the gradual emergence of Eyüp as the site of the Ottoman “coronation” where all new sultans girded themselves with the sword of their forefather Osman. The latest Turkish movie about the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople, Fetih 1453 (2012) takes the apocalyptic prophecy of Muhammad as its point of departure and thus shows how the significance of the event is embedded in a narrative that goes back to the rise of Islam and ends with the submission of the world.

Two caveats need to be inserted here. The pre-1453 Turkish cult of the Arab warrior does not necessarily relate to a narrative that connects him with the past Arab-Byzantine wars or future conquests of Islam: just like with their Christian counterparts it is important to differ between the eschatological horizon of the Islamic saints and the one of those who preserve their remnants as a source of strength for the living. Al-Battal might have figured – as Marius Canard pointed out more than half a century ago – in legends and perhaps even on icons in Anatolia in the Byzantine era. Similarly, since the conquest of Constantinople did not unleash any eschatological process, the emergence of the tombs at Eyüp and Yeralı and their incorporation in an Ottoman legitimising narrative and ceremonial rather indicates the transformation of the apocalyptic future into a sacred past. In a sense, one could perhaps even say that you are what you eat: by appropriating the terrestrial place of the Byzantine Empire, the Ottomans had put themselves in the danger zone of future apocalyptic imagination – and indeed we hear the “Islamic State” claim it as one of their goals to “conquer Constantinople”, but this time from the Turks.

There is another possibility of narrating the history of the Byzantine Empire from a Muslim point of view, of course, and in which both the prevalence and fall of the Roman Empire in the Eastern Mediterranean becomes a mere sideshow in the much bigger struggle between Islam and
Christendom. Not surprisingly, this has been a narrative favoured by Arab rather than Muslim authors that prefer to tone down the apocalyptic overtones of their own past, and focus on the Crusades as a defining event in the history of Christian-Muslim conflicts. In his popular history *The Crusades Through Arab Eyes* (1983), the Maronite author Amin Maalouf frames his history so skilfully that the shock of the Turkish threat to the Byzantine Empire after 1071 is omitted, and the appearance of the Crusaders a few years later seems to take place entirely at the invitation of Alexius I Comnenus, who is described at the very outset of the book as a man “always decked in gold and in rich blue robes, with carefully tended beard, elegant manners, and eyes sparkling with malice.”

Does this mean that Byzantium is doomed to represent “the Western Other” in Islamic narratives? Not necessarily. It was not out of occidentalist bias that the early Muslims began to regard the “Romans” as their main adversaries, but because their empire was the only one that did not succumb to the apocalyptic promise. Byzantium came to embody the promise of history coming to a close, and as such it remained imbedded in the apocalyptic matrix of the later Islamic world: a dormant trope that could resurface whenever the horizons of time narrowed.
Byzantium in Istanbul: 
Two Exhibitions at the Istanbul Archaeological Museums

Istanbul, with its long, complex, and cosmopolitan history sometimes seems to suffer from a glut of heritage opportunities. Its skylines are studded with eye-catching, unique buildings and aimless wandering through its historic centre cannot help but yield unexpected discoveries of its multi-layered history. Within this dense web of interwoven narratives of history, heritage, language, religion, culture, and politics, it can be difficult to trace a single thread, as the example of ‘Byzantine Istanbul’ demonstrates. Once the capital of the Byzantine Empire, Istanbul’s material Byzantine heritage can at times today seem elusive, so intertwined is it with later Ottoman buildings and renovations. The Hagia Sophia stands as one of the most visible and well-known symbols of the city’s Byzantine heyday; other surviving Byzantine churches are more tucked away, and many remain as the mosques into which they were converted under Ottoman rule. These religious buildings are the most frequent and complete survivors of the Byzantine period. Other architectural remains include large sections of the Theodosian Walls (heavily restored in places in recent years) and a number of cisterns (some underground have been converted into event spaces and some open air have become parks). The rest of the Byzantine remains of Istanbul tend to be fragmented: a column pedestal here, partially-excavated vaults beneath a restaurant there. To the wanderer through modern Istanbul, it can be difficult to construct a mental image of the former physical presence of Byzantine Constantinople, a lack suggested by the 2007 book, Walking Thru Byzantium, which offers walking routes to visit little-known sites of ruins complemented by three-dimensional reconstructions of the city’s Byzantine layout to place these remains in their original contexts.

Turning, then, from the city itself to its museums to capture a narrative of Byzantium, visitors find similarly patchy stories. The Great Palace Mosaics Museum, home to some of the most vibrant remains of the now lost Great Palace, is hidden behind a tourist bazaar, while the Byzantine Gallery of the Istanbul Archaeological Museums has been closed for several years while the museum has undergone seismic retrofitting. Some of the museum’s best and largest pieces of Byzantine art and architecture are instead displayed as part of the permanent ‘Istanbul through the Ages’ exhibition, which orders these objects according to their find-sites throughout the city (eg. the Hebdomon, the Forum of Constantine). This exhibition contextualises the Byzantine objects within the longer history of the city itself, but offers relatively little insight into the nature or narratives of the culture or empire that produced them.

This stands in striking contrast with blockbuster exhibitions of Byzantium found in the United States and Europe in recent years – a difference that reflects several key factors. First, and significantly, many of the most striking surviving objects of Byzantium have long been located outside of the city in which they were created. Many of these were carried off during the looting of the city by the Venetians following Constantinople’s conquest in the Fourth Crusade, while others travelled as diplomatic gifts in more peaceful times. Many of these objects are religious in
nature – icons, reliquaries, votive objects – reflecting a second significant factor: religion. Despite the division between the Latin West and the Orthodox East, shared Christianity made the cultural objects of Byzantium more relevant to subsequent generations than they were to Constantinople’s Muslim conquerors (although Mehmed II was sympathetic to the city’s Christian and pre-Christian heritage, and many objects such as statuary and architecture survived at his behest). In the United States, Byzantine exhibitions at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York have emphasised cultural connections between Orthodox communities of the modern US and Byzantium, while European exhibitions have often emphasised a discourse of ‘European identity’ that seeks to embrace Byzantium, in part to support modern iterations of ‘Europe’.

In Istanbul, on the other hand, narratives of Byzantium frequently place it within a larger narrative emphasising the cosmopolitan plurality of the city’s culture and heritage. Where Byzantium is portrayed as a narrative unto itself, it is usually somewhat piecemeal, reflecting its fragmentary survival in the city and the degree to which its remains have become interwoven with other narrative strands over the centuries.

Both of these types of Istanbul Byzantium narrative can be observed in two recent exhibitions held at the Istanbul Archaeological Museums, which were both thematically linked with the triennially International Sevgi Gönül Byzantine Studies Symposia held in 2010 and 2013. The first of these exhibitions, Byzantine Palaces in Istanbul (İstanbul’daki Bizans Sarayları) (21 June 2010-2 October 2011), was the smaller of the two and focussed on the Archaeological Museum’s collection of finds from the excavations of the sites of Byzantine palaces over the last hundred years or so. These objects tended to be small – plates, oil lamps, and small architectural elements – and they were contextualized in the exhibition by three-dimensional images of the palaces prepared by the Byzantium 1200 project. The symposium topic that year was ‘The Byzantine Court: Source of Power and Culture’, a topic which offered context to the limited material remains of the palaces available. The second of these exhibitions, Stories from The Hidden Harbor: Shipwrecks of Yenikapı (Saklı Limandan Hikayeler: Yenikapı’nın Batıkları) (25 June 2013-25 January 2014), was much larger as well as broader in its chronological timeframe, as the excavations of Yenikapı yielded finds that spanned millennia. The symposium topic that year was trade in Byzantium, which the introduction to the symposium acknowledged was partially inspired by interest stirred in this topic by the Yenikapı excavations. The preface to the exhibition catalogue by the museum director, Zeynep Kızıltuna, also indicated that the museum had already been planning a second exhibition on the Yenikapı finds (following the immensely successful In the Daylight: 8000 Years of Istanbul, originally planned to run for several months, but instead kept open from 2007-2010). Thus while the Byzantine Theodosian Harbour came to the fore in the 2013 exhibition, it was contextualised within the larger narrative of Istanbul’s history.

Despite its more specifically Byzantine focus, the earlier exhibition also stemmed from a symposium topic that was intended to fit in with a larger programme of events in Istanbul in 2010, in which year the city was named the European Capital of Culture. The symposium’s exhibition was intended to highlight the Byzantine elements of this culture, placing the images from the pages of Walking Thru Byzantium and the website Byzantium 1200 (associated projects) into the more public space of the museum, and further illustrating these reconstructions with historical objects. Nonetheless, the exhibition was far more clearly a product of the symposium than the 2013 Yenikapı exhibition – a distinction indicated by the forewords to the two catalogues in which the Palaces catalogue refers exclusively to the impetus of the symposium, where as the Yenikapı catalogue only mentions this briefly.
For visitors, this background to the 2010 exhibition was less important. Instead, the most striking element of the exhibition appears to have been the digital reconstructions of the lost palaces – perhaps more than the surviving small, everyday objects from these sites on display. Especially for tourists making the round of the Old City and its surviving Byzantine monuments, this exhibition served a similar purpose as the *Walking Thru Byzantium* guidebook: a visual context for the fragmentary and isolated *in situ* remains around the city; an interesting and supplementary addition to a larger tour, but not necessarily the centrepiece of the experience of visiting Istanbul in its year as Capital of Culture. Indeed, in articles in newspapers outside of Turkey (for example, *The Telegraph*) reporting the array of events available to tourists in this year this exhibition is not mentioned and the Byzantine history of the city is instead invoked through the more common and widely-known images of the Hagia Sophia and other surviving Byzantine churches.

The Y enikapı exhibition, on the other hand, seems to have been received by visitors far more strongly within the larger context of the larger fabric of the city’s history, as well as within the context of the groundbreaking excavations that underpinned the exhibition. The pioneering archaeological techniques involved in these excavations generated a deep sense of pride in the Turkish archaeological and heritage community and this was emphasised alongside the historical context of the finds in the exhibitions held at the Archaeological Museums. By 2013, the Yenikapı excavations had been running for nearly ten years and were well known both in Istanbul and internationally. This generated significant press attention for the exhibition – as well as for the symposium. The latter was reported in the *Hurriyet Daily News* as an event in itself, tied to both the Yenikapı exhibition as well as a photography exhibition, *Artamanoff: Picturing Byzantine Istanbul, 1930-1947*, held at the Research Center for Anatolian Civilisations – the venue of the symposium.

The multimedia exhibition used numerous techniques to draw in viewers and immerse them in the historical context of the more than 8,000 years of the region’s history contained in the Yenikapı excavations. The oldest finds belonged to a Neolithic settlement in the region, and although the Theodosian Harbour yielded the most finds, the exhibition did not focus on ‘Byzantium’ but rather ‘Istanbul’ as a theme, choosing to represent the various layers uncovered in the excavation as layers of the various civilisations and cultures that had occupied this same region over several thousand years. This Istanbul-centric approach was indicated, for example, by the digital reconstruction of a woman’s head on the basis of an excavated skull. This display was titled ‘An Istanbulite from 1000 years ago’, with no mention of ‘Byzantium’ except in the smaller print, where the skeletons studied are described as ‘Byzantine’, but when the print describes the people to whom the skeletons belonged and their lives, they are called ‘Istanbulites’ again. This distinction creates a sense of historical context (Byzantine) that does not override a sense of continuity (Byzantium being but one part of the long history of Istanbul, to which all modern Istanbul residents are heirs).

Comparing these two Istanbul exhibitions to exhibitions of Byzantium in other countries, another significant difference quickly becomes evident: the place of religion. Again, in part this difference lies in the nature of the objects on display. In the blockbuster exhibitions mentioned above in the US and Europe, many of the objects were religious and, indeed, many of Byzantium’s greatest religious objects have survived outside of Istanbul. But the difference also lies in the aims of the exhibitions and the larger narratives they sought to construct. In advertising the 1997 exhibition, *The Glory of Byzantium*, the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York made use of ‘ethnic marketing’ strategies which targeted particular ethnic communities – in this case different Orthodox communities in New
York. The emphasis here was both cultural and religious, appealing to members of these communities as the heirs of Byzantine culture and heritage, sharing related religions and languages. Although this type of targeting has been less explicit in many European exhibitions, nonetheless, the religious nature of Byzantine objects has often been emphasised in exhibitions and displays, identifying familiar Christian figures and comparing them with Western, Latin representations, explaining the different forms of worship in the Orthodox and Latin Christian worlds, while also exploring the similarities and cultural connections between the two religious traditions.

In the Istanbul exhibitions, a sense of continuity and inheritance of the legacies of past civilisations is likewise evident, but here the common touchstone is not religion, given the shifts in the dominant religion of the city over the centuries, but rather the city itself. Each successive dominant power in the city has engaged with its predecessors, out of necessity and out of desire, and this engagement with a shared past continues to be evoked in exhibitions held in Istanbul today. This approach appeals both to local visitors, conveying to them a sense of the long line of history of which they are the current heirs, and to visitors from abroad, presenting to them a sense of the richness and antiquity of the city in which they are staying.

While the association of the academic symposia with their particular focus on Byzantine history had an impact on these two exhibitions – in particular, the 2010 *Palaces* exhibition – nonetheless, this overriding emphasis on the narrative of Istanbul remained at the fore of both. Byzantium played a secondary role as a sub-narrative within the larger story of the history of the City (under one of its various names). In this urban context, Byzantium becomes less ‘exotic’ than it can sometimes appear in US and European exhibitions, where much effort is spent on providing visitors with a cultural context to make the unfamiliar accessible. In the exhibitions examined in this paper, Byzantium is presented more as a familiar element of local history, whose culture may be far removed from modern Istanbul, but whose legacy and heritage continues to colour the modern city through surviving monuments and buildings, ruins and spolia, and toponyms. To a degree, the narratives of Byzantium presented in exhibitions in Istanbul can seem ‘domesticated’, less grand than the at times triumphalist narratives presented elsewhere. But this difference can also be seen as reflecting the manner in which Byzantium and its cultural legacy never completely disappeared from Istanbul, but instead have become part of the familiar urban backdrop of everyday life.

Indeed, the very excavations at Yenikapi famously came about due to efforts to develop the modern transport infrastructure of Istanbul through an expansion of the city’s Metro system via an underwater tunnel, dubbed the Marmaray. The construction work entailed uncovered the remains of the harbour at Yenikapi, touching off nearly a decade of excavations, and delaying the opening of the Marmaray. The Yenikapi excavations are thus a large-scale example of a common problem faced by those seeking to build in modern Istanbul, in particular in its Old City quarters: the ubiquity of historical remains lying below the ground throughout the region. The patchy network of remains of the palaces of Istanbul – in particular the Great Palace – similarly reflects this issue, and a number of the sites listed in *Walking Thru Byzantium* are private excavations beneath shops and restaurants, accessible via these businesses. The large excavation site behind the Sultanahmet Four Seasons Hotel (paid for in part by the hotel) was originally projected to be opened to the public in 2008, but eight years on, it remains enclosed by boarding, a prime example of the many, at times contentious, interests at stake in uncovering the region’s historical heritage.
While the Marmaray and Metro extensions are gradually being opened for use, there are efforts underway to ensure that the Yenikapi site does not meet the same fate as the Sultanahmet site. In 2012, an international competition was held to design a building that would double as a transport hub and an archaeological park and museum. The design by Peter Eisenmann and Aytac Architects won this competition and exhibited their plans in Venice in June 2014. Their design was intended to reflect the layered nature of both the physical site and its uses and history, with overlapping grid systems and a deliberate interplay between the modern urban orientation and that of the archaeological site. However, as of the end of 2015, no further developments have taken place to put this project into action, and the site remains undeveloped and empty following the conclusion of the excavation work in 2013, with the 37 shipwrecks discovered waiting in limbo in museum storage.

Narratives of Byzantium in Turkey – and abroad – have long found themselves wrapped up in larger political narratives as well as local identity and religious narratives. What distinguishes the narratives found in Istanbul is the city itself, the former capital of the Byzantine Empire, which today is remembered for far more than just this chapter in its history. Instead, its cultural roots are seen as myriad and complexly interwoven – a true blend of east and west with global influences, reflecting its geographical location straddling continents and cultural and religious divides. Narratives of Byzantium are often absorbed into this – sometimes to their disadvantage, as there is so much varying material heritage to be preserved and presented in the city, itself rife with political and ideological conflicts, that remains often sit in limbo, half-accessible to and under-interpreted for visitors, both local and international. This embedded presentation of Byzantium can extend to museum narratives, even within exhibitions more or less dedicated to Byzantium. Perhaps more than they seek to offer visitors insight into 'Byzantium', these exhibitions aim to offer visitors a sense of 'Byzantine Istanbul', and the continuity of Istanbul as a multicultural, cosmopolitan urban centre.
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The Serbian tradition of George Glabas’ work
Homily to the Holy and Great Paraskeve

The manuscript tradition of George Glabas’ work (mid-14th cent.), *Homily to the Great and Holy Paraskeve*, is of particular interest. The *Homily* is known to us not only from the Greek original but also from its Old Slavic translation (which is transmitted by perhaps more than six manuscripts in a Serbian variant). The Greek text is preserved in two manuscripts, one of which lies in the library of the Great Lavra Monastery on Mount Athos. The antiquity of the oldest Slavic manuscript (cod. Dečani 88), which dates to c. 1360-1365, that is to say, about the time in which the author of the *Homily* himself lived, as well as the similarity it bears to the manuscript at the Great Lavra – the only one to transmit the complete Greek text of the *Homily* – permit us to put forward various proposals regarding the restoration of the text. This paper represents an initial presentation of the forthcoming publication of the text and accompanying commentary.
Flush Toilets, Torn Nostrils and Other Byzantine Realia
Revealed by the Oldest Slavic Translation of the Life of Basil the Younger

The Life of Basil the Younger (BHG 263, hereafter LBY) was written by a layperson Gregory who was his main hero’s disciple. His writing dates back to the middle of the tenth century. The events of this huge and extremely interesting story unfold during the first half of the tenth century as well as at the Last Judgment and in the subsequent eternity. The author takes the reader to the Emperor’s palace and to his own country estate, to the houses of the rich and to the huts of the poor, to monastic cells and busy city streets, to tollbooths of demons and to heavenly abodes of saints. He brings to the fore dozens of characters with their life stories, he tells about the mutiny of Andronikos Dukas and the war with the Rus’, the court intrigues of the Macedonian basileis and the incursion of the Hungarians. LBY is well known to the scholars, has been widely used for a long time, and yet, has a lot more to tell.

The Greek original of LBY exists in 22 manuscripts, subdivided into many families and versions. It has been assumed for a long time that the oldest and the most accurate version is represented by the Moscow Synodal manuscript N249 (hereafter M). This theory was originally suggested by A.Veselovskii in the nineteenth century, supported by S.Vilinskii, shared later in the twentieth century by Ch.Angelidi and L.Ryden, and recently repeated in the Dumbarton Oaks publication: The Life of Saint Basil the Younger, ed. D.Sullivan, A.-M.Talbot, S.McGrath, Washington 2014 (hereafter M). True, the Moscow version is the longest one, but this does not automatically imply that it is indeed the closest to the protograph of LBY. Unfortunately, all the extant manuscripts are very late and we should assume that the original text had gone through multiple editing which explains a wide discrepancy between the versions. Yet, there is every reason to believe that the Moscow version rather than replicating the original Life, augmented it with new, sometimes anachronistic details. Meanwhile, there exists a copy, which reflects a much earlier redaction than the Moscow one – it is the manuscript N107 (in the previous catalogue 187) from the Athos monastery of Dionysiou (hereafter D), written in 1328. The idea of the priority of D was expressed for the first time by Tatyana Pentkovskaya (Пентковская Т. В. Житие Василия Нового в Древней Руси: проблемы оригинала и перевода // Вестник МГУ. Сер. 9 (филология). 2004; Eadem, Древнейший славянский перевод Жития Василия Нового и его греческий оригинал // Византийский временник, 63 (88), 2004. С. 114-128). Her work was known to the editors of the Washington publication but they nevertheless stick to the traditional view sometimes turning to the Paris manuscript published in Acta Sanctorum, whose relations to other copies is yet to be clarified.

The critical edition of LBY is a tremendous task for the future. For now, T.Pentkovskaya, L.Shchegoleva and the present writer are preparing an edition of LBY from D together with the parallel text of the oldest Slavic translation represented by the manuscript N 162 of Egorov’s collection from the Russian State Library in Moscow (late 15th century, hereafter E). It is to D that this translation, made at the end of the eleventh century, is closest. Whereas E is not substantially
different from the version known from the Great Menaea (Die Grossen Lesenenaen des Metropoliten Makarij. Uspenskij Spisok. 26.-31. Maerz. Freiburg i.Br., 2001, hereafter VMC), the Greek text of D displays great differences from M. When Vilinskii published several versions of the Greek Life together with several versions of the Slavic one, the fact that these texts were placed side by side under the same cover did not yield much result, because the differences between them were too big. Now, as we can compare two very close texts (though written in different languages), there appears a possibility to find out how a Slavic bookman worked, as well as how he understood and interpreted his prototype. Finally, this could enable us to speculate who he was and where he lived.

In the present paper I do not deal with all the numerous and highly interesting historical details contained in D but absent in M and, therefore, heretofore unknown to scholars. I will dwell on this topic elsewhere. Let me cite but one example of how accurate D is as compared to M and how the Slavic version can be of additional help. Gregory, the narrator, leaves Constantinople for the country estate he works at. There a sequence of breath-taking events is unfolding: Gregory is flirted with by the neighbor, a licentious Melitene, who is known to be unfaithful to her husband, a farm hand Alexander; her mother is a sorceress of great might, everyone around is afraid of her. The narrator experiences high sexual temptation, incited by Melitene's dissolute advances and enhanced, no doubt, by her mother's spells; finally Gregory manages to escape the seduction by resorting to the local church of St.George. The disappointed witches send a deadly fever on him. He nearly dies because St.Stephen, to whom he had prayed, was on business away from his shrine, while Basil the Younger was angry at his disciple because he had stolen a piece of jewellery. The whole story reflects the vivid atmosphere, so characteristic of the whole Vita – but where do these dramatic events take place? The only reference given by M sounds like this: ἐν τῷ κάστρῳ τοῦ Ῥαιδέστου (M,168). Meanwhile, D is much more precise: ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι τῆς Θρᾴκης πλησίον τοῦ προσαγορευομένου Ῥαιδέστου πρὸς ἀνατολὰς τοῦ κάστρου κείμενον ἀπὸ ἕξις σημείων τὰ Μεσαίου οὔτω προσαγορευομένου (D, 33-34), and both E and VMC follow the latter reading: «В стране западней близ града Родосты на восточной стране града того соуця в дале 6 поприц, Мосея наричающеся» (VMC,635d). In all probability, the village mentioned here is Mesokómion (Μεσοκώμιον), on which A.Kuelzer writes; «Sehr wahrscheinlich in der Umgebung von Tekirdağ (Raidestos), nicht genau lokalisirt «. (A. Külzer, Ostthrakien (Europé), Tabula Imperii Byzantini, vol. XII, Wien 2008, 552). Now we can localize this place with absolute precision: whereas M is, once again, laconic: πρὸς τὸν ἐκείσε ποταμόν ὅλιγον τῶν οἰκημάτων ἀπέχοντα (M,174), D gives us further precious detail: ποταμοῦ διαπορευομένου ἐλαχίστου ὑσεὶ πηχῶν τρίακοντα ἀπέχοντα τῶν οἰκημάτων (D,36); this time the Slavic text adds a small correction to the Greek one: «реце мале того соуци близъ, четыре лакот отстоящи от храминъ тежъ» (VMC,655b). The combination of this data permits us to identify the location of all the above-mentioned dramatic events as today's Tekirdağ Merkez (110 km west of Istanbul) where a dry brook is indeed found today.

The author of the original version of LBY purposefully inserted into his text an array of small, precise details of everyday life aimed at inspiring equal trust for his otherworldly visions. However, at later stages of editing, the concept gradually changed, and countless mundane details were removed, while otherworldliness grew in volume. Such is M. Both D and E+VMC retained a great deal from the original version. But in the rare cases when E+VMC diverge from D, which reading should be preferred? I think that the Slavic text was translated from a Greek version which is little closer to the Urtext than D. For example, in an episode in which a certain woman is characterized as
a pious supplicant of the Hodegoi monastery in Constantinople, E+VMC give a succinct phrase «в Одинцтвию ходици и Господеви и Богородице слющци» (E,37; VMC,652c), while D is much more talkative: «аеи тои эн ти тимоєнєν Θεотοκα кай Μητρи τуи Κυρиу иµив Οδηгоиexusπεртєουσє кай ть литанєїа аутицє тї кαθ’ ѭќастьиу ѭродомаиа гиνомєнє ѭїπακολουєнουσє (D,33v; М,162-164). One may suspect that the translator abridged his original but this phrase is also missing in the Greek text of the Paris manuscript. Moreover, the weekly processions with the miracle-working icon of Hodegentria are mentioned for the first time at the end of the eleventh century. These facts led to the publishers of the Washington edition of 2014 to hypothesize (M,165) that the phrase could be not part of the Urtext. This hypothesis is perfectly corroborated by the absence of this phrase from the Slavic version. This, in its turn, implies that the translation had been made from a text that preceded D, and in the case of discrepancy, the preference should be given to the Slavic readings.

Yet, in the present paper I am interested in the cases when the Greek and the Slavic texts are congruent and exactly for this reason the way the foreign reality is rendered helps to grasp the perception of this reality by the translator. Surely, there are numerous instances when the latter was urged to use words and phrases which inevitably simplify the Byzantine realia for the simple reason that such realia were lacking in the Slavic world and language. For example, ἀπρεπῆ τινα πράγματα ἐπι τού δηµοσίου ἐγίνοντα (D,7; abridged in M) turns into a more vague «неподобныи некимъ вещемъ на уроцехъ бываощихъ» (E,8; VMC,637b), ταζεώτας ѭќастью сеќрєтου (D,10; abridged in M) into «стрельца кое на и» (E,10; VMC,638d); ειδώλων νєкрєν тον ѭν тои ἱπποδροµίоис хαριν тинν ѭп’ ἀναµηςє εсїηλαµєвнєн (D,138; М,588) becomes «идол мертвыхъ, якое на игрищє въспоминание лицыи» (E,155; VMC,717d) etc. This does not mean that the Slavic bookman does not understand what he is reading about: he does, and this becomes obvious when he renders rare termini technici of the Hippodrome, which are conveyed periphrastically. The phrase τέσσαρες ἡνίохοи εξερχόµενοι ευδροµοια τας ἕπτα ταϋλας εἰσπράττοντες (D,75; lacks in M) uses the word ταύλα in an unusual sense: normally it means ‘part of the race track’ (Constantini Porphyrogeniti De caerimoniis, Vol. 2 p.141.7;10; 146. 7; 166.16) but in LBY it seems to imply the whole round. The translator grasped it and came up with: «на четырехъ колесищъ ткоеутъ седмицдъ подроюме объходище» (E,90; VMC,682a). In another instance, each member of the regent council sends his personal ‘protection writ’ to Andronikos Dukas: ἀπεστειλαν ѭќастью тο φυлактоν αυτοι (D,8; lacks in M). Normally, the word φυλακτον means ‘amulet, talisman’ but here a secondary and rare meaning is employed - the translator understood it and found a good equivalent: “послаша к немоу коивждо ротоу сувоу» (E,9; VMC,637d). The translator displays subtlety when he finds unexpected equivalents to different terms: for example, one of the groups of sinners sent to eternal punishment, is defined in the original as εὑτράπελοι (D,90; lacks in M), by the direct meaning ‘the witty ones;’ they are rendered as «строптивии» (E,105; VMC,690b), ’the recalcitrant ones’, which is correct, if we consider the broader context!

The translator is at home in Constantinople. In one episode, a possessed woman who has previously escaped from the church of St.Anastasia Pharmakolytria, is brought to saint Basil. In this church, the hagiographer explains, <προσκαρτεροντєс ѽперєтє тοв аσθєνєв (M,322; lacks in D). This information is augmented in the Slavic version: «слѹґї свѧтєя Анастасія, ієє тυю нарѫженє бесныхъ ради» (E,74; VMC,677с). We know that this very church was the place where demented and possessed people were kept ( L. Ryden, ’A Note on Some References to the Church of St Anastasia in Constantinople in the Tenth Century’, Byzantion, 44 (1974), 198-201), but it is only from the Slavic text that we learn of the specially trained psychiatric personnel.
Here is a more complicated case. Another character of LBY fell ill while at home, and his housemates wanted to take him to the monastery of Andrew the Apostle. This place is described differently in different versions of the Greek text. In D we read: ἀπαγάγετε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ Πασχόντιον ἐπὶ τῷ ἄγιον ἅγιον τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀνδρέου τοῦ ἀποστόλου μηχανήματι (D,72). The word μηχάνημα in this context is highly obscure and what is Πασχόντιον remains a mystery. And, last but not least, we know nothing of any church or monastery of Andrew the Apostle in Constantinople (M, 327). Maybe, Πασχόντιον was not a church at all? To resolve this ambiguity, the creators of the late Byzantine version added the explication καταγώγιον to the mention of St. Andrew; they removed the word Πασχόντιον, which was as abstruse to them as it is to us; and finally they did away with the whole syntagma ἐπὶ τῷ …μηχανήματι (M,326) which looked incomprehensible to them. The Slavic translator also had serious problems with this passage, and he also omitted the word Πασχόντιον and turned St. Andrew’s into a church – but at least he tried to do something with the enigmatic locution ἐπὶ τῷ …μηχανήματι: «доведете его к цркви сто Андрея апсля да сотворять емуо по обычному строению» (E,83; VMC,678c).

Now, when we made sure that our Slavic bookman can be trusted for finding good equivalents, it is time to present several unusual decisions he made. The phrase τὴν ῳνα τμηθείς (D,9; M,96) reflects a well-known Byzantine execution when the victim’s nose was cut off J. Remensnyder, M. Bigelow, R. Goldwyn, ‘Justinian II and Carmagnola: a Byzantine rhinoplasty?’, Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 1979, 63(1), 19-25). Yet, the translator found an unusual way to describe this maiming: «и ноздри въспорют емоу» (E,10; VMC,638b), 'his nostrils will be torn'. It is not ruled out that this execution could be performed in different forms: a more severe one when the very cartilage was cut off, and a more “sparing” one, when only nostrils were torn. We have at least one example thereof: Eustathius of Thessaloniki writes about the notorious Hagiochristophorites that his nostrils had been excised - τὰς ῳνάς τε ἀπεσχίσθη (Eustazio di Tessalonica. La espugnazione di Tessalonica, ed. S. Kyriakidis. Palermo, 1961, 44). Probably, the translator was aware only of this particular kind of maiming.

And here comes the most striking case of ingenious translation in LBY. Another character had been bedeviled, fell ill and lost his bodily strength to the extent καθότι ἂν μὴ ἐβαστάζετο χερσὶν ἄνδρειων ἑλιτὰ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν τῆς γαστρὸς αὐτοῦ ἐξαναστήναι ἐδεδύνητο (D,66; abridged in M) 'that he was unable to get up to the call of his stomach unless he was carried on the hands of his servants. The sentence is translated thus: «и гнои не чистота их, яко водолажный...» (E,70; VMC670d). The word водолажка is nowhere to be found in other Slavic texts. It was analyzed in the dissertation of T. Pentkovskaya, defended under her maiden name (T.V. Михайлышева, Житие Василия Нового в древнейшем славянском переводе. Moscow, 2001) who interpreted it as a composite, consisting of two roots: вода 'water' and лажа which could be connected with the verb лазить 'crawl'. Mikhailyscheva interprets водолажка as «баня (?)», 'bath'. Yet, bath in the proper sense is not a place to which a person would be brought to answer the call of his stomach! There is another passage where we come across the same word, this time the hagiographer says that in the Inferno pus is streaming from sinners ὡς ἐκ βαλάνου βόρβορος ἐπιπορευόμενος (D,120; abridged in M), 'as sewage dashing down from the bath'. Strictly speaking, βάλανος is not 'bath', βαλανεῖον, but either 'acorn' or 'penis'. Since neither can effuse sewage in significant quantities, I assume that we deal here with the scribe’s inaccuracy and the translator saw βαλανεῖον in the original. He translated the phrase as «и гнои нечистота их, яко водолажный...»
гной» (E,136; VMC,707a), ‘and the pus of their impurity is like sewage from the bathroom.’ So, both contexts convincingly show that водолазжа is a special technical term.

Whenever the Slavic bookman comes across the word ‘bath’ (as opposed to bathroom), he translates it as «баня», whether as a facility where people wash (E32, VMC,650b), in which case the Byzantine author does not hesitate to use the same word as above: τῷ βαλανείῳ λούσασθαι (D,29; M,154), or as a building (E, 142; VMC, 710c), in which case the author of LBY uses another word, λοετρά (D,126; M,544). When the hagiographer writes that after the saint had relieved a man of magic spell the latter exuded smoke καθώσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν κορώνων τοῦ βαλανείου (D,72; lacks in M), ‘like from the corners (?) of the bathhouse’, - the translator takes liberty with the text: «яко от печнаго окна банны го дым» (E,84; VMC,679a), ‘like the smoke from the bathhouse window.’ This means that in his mind he saw a real bath; he looked not at the words but at the inner sense; and when he understands that the author had in mind a bathroom, not a bath, he uses a special word, which does not exist in Greek!

So, it turns out that the in the tenth century Byzantines had flush toilets inside rich people’s houses but did not have a special word for them; the Slavs, on the other hand, coined such a term, although it remains unclear where it could be practically used. Both conclusions look rather astonishing. True, public baths always had toilets (A. Berger, Das Bad in der byzantinischen Zeit. München 1982, 114), usually between the locker-room and the sweating room (Handbook of Engineering Hydrology: Environmental Hydrology, ed. S.Eslamian. Vol.1, 2014, 189-192), but our data on the water supply in Constantinople of the mid-Byzantine period are very meager (J. Bogdanoviс, Water supply in Constantinople, 2008, Εγκυκλοπαίδεια Μείζονος Ελληνισμού, Κωνσταντινούπολη, http://www.ehw.gr/l.aspx?id=12507). The underground wastewater system of the imperial capital could survive from Constantine’s times, as it did in the early tenth-century Thessalonike (cf. Joannes Cameniata, De expugnatione Thessalonicae, 57), but this in itself did not guarantee the existence of built-in flush toilets - we know nothing about running-water facilities in the rich private houses (A. Karpozilos, Περί Αποπάτων, Βόθρων και Υπονόμων. In: Η καθημερινή ζωή στο Βυζάντιο, Ed. X. Aggelidi, Athens, 1989, 335–352, esp.351). Thanks to the Slavic version of LBY, now we can be pretty sure that they existed.

How could a Slav become a source of information to this effect? Flush toilets were not uncommon in the Roman Empire and in Early Byzantium but for the rest of medieval Europe cesspit remained the universal urban solution. I am not in the position to intervene in the long dispute over the language of the Slavic translation of LBY, whether it is East- or South-Slavic. What I am confident of, neither in Kiev, nor in Preslav nor at the Mount Athos could there function a flush toilet. The term Vodolazha must have been invented by the Slavic inhabitants of Constantinople.
Неизвестная славяно-русская редакция «Мучения семи отроков Эфесских» в Тихонравовском и Рогожском хронографах


В процессе работы над продолжением издания TX в его составе было обнаружено «Мучение семи отроков Эфесских» (память 22 октября и 4 августа, первая половина памятника – до воскресения отроков при императоре Феодосии, л. 463–464 об., далее – МОЭ), не отмеченное в работах В. М. Истрина и О. В. Творогова. Текст МОЭ сохранился в TX не полностью: судя по величине отсутствующего текста и тетрадной сигнатуре, в нем утрачены два листа в середине и 0,5 листа в конце.


И та и другая половины МОЭ существенно отличаются от известных на сегодняшний день списков памятника в Минае четы на октябрь. Чтобы оценить этот факт, необходимо обратиться к историографии.
Согласно исследованию Д.Е. Афиногенова [Афиногенов 2006: 261–283], приблизительно в перв. пол. XII в. болгарские книжники перевели единообразно не дошедший до наших дней неполный годовой комплект Студийских дометафрастовских Миней (из 10-ти томов – без июня и августа). Этот перевод, по мнению исследователя, отразился в самом раннем из сохранившихся в древнерусской книжности комплекте Миней четырех – Иосифо-Волоколамского монастыря (октябрьский том которого: РГБ. Ф. 113. № 591 далее обозначим как – ИВ), датируемом посл. четв. XV в. Тот же славянский перевод с небольшими редакционными изменениями вошел и в состав Великих Миней четырех митрополита Макария (далее – ВМЧ), формирование которых было предпринято им еще в Новгороде в 30-х гг. XVI в.

Сравним версии МОЭ Тихонравовского и Рогожского хронографов и Иосифо-Волоколамской минен. 3 В ТХ и ИВ начало МОЭ выглядит следующим образом (разности выделены жирным шрифтом, в скобках восстановлены индивидуальные ошибки писцов):

TX (л. 463–464 об.)

Егда же царство Декии царь, и вниде въ Ефесь от Кракангла града, тогда собраша окаянную мѣсто и вести на женіе соученых боговѣ, церкви же вѣрныхъ разориша и свещеници [и] хрестьянъ пронеющие бѣзе. виогда же оует вниде Декия царь во Ефес, и вознесся сердце его, и нача създать церкви идоломъ посреди града. егда же пролься кровь на жертво идольскую, тогда заповида старешинамъ градскимъ жрети соученые идоломъ, якохже оскорвяяхося телеса ихъ от крови жертвы, все множествѣ собирахосе от коего ждлъ мѣста во храмище идольское въ Ефесь, и дымъ злыхъ покры градъ, и та бысть и скверъ жертвь ихъ, иже жрію соученому идоломъ. и всхожае ис среды града и покрываше стѣны ихъ.

егда же праздникъ творяще Декіи б esos, и повелъ всемоу множеству сбратисе на праздникъ боговъ своихъ, тогда собраша от коего ждлъ мѣста множество во храмище идольское, соуще въ градѣ, и жрію, повиновахосе соученому. -: Восмердѣ весь град от жертвь, великъ же плач одеркаше вѣрных. и оуничникухъ бѣхаху ото идолослужения, и не(ж)моху и покрывашо са лица своя от страха Деквева, стеньше и немощь одрѣкаша ихъ. и въ день третій повелъ царь яти хрестіаны. се же елины [и] иоди подвизахо воины, изъ домовъ и вереповъ влачахо хрестіаны. и одрѣкахоу

ИВ (л. 238 об.–239 об., 241–241 об.)

Егда въцарися Декіи царь и приде въ Ефесь отъ Караганческаго града, тогда събрася вся страна мѣста того требы створити соученымъ боговѣ, церкви же вѣрныхъ раздіосяся, свещеници и хрістіане гонимы бываху. егда же виогда Декіи царь въ Ефесь, взынесеся сердце его, нача здать требища коумиромъ посредъ града. егда вдася весь бѣсомъ, тогда повелъ старышинамъ града жрети съ нимъ соученымъ коумиромъ, како же осквернилъ телеса ихъ въ крови жрѣтвѣнѣ, и весь народъ сбирашеся отъ всѣхъ мѣста въ требища коумирскага, соуща въ Ефесь. дымъ же требищи и скверъ покры весь градъ, тѣмъ и сквера требъ ихъ, яже жрію соученому коумиромъ, всхождаше отъ среды града и покрываше стѣны его.

творы же праздникъ Декіи царь бесомъ, повелъ всемоу народу сбратися въ праздникъ боговъ своихъ. сбра же ся бесчислено множество от всѣхъ мѣста въ требища коумирскага, соуща въ градѣ, и жрію соученымъ. всмердѣ же са весь градъ требами, вѣліе же стѣованіе одеркаше вѣрныхъ и насилованіе, будахоу коумиро служитѣ-ли, и бѣжаща и скрышася и закрываху лица своя, и стеньше и въздѣряние одеркаше я отъ страха Деквева. въ третій же день повелъ царь яти хрестіаны. елине же и жидове приплѣляху ся хрестіаномъ, и извлчаще ис хлѣвніи и ис пещеръ. и ряхотуть съ прщеніемъ и привожахоу а с прилежаніемъ к народу.
к народу собранный и
жрехоу идолом, вкоупе и цареви. и
остроифиа моукъ, иnehомахоу и отпадахоу
от [сынов] въры,
хотячи быти живи.
и приклоняющихся на жертвы идолъ пред
народом. вървгъи хрестьянъ, слышащи си, и
инемахоу и плакахоу доущи своих.
обртъны же ся в (т)о время кръпци стояху
на камени въры, недвижимы оум имоуи, и
прещения
моучителства приемлющи на телъсъ
своих, и стрълы лоукаваго раджены и
прочия моукону терпящи. оле! плоти святых, яже
источчеваеми от моукъ беахоу
и пометаеми бявахоу, яко прах земны,
кровь от стоядова их течаше на землю.
Егда же сечахоу их и на стенах града
повешахоу телеса святых моученикъ, и
главы их востяхоу по древам пред враты
градными, вранове же и орли и множество …
(утрата 2-х листов)
им о пришествіи моучителв, еже в полтъ, яко възсканіе о нас бысть с
жителями града, вни(ти) и пожрети богомъ их
пред царемъ. и якоже слышаше, и
зъло оубоашеся и смолишас боого, ницъ же
лежащи лици на земли, съ слезами и стенианем
великим и плачемъ и болтънюю кръпкою
предложахоу доуши свои богови.
взем же Амбляхъ, положи пред ними
мало хлѣбы, яже бъ купил.
и восташе на пріятъ(ти)е и на возоженіе и на
побжденіе къ моучителю. вкоупъ же им седящи
посреди вертепа…

съраномоу и жрещемо коумиром
съ царемъ. и
боаще же ся моукъ, поплѣзахоуся и
падахоу ся от [сынов] въры,
и отъдоща вѣчныя жизни, нет в греч.
окланяющеся въ требуется коумирскія пред
народом. врьнніи же хрестьяне, слышаше се, и
туждахоу и състояхаоу доушиами
своими за приступающи коумиромъ.
бывающи же тверди въръ в то время, стояхоу на камени въры, недвижимы оумъ
имоуце, не вѣзмнѧщеся прещения моучитель
приемлюще же пече на телесъ своихъ, стрѣлы
лоукаваго радженя и прочаа моуки тръпляще.
плоти же святых, измоуучаемы бявахоу,
яко же и смети,
кровь же течаше на землю ис телесъ их.
и по стѣнамъ града висяхоу телеса святых,
главы же их възнисахоу
на конепца и поставляхоу пред
враты града, враны же и нестыты
и прочая …
имъ яко пришель есть
въ град свои Декии, еще яко поискиами быща с
гражданами
пред царемъ и егда си оусльшаша, оубоашеся
зъло и помолилас боого, ници лежаше на
земли, с плачем и
станиамъ великим и съ болтънюю
кръпкою да преддать свои доуша боого.
въстав же Амбляхъ, положи пред ними хлѣбы,
яже бъша коупили.
и тако въстава вкоусити и сильы прятяти на
бореніе моучителя. вкоупъ же имъ съдящим
посредъ пещеръ…

Аналогичным образом отличается от ИВ и текст МОЭ в РХ.4
Для обеих версий МОЭ (хронографической и минейной) свойственны сходные отличия
от редакции Симеона Мегафраста:5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ТХ</th>
<th>ИВ</th>
<th>Греч.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>и покрываще стѣны их.</td>
<td>и покрываще стѣны его.</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>хотячи быти живи</td>
<td>и отъдоща вѣчныя жизни</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>источчеваеми от моуку бявахоу</td>
<td>измоуучаемы бявахоу</td>
<td>ἐταλεινοῦτο ὅπο τῶν βασάνων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и пометаеми бявахоу, яко прах земны</td>
<td>якоже и смети</td>
<td>унижаемы от мук</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ницъ же лежащи лици на земли</td>
<td>ници лежаше на земли</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и болтѣнью крѣпкою</td>
<td>и съ болтѣнью крѣпкою да</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>предложахоу доуши свои богови</td>
<td>преддавать свое доуша боого</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и т.д.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
При этом, судя по ряду одинаково читающихся значительных по величине фрагментов, в основе хронографического и минейного списков МОЭ, по-видимому, лежал один славянский перевод, например:

**TX**

от печали, соушья во сердци их. -: Те(м) же щедрыи человеколюбецъ богъ, иже всегда проразумевая делателем винограда, и повелѣ имъ умрѣти
eгда же слыша си царь, разъгневавшися и поусти по родителя их. и пришедши и стать пред нимъ, и вопрости я царь: гдѣ соуцъ отступинци они, отступивши от царства нашего

**RX**

не оуслышать словес господния, рекшаго: оуслышать соущя въ гробех глас сына человѣческаго и живи боудоуть. и пакы глаголетъ: мнози отъ тѣ же господь възгласивы Лазаря от гроба и даровавъ емуо животъ, тѣ есть иже иманіемъ повѣльѣа своего подава и святымъ моученикомъ доухъ животень. и вѣсташа и сѣдова

**ИВ**

от печали, сошуцья въ сердцца ихъ. -: щедрыи же человеколюбецъ богъ, иже всегда промышля всегда о дѣлателяхъ винограда, и повелъ имъ умерпѣ иегда оуслыша се царь, разигвѣвася и поустивъ призвати родителя ихъ пришедше же, стаца пред нимъ и вопрости ихъ царь, глагола: «гдѣ соуцъ отступинци они, отступивши царства нашего

не оуслышать словес господния, рекшаго: оуслышать соущя въ гробех глас сына человѣческаго и живи боудоуть. и пакы глаголетъ: мнози отъ тѣ же гласъ възгласивы Лазоря изъ гроба и даровавъ емуо животъ, тѣ есть маниемъ повѣльѣа своего подавы святимъ моученикомъ дуюхъ живота. и вѣсташа и сѣдова

Первичные чтения МОЭ в TX и RX указывают на их независимое от ИВ восхождение к архетипу перевода:
Град — весь градь  
Тма — тъм  
Егда — ----  
Декии — Декий царь  
Тогда — ----  
Подвизахо воины — прилепляхоуса  
Изъ домовъ — ис хлѣвинѣ  
Обрѣтшии же ся — бывающеи же  
Приемляющи на тельсѣх — пріемлюще же паче на телесѣх  
Оле! плоти — плоти же  
От стоудовъ — ис телесеи  
О пришествіи моучитлевѣ, еже в полатѣ — яко пришелъ есть въ град свои Декии  
Внии(ти) и пожрети — -------  
И т.д.  

Рх — ИВ  
Дарова — подаль есть  
Объявишася — возникноша  
Святѣ — свои  
Въ божіахъ церквах — въ церквахъ  
Младенецъ — свѣтъ  
Ниже изыдеть плотию — -------  
Помыслъ — оумѣ  
Вѣста — -------  
Яже бѣахоу — имиже коупоахоу  
372 лѣта — оттолѣ  

И т.д.
Примеры ошибочных чтений МОЭ в ТХ, РХ по сравнению с ИВ еще более многочисленны, но мы вынуждены их опустить ввиду ограниченных рамок статьи.

Некоторые чтения ТХ, приближенные к греческой кальке, но неточные по смыслу, в ИВ выглядят исправленными, например:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ТХ</th>
<th>ИВ</th>
<th>Греч.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>все множество</td>
<td>весь народ</td>
<td>πάντα тὰ πλήθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>все множество, весь народ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>первин</td>
<td>старъвины</td>
<td>οἱ πρῶτοι первые, знатнейшие</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>церковь</td>
<td>требица</td>
<td>ναοῦς храмы (Асс.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>по древам</td>
<td>на копенца</td>
<td>ἐπὶ ξύλον на копь, палки</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>свѣтла и велика</td>
<td>болярска и велможна</td>
<td>лαυτρόν καὶ μεγάλου святых (блистательных) и великих</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>с первыми жителями</td>
<td>съ старвиинами и съ грацаны</td>
<td>μεταξύ τῶν πρῶτων καὶ τῶν πολιτευομένων среди знатнейших («первых») и государственных деятелей</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Первый, второй и пятый примеры последней таблицы присутствуют и в РХ. Таким образом, в ТХ и РХ сохранилась, скорее всего, более ранняя разновидность славянского перевода МОЭ, чем отразившаяся в ИВ и ВМЧ.


Итак, половины МОЭ в ТХ и РХ обладают рядом общих особенностей перевода и лексики, и, с учетом одинаковых вводных слов, сопровождавших эти вставки, с большой вероятностью являлись когда-то частями одного хронографа. Памятник отразился и в древнерусской Минеи четыре, но в какой-то момент его бытования в составе последней подвергся существенной правке (а по сути – новому переводу) по греческому оригиналу.

Вставка «Мучения семи отроков Эфесских» в архетип ТХ и РХ произошла не позднее датировки списка последнего (40-е гг. XV в.) и была вызвана, по-видимому, превентивными ожиданиями конца света в 1492 г. Вместе с МОЗ вошли в состав ТХ, скорее всего, и другие вставки этого хронографа: «Покаяние Киприана» (память 2 октября), рассказ о граде Адулии «Христианской топографии» Козьмы Индикоплова и сокращенный вариант Псевдо-Климентин (или «Беседы» апостола Петра, память 25 ноября). Все они требуют дальнейших
исследований. Что касается происхождения архетипа Тихонравовского и Рогожского хронографов, соединившего в себе невероятное количество различных древнейших источников, на сегодняшний день можно с уверенностью сказать лишь одно: его автором был выдающийся древнерусский книжник.

Примечания.
1. Результаты этого исследования будут опубликованы в конце 2016 г. в очередном томе «Летописи и хроники» (Москва–С.-Петербург), посвященном памяти О.В. Творогова.
4. Изд. текста: [Анисимова 2010: 124–133].
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The Lexical Selectivity in the Old Bulgarian Translations as a Stylistic Marker of the Genre (Based on Data from the History of Hymnographic Texts)

The study discusses the synonymy in the earliest Slavonic translations, when representing some of the lexical elements, specific for the hymnography. The information is extracted from early copies of the Menaion (the book of offices for immovable feasts). The discussion of this problem, underlines a number of oppositions or translations, specific for the early Slavonic hymnography, which have not yet been supported by other type of texts. A more general social and cultural context is provided, to rationalize the trends, observed in the similar translation decisions, regarding certain specific Greek models (e.g. compound words, derivatives with α-privativum etc.). The conclusions outline the mechanisms of adapting of the models of the complex Byzantine hymnographic (poetic) style in the Slavonic environment.
Дамьянов сборник (cod. Vindob. slav. № 24):
славянские параллели и византийские оригиналы


Самые многочисленные тексты сборника принадлежат Иоанну Златоусту, их всего 18. Среди них два текста: один оригинальный, который еще не определен. В общее число входит псевдо-златоустовские гомилии (речь идет о номерах 7/CPG 4673, 11/CPG 4612, 13/CPG 4605, 17/CPG 4653, 18/CPG 4651, 19/CPG 4592, 20/4534, 21/4532 и 27/CPG 4536). В шесть случаях в рукописи утверждается, что их автор – Иоанн Златоуст, но в действительности их авторами являются Леонтий Иерусалимский (№ 4; Нач.: Бл(а)го връме и все доброгласно и под(о) бно н(ы)няяше връмени), Пс.-Епифанисий Кипрский (№ 5; Нач.: Въставъ въ трети д(ь) нѣ г(осподъ) нашъ Ис(у)х(ри)с(т)ъ), Климент Охридский (№ 6; Нач.: Д(ь)н(ь)сь възлюблении тьмная мѣста вьходить вл(а)д(ы)нъ се нашъ), Прокл Константинопольский (№ 14; Нач.: Се бо приспѣлъ вамъ дѣлъ повѣдати. дѣлъ ѣ мене подавающа), Амфилохий Иконийский (№ 16; Нач.: Якохе свѣтъносна луна ноци тьмною бѣлѣли) и Северин Гавальский (№ 25; Нач.: Всаки убо д(ь)нь свѣтъ. сѣлъныны лукъ носеци). С другой стороны, один текст Пс.-Златоуста приписывается Афанасию Александрийскому (№ 11; Нач.: Въчера братъе вы въ нарочь паскѣ нѣчто г(лаго)дахомь). Другим отцам церкви принадлежит разное число гомилий: Амфилохию Иконийскому – 1, Василию Селевкийскому – 1? (№ 30), Григорию Антиохийскому – 1, Диадоху Фотийскому – 1, Пс.-Евсевию Александрийскому – 3, Пс.-Епифанисию Кипрскому – 2, Кириллу Иерусалимскому – 1, Леонтию Иерусалимскому – 1,

Johannes Michael Reinhart
University of Vienna, Department of Slavic Studies, Vienna, Austria;
johannes.reinhart@univie.ac.at
Проклу Константинопольскому – 3 (? № 30 может принадлежать и Василию Селевкийскому) и Севериану Гавальскому – 1. Самыми поздними авторами являются Григорий Антиохийский (конец VI в.) и Леонтий Иерусалимский (VII в.). Само собой разумеется, что оба автора древнеболгарских оригинальных сочинений, Климент Охридский и Иоанн элпари, жили в гораздо более позднее время, в конце IX в. или в начале X в.

К некоторым текстам Дамьянова сборника имеются параллельные тексты в старославянских рукописях, а именно в Сборнике Клюца (1x; № 1; Совершение Исуса в ад; CPG 3768, Нач.: Чъто се дългъ безмѣвъ на земли) и в Суправльском сборнике (2x; № 1, № 8, Нач.: Въ ть дѣйнь и се два бѣста идуща путьемъ). Встречаются параллельные тексты и в древних церковнославянских рукописях: Торжественникіе/Златоусте Ф.п.1.46 (1x; № 5), Успенском сборнике (5x; № 5, 12, 16, 24, 29), Гомилиарии Михановича (9x; № 1, 2, 6, 8, 15, 16, 18, 24, 27), Сборнике Германа (5x; № 1, 15, 17, 24, 31). Три гомилии Дамьянова сборника в старославянских/церковнославянских сборниках представлены в более древних переводах. Это относится к № 14, тексту, принадлежащему Проклу Константинопольскому (CPG 5832; Нач.: Се бо приспѣхъ вамъ длѣть повѣдати. длѣсть в менѣ подавающа), другой перевод которого читается в Суправльском сборнике (текст № 44, лл. 498-508; Нач.: Идь длѣть вамъ отдати. длѣсть мъ мнѣ дѣшѣтоуюмому), а также к № 16, гомилии Амфилохии Иконийского (CPG 3236; Нач.: Якоже свѣтоносна луна насти тѣмнѣ бѣлѣси и юже по землѣ. и юже по мору плавательмѣ), представленной в другом переводе в Успенском сборнике (№ 38, лл. 25068-254r25; Нач.: Якоже свѣтъ мѣ с(в)ъ с(а)цъ ношенно обѣлилъ. иже и по землѣ и по морю пловущимъ) и к № 34 (Нач.: Понеже петидесетницу с(в)ѣт(а)го праздникъника свършисмо), тексту на Воскресене вѣсіх світъ, которы в более древних рукописях (Успенский сборник [№ 45, лл. 282r1-287r24; Нач.: Отънѣлѣже чистыи праздникъ пятьдесяцны прихода д(у)ха с(въ)тааго сътвориомы), Гомилиарии Михановича) переведен по-другому. Но существует и рукопись, тексты которой полностью совпадают со сборником Дамьяна, - это сербскій сборник № 299 Библиотеки Румынской академии наук с середины XIV в.: в нем только в двух местах отличается порядок текстов.

В нашем коротком докладе мы попытались выявить структуру сборника Дамьяна. Для этой цели существует ряд критериев: наличие текстов в других, прежде всего в более древних списках, анализ языка и цитаты из Свидетельного писания. Не подлежит сомнению, что в рамках короткого доклада могут быть произведены только эмпирические исследования. В идеальном случае анализу должно было бы предшествовать критическое издание каждого текста, однако это невозможно уже потому, что в моем распоряжении имеется лишь ограниченное число параллельных списков. Однако нелишне подчеркнуть, что исследователи древних славянских гомилетических сочинений находятся сейчас в гораздо более выгодной ситуации, чем авторы классических исследований последней четверти ХХ в., из которых здесь назову только Эмилию Благову, Климентину Иванову и Дитриха Фрейдмана. В несколько лучшей ситуации был Христиан Ханник, когда писал свою книгу (вышедшую в 1981 г.), поскольку он уже мог пользоваться некоторыми пособиями. В настоящее время мы располагаем несколькими новыми изданиями славянских текстов и пособиями, облегчающими отыскание параллельных славянских списков и греческих оригиналов.

Что касается изданий, то их можно разделить на четыре группы: 1. Издание текстов сборника Дамьяна; 2. Критическое издание текстов, в которых приводятся разночтения из
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сборника Дамьяна; 3. Тексты сборника Дамьяна, которые изданы по параллельным спискам; 4. Тексты сборника Дамьяна, существующие в другом славянском переводе, который опубликован.

ad 1. Из текстов сборника Дамьяна издан один-единственный, а именно Никодимово евангелие (№ 3; Стоянович 1885, Vaillant 1968 [только в разночтениях]).

ad 2. Издания с разночтениями нашей рукописи следующие: Сошествие Исуса в ад (№ 1; CPG 3768; Vaillant 1958; кроме того, существуют издания отдельных списков: Сборника Клоца, Супрасльского сборника, Гимилиария Михановича и Германова сборника); пасхальная гомилия Климентта Охридского (№ 6; Ангелов – Куев – Кодов – Иванова 1977: 318-319); Слово Иоанна Златоуста об учениках из Эмауса (№ 8; Заимов – Капалдо 1983: 403-419); пасхальная гомилия Иоанна Златоуста, в переводе презвитера Иоанна (№ 9; CPG 4425; Велковска – Иванова 2010).

ad 3. Издания текстов сборника Дамьяна по параллельным спискам представлены хорошо: Слово Пс.-Евсея Александрийского в Великую субботу (№ 2; CPG 5522 = BHG 685v; Успенский сборник, ТСЛ № 12, Гимилиарий Михановича); Слово на Воскресение Пс.-Евсея Александрийского (№ 5; CPG 5527 = BHG 635v; Успенский сборник); Слово на Воскресение Григория Антиохийского (№ 12; CPG 7384; Успенский сборник); Фомина неделя (№ 15; Гимилиарий Михановича, Германов сборник), Слово Амфилохия Иконийского на 4-e воскресенье после Пасхи (№ 16; Гимилиарий Михановича), Слово на среду перед Преполовением (№ 17; Германов сборник), Слово на Преполовение (№ 18; Гимилиарий Михановича), Слово на 5-e воскресенье после Пасхи (№ 19; ноябрьский том Макарьевских Великих Миней), Слово на Вознесение Иоанна элексарха (№ 24; Успенский сборник, Германов сборник), Слово на Пятидесятницу (№ 29; Успенский сборник, Златоуст Ягича), Слово на Пятидесятницу Прока Константинопольского (№ 31; Германов сборник), Слово на Пятидесятницу Кирила Иерусалимского (№ 32; 16. Оглашение; мартовский том Макарьевских Великих Миней), Воскресенье всех святых (№ 33; ноябрьский том Макарьевских Великих Миней).

ad 4. Текст сборника Дамьяна, другие переводы которого изданы: Слово Прокла Константинопольского на Фому неверующего (№ 14; CPG 5832 = BHG 1839; Супрасльский сборник), Слово Амфилохия Иконийского на 4-e воскресенье после Пасхи (№ 16; CPG 3236; Успенский сборник) и Слово Пс.-Иоанна Златоуста на Воскресенье всех святых (№ 34, CPG 4365; Успенский сборник, Гимилиарий Михановича).

В языке Дамьянова сборника встречается относительно мало новых сербозмов (не принимаются во внимание более древние явления – такие, как деназализации носовых гласных и совпадение гласных /i/ и /y/). На графическом уровне отмечено несколько примеров двойного редуцированного в ауслауте в родительном падеже множественного числа (например, пелень, прр(о)къв, узъ, йьчъв). В области фонетики наблюдаются редкие случаи перехода ятв в е/я (напр. тело, целоумне, стеканво, семо). Ещё реже примеры перехода *ъв и *ъв в у (возможно, оутриш [30, 269r13] – ой халквета; *ътри?), но в рукописи почти без исключения пишется глагол взвоуити (стл. взвоити). Болгарское или македонское прояснение редуцированных встречается почти без исключений в склонении слов срќу и лјубу и в их производных, в других лексемах оно преставлено редко (но ср.: брение, книгочие, 1161
последовкъ, тежек, начатьь [33, 294r13]). Часто наблюдается среднеболгарский переход *-ii в -ei, прежде всего в родительном падеже множественного числа существительных и в кратких действительных причастиях прошедшего времени i-глаголов (напр. людемь, ясемь, бд(а)годнянемь; иставлешь, умочеи, створеи). С другой стороны, примеров для поздне-старославянской или среднеболгарской меры юсов почти нет (настоящую [11, 111v17-18], сю [14, 147v22; род.ед.ч.]). В морфологии хорошо представлено распространение окончания -ie именительного падежа множественного числа на io-основы и на согласные основы (напр. идевишь, мужкие, винарике), также часто встречается экспансия интерфикса множественного числа -ov- в именительном падеже (напр. бьсовов, попове) и в других падежах (напр. бьсововь, с(в)нововь). В творительном падеже множественного числа окончание -три расширило область своего первоначального употребления (напр. гръхьми, съ жиовыми). Типично сербской инновацией следует считать окончание -е в твердой разновидности склонения у существительных женского рода, равно как и у прилагательных и местоимений (напр. жены те [3, 46v9], страшишьye [12, 131v13; им.мн.ч.ж.р.], жены [18, 175r5; род.ед.ч.]). Прилагательные нередко изменяются по местоименному склонению (неготовьмы, црѣъемь, кратцымь, гръшьмы). У притяжательных местоимений имеются инновационные южнославянские формы jegov-, segov-, иgов-. Некоторые числительные также склоняются по местоименному склонению или по склонению полных прилагательных (напр. десетишь, цестишъ). Типичным сербским новообразованием является родительный падеж числительного '2' (двыю; вм. стсл. дьвою). У глаголов иногда появляется сербское окончание -то первого лица множественного числа (например, свьмо, дамо, иесмо, приесмо, пиимо). Но если обратиться к более древним параллельным спискам, оказывается, что многие фонетические и морфологические инновационные формы были внесены относительно недавно, ср., например: деветимь (24, 223v2)] Усп. сб. 264625 девямить; родове (32, 285v22)] ВМЧ/март/1 504c7 рьдъ – г'ёнъ.

Возникает вопрос, когда и где были переведены тексты, у которых нет старославянской или древней церковнославянской текстуальной традиции (до XIV в.). Это касается следующих текстов: № 4, № 7, № 11, № 13, № 14, № 17, № 19, № 20, № 21, № 23, № 25, № 26, № 27, № 28, № 34). Для текстов, в которых обнаруживаются болгарские языковые особенности, увеличивается вероятность того, что мы имеем дело с переводом, возникшим позже, чем памятники старославянского языка, т.е. после XI в. Это касается текстов № 4 (ср. дытти [4, 69r14]), № 13 (ср. велеви [7, 84r1, 84r11]), № 7 (ср. настоиовощу [11, 111v17-18], вешеи [11, 112v8]), № 14 (ср. сю [14, 147v22; род.ед.]), № 19 (ср. смоковницу [19, 182v20-21]), № 20 (ср. на пословьы [20, 197r14] – ёп’єгъхьту), № 27 (ср. зврпи [27, 247v5], окурпшпеи [27, 247v22]), № 34 (ввводяхоу [34, 301r3], в нанасти [34, 302r15]).

Дополнительное основание для поздней датировки переведенных текстов – цитаты из Евангелия, совпадающие с редакцией/переводом, составленным в послеканонический период. Назовем хотя бы следующие два примера:


2. выпрошь (28, 258v6)] Мар оумоль (Ио 14.16); Разночтение Дамьянова сборника совпадает с переводом Феофилакта Охридского (ХII в.) (см. Алексеев 1998: 67).
Данные языка, распространение текстов, а также отклонения в некоторых цитатах из Священного Писания - всё это приводит к заключению, что часть текстов в сборнике Дамьянка не были переведены раньше XII или XIII в., а большая их часть - вероятно, в Болгарии или в Македонии. Чтобы удостовериться в правильности этого вывода, следует изучить большее число рукописей, чем было возможно до сих пор.

В итоге проведенных разысканий можно сказать следующее. Сборник Дамьянка представляет собой своеобразный вид сборника с гомилиями Цветного цикла (от Пасхи до Воскресения всех святых). Все переведенные гомилии, автор которых был выявлен - лишь два текста являются исключением в этом отношении - были сочинены греческими отцами церкви. Не встречаются авторы более нового времени. Можно предположить, что архетип нашей рукописи и ее "близнаца", сербского сборника № 299 Библиотеки Румынской академии наук, возник в начале XIV в. или в конце XIII в.. Переводы 34-х текстов нашего сборника возникли частично еще в эпоху старославянских памятников, поскольку они встречаются в старославянских списках (Сборник Клоца, Супрасльский сборник) или в древних церковнославянских рукописях (Торжественный/Златоуст Ф. п. I. 46 из XII в., Успенский сборник XII/ХIII вв., Гомилиарий Михановича, Германов сборник). С другой стороны, некоторые тексты нашего сборника возникли, скорее всего, позже, вероятно, в течение XII или XIII в. В пользу такой хронологии говорит позднее распространение в рукописях, лингвистические критерии и – в отдельных случаях – цитаты Священного Писания в редакции, которая возникла после старославянского периода (например редакция Феофилакта Охридского). В трех случаях текст в Дамьянковом сборнике представляет собой отличающийся от старославянского перевод, который, вероятнее всего, возник в более позднее время. Для традиции переводов греческой патристики (так называемой Nebenüberlieferung) наш сборник дает целый ряд текстов, не указанных в справочнике Clavis Patrum Graecorum: они заслуживают упоминания в будущем дополнительном томе этого издания.

Перечень текстов сборника Дамьянка

1. 1r1-20v14, без начала (Пс.-Епифаний Кипрский, CPG 3768; Нач.: Ћтo se дьньсь bezmьвie na zemli; Клоц Супр Мих Герм)

2. 20v15-31r8 (Пс.-Евсеий Александрийский, CPG 5522 + CPG 5523 + CPG 5526 = BHG 635; Усп., ТСЛ 12, Мих)

3. 31r9-68v22 (Никодимово евангелие)

ЧТЕНИЯ НА ВсСКР(ь)С(Е)НИС г(осподь)нє. дєянєє c(ве)тє троїце. створено Кариномь и Ливешемь. бл(аго)с(ло)ги в(ть)чє : ~

Нач.: Вє имє c(ве)тє троїце, начєть дєяєє cп(а)са и г(оспод)а нашєє Iс(уса) Х(ри) c(т)а. яєє вбрєте Òеudad(о)сєє велиєє ц(єса)вє вє Иєр(у)c(а)л(и)мє.
4. 68v1-72r2 (Леонтий Иерусалимский, CPG 7890; Вологд 431, МДАА48, ТСЛ146)

ИЖЕ Вь С(ВЕ)ТЫИХ(Б) в(ть)ца нашего Ивания злат(o)устаго, слово, на пръславнаго
въскр(ъ)сение г(оспод)а нашего Ис(уса) Х(ри)с(т)а. бл(аго)c(ло)ви w(тв)ъч(e)
Нач.: Бл(аго)го връмѣ и все добропласно. и под(о)бно н(ы)няшнему връмени. и ъмѣше
въру нами c(ве)гопѣвцу D(а)в(ы)ду г(лаго)люющу.

5. 72r3-79r17 (Пс.-Евсеевий Александрийский, CPG 5527 = BHG 635u; РНБ/Ф.р.146, Усп.,
Pc645, Деч84)

Того же Ивания злат(o)устаго слово. на пръславнаго въскр(ъ)сение г(оспод)а нашего
Ис(уса) Х(ри)с(т)а. бл(аго)c(ло)ви, w(тв)ъч(e) : ~
Нач.: Въставъ въ трети д(ь)ень г(оспод)ь нашъ Иc(u)с(то)б. жизнь мирова дакъ, и се
въ нѣци ъ кустодиє приѣшд(ь)ше къ иудеемъ ръше.

6. 79r18-82r22 (Климент Охридский; Мих, Милеш, Хлуд55)

Того же Ивания злат(o)устаго, слово на въскр(ъ)сение x(ри)c(то)во. бл(аго)c(ло)ви,
w(тв)ъч(e) :
Нач.: Д(ь)н(ы)бе възлюблениѣ тѣмная мѣста вѣходить вл(а)д(ы)ка нашъ. д(ь)ньс(ь)
мѣдная врат(а) скурушилъ. д(ь)ньс(ь) затворе жѣлѣзныѣ словиѣ.

7. 82v1-85v4 (Пс.-Златоуст, CPG 4673; Вологд 431, МДАА48, STL146)

Того же Ивания злат(o)устаго слов(о). на с(ве)тоѣ въскр(ъ)сение x(ри)c(то)во. бл(аго)
c(ло)ви, w(тв)ъч(e):
Нач.: Звѣло ми н(ы)ня умѣ дрѣжитъ г(о)с(по)дскаго въскр(ъ)сения, и дивнаго видѣння
тайны.

8. 85v5-92r5 (Оригинал неизвестен; Супр, Мих, Милен, Гомир, Вологд 431, МДАА48, ТСЛ146)

Въ туждѣ нед(ѣ)лю. того же Ивана злат(o)устаго, на въскр(ъ)сение x(ри)c(то)во. вѣ
Лукѣ с(ве)г(а)го вѣн(ы)c(ло)въ. бл(аго)c(ло)ви, w(тв)ъч(e):
Нач.: Въ тѣ д(ь)ньѣ и се два бѣста идуща путемъ. въ вѣсъ сущую далечѣ вѣ Иер(u)с(а)л(и)
ма, Ѣ (= 60) пѣпцѣ. ѣнѣже имѣ ІѢммаус.

9. 92r6-98v15 (Златоуст/Иоанн Экларх, CPG 4425, PG 59.467-471; САНУ19, Вологд 432,
Вологд 433)

Нач.: Отѣдлѣта же пакѣ къ себѣ ученика дивеща сѣ.

10. 98v16-106v22 (Златоуст/Иоанн Экларх, CPG 4425, PG 59.422-425 + ? [Конец не
совпадает]; САНУ19, Вологд 432, Вологд 433)

Нач.: Понѣсѣ рѣч(е) убѣ много имамъ г(лаго)лати, нѣ не можетѣ трѣпѣти мнѣ.

11. 107r1-127v2 (Пс.-Златоуст, CPG 4612; Вологд 432, Вологд 433, Вологд 437)

C(ве)таго Аванасія Архѣп(и)скопа Алеѣндарскаго. сказаніе въ празднѣ пасхѣ.
бл(аго)c(ло)ви w(тв)ъч(e):
Нач.: Вѣчера брать(ъ)ю вѣ нароцѣ пасхѣ нѣчто г(лаго)лахомъ. понѣсѣ быс(тѣ) нѣкая
распра се назнаменахъ вѣ имѣ г(оспод)а нашего Иc(u)с(ри)c(т)а.
12. 127v3-137v22 (Григорий Антиохийский, CPG 7384 [Конец не совпадает]: Усп. Чуд20, Волок431, МДА48, Тих50)

С(вета)го w(ть)ца нашего Григория нисьского, слово. w трид(ь)невнѣвъ высок(ь)сени г(осподь)ни. и w Иуцифъ аримаев. и w мироносцахь. бл(аго)c(lo)ви, w(ть)че:

Нач.: Похвалынь цръ(ь)ковный съ законъ. готовы ны трид(ь)невныя памяти праховати сп(a)са нашего Ис(y)х(rи)c(t)a. слышите убь въвъ въвълюбленаго намь неизрѣч(е)нную тайну.

13. 138r1-139r11 (Пс.-Златоуст, CPG 4605, PG 59.721-724; F.I.829, Деч85, Рс338, МДА48, ТСЛ404)

Иже вѣ с(ве)cъхъ w(ть)ца нашего Іванна архиєпископа квнъстантина града злат(о) устаго. слово учителю: ~

Нач.: Аще кто бл(аг)очестивъ и б(o)голюбивъ. да насладитъ се добръ н(y)няшняго трѣыхъства. Аще кто w рабъ бл(m)агонравныхъ, да вънідьтъ радуе се въ радос(ть) г(осподь) а своевт.

14. 139r12-148r22 (Прокл Константинопольский, CPG 5832 = BHG 1839; МДА48, Волок431; Супр)

ИЖЕ ВѢ С(ВЕ)Г5Б)ХѢ W(ТЬ)ЦѢ НАШЕГѢО Іванна злат(о)устаго. слово. невъръствия ради Θомы ап(о)с(то)в г(осподь)я по пас(цѣ). бл(аго)c(lo)ви w(ть)че: ~

Нач.: Се бо приспѣхъ вамъ длѣть повѣдати. длѣть w менѣ подаваща ієже бѣвае на ползу, и вась вбогощающа. приходитъ бо паки показати се Θомѣ.

15. 148v1-157r22 (Златоуст, CPG 4425, PG 59.473-478 [Конец не совпадает]: Мих, Рс 645, Герм, Гомир, МДА48, ТСЛ146)

ВѢ тужше нед(Ѣ)лю новуѧ, слово. w сказанія еу(аг)г(е)льскаго. бл(аго)c(lo)ви w(ть)че:

Нач.: Θома же ѵєдінь w обою на дес(ѣ)те г(лаго)лѣмѣ близыцы. не бѣяще сѣ ними ѵєдча приде I(су)ы. г(лаго)лаше же ѵєму ученици видѣхомъ г(осподь)а.

16. 157v3-166r9 (Амфилохий Иконийский, CPG 3236; Мих, Рс645, Тих50, F.I.829, Гомир; Супр)

НЕЪ(Ѣ)ЛѢ, Д. (= 4) ИВАН(Ѣ) АРХІЄП(Ѣ)СК(Ѣ)ПА кун(Ѣ)стантина град(Ѣ). слово w раслаблениѧмъ. въ прѣподвѣленіе празд(Ѣ)ника. ієже не судити на лица. бл(аго)c(lo) ви w(ть)чѣ: ~

Нач.: Якаже свѣтоносна луна ноци тѣмою бѣлеши. ієже по земли. ієже по мору плавателемъ. і путивникъмъ свѣть сияющи. не блазѣно швѣствие комуж(Ѣ)до сѣдѣвает(Ѣ).

17. 166v10-169v11 (Пс.-Златоуст, CPG 4652, Ио 7.14; ’Герм, F.I.829, Тих50, МДА48, ТСЛ146)

ВѢ СРѢД(Ѣ). ВѢ ПРѢПѢЛ(Ѣ)ОБѢСѢНѢЕ ПРАЗДѢ(Ѣ)НИКА. ИВАННѢ АРХѢѢПѢ(Ѣ) СКОПѢА КУНѢ(Ѣ)СТАНТИНА ГРАД(Ѣ)А ЗЛАТ(Ѣ)ОУСТАГѢО. слово. ієдѣ възьды И(су)съ въ црѢ(Ъ)къва вѣбл(Ѣ)аго)c(lo)ви w(ть)чѣ:

Нач.: Идѣже вѣбл(Ѣ)дѣка яко источникъ живутъ тѣлесно придеть. многыѣ и различныѣ истачаетъ капле чл(Ѣ)вѢ(Ѣ)колюбіе. възіде на гору сѣ ученики по бл(Ѣ)женѢмъ высокѢ сени.
18. 169v12-176r16 (Пс.-Златоуст, CPG 4651; Мих, Хлуд55, Деч84, Гомир, Тих50, F.I.829)
Тогожде иже въ с(ве)тъхъ въ(ть)ца нашего Иванна архієп(ис)кopa квнъ(ь)станъстанътина (!) градъ(а) златъ(о)устаго. слов(о). кгда възиде I(с)у съ въ с(ве)тилище пръполовльшу се праздн(ь)ника, и въ Мелъ(х)иседѣцъ: благослови, втѣчъ: ~
Нач.: Шипълъ. яблоко же. и финцѣ. и прочи плодъ(ов)е дрѣвъесни. тѣлесны грытанъ всладчаваютъ.

19. 176r17-196v21 (Пс.-Златоуст, CPG 4592; Тих50, МДА48, ВМЧ/Ноябрь)
НѢД(ѣ)ЛѢ, Е. (= 5) Иванна злат(о)устаго слово. кгда исцѣлъ Х(ристо)сь слѣпца. въ судѣ. и въ м(и)лостыни. бл(аго)слови, в(тѣ)чѣ: ~
Нач.: Многа и различна суть с(ве)тъхъ книгъ учения. юдина же бл(а)г(о)д(а)ть сияюща на всѣхъ. и идѣнъ источникъ ʿчения д(у)хъ истинъны.

20. 197r1-203r22 (Пс.-Златоуст, CPG 4534; F.I.829)
ИЖЕ ВѢ С(Ѣ)ВѢТѢХЪ(Ѣ) ВѢ(Ѣ)ТѢ ТѢ(Ѣ)А(Ѣ) НѢАГѢ(Ѣ) Иванна злат(о)устаго. арх-еп(и)скoпa квнъ(ь)станъстанъ градъ(а). слово. на с(ве)тое възнесение
Нач.: Свѣтълъ праздникъ(и)никъ Х(ри)ста(р)ова смотрѣніе, просвѣщѣніе бѣ вѣрныѣхъ сръ(ѣ) д(ѣ)ца, свѣтлѣ же и првѣдѣствующаго праздникъника вещъ. почто же свѣтлѣ. въ прѣдѣ(ѣ) лежѣ(и) г(лагол)ъ покажемъ.

21. 203v1-209v10 (Пс.-Златоуст, CPG 4532; *Миленъ, F.I.829)
Иже въ с(ве)тъхъ въ(ть)ца нашего. Ивана архіеп(ис)копа квнѣстантина градъ(а) златъ(о) устаго, слово, в. (= 2) на възнесение г(оспод)а нашего Ис(у)х(ри)с(т)а. бл(аго)с(ло)ви, в(тѣ)чѣ: ~
Нач.: Бл(аго)с(ло)вѣнь бѣ(т)ъ. блѣ(д)о врѣмѣ дѣ(и)н(ы)ѣ всѣмъ намъ въззупити прорѣ(т)ъ хъскоѣ слово, въ вѣкѣпѣ всѣмъ намъ блѣ(д)о(и)къ вѣспѣти и г(лагол)ълати.

22. 209v11-216r1 (Пс.-Епифаний Кипрскій, CPG 3770; Деч147)
Иже въ с(ве)тъхъ въ(ть)ца нашего Епифания архієпископа кирпскаго. слово, на възнесеніе г(оспод)а нашего Ис(у)х(ри)с(т)а. блѣ(д)о г(ослови, в(тѣ)чѣ: ~
Нач.: Блѣ(д)о с(ло)вѣнъ бѣ(т)ѣ. красота плѣти вѣзложенѣ тѣлѣ главѣ. украшеніе же праздникъ(и)никъ, дѣ(и)ныѣ праздникъ(и)никъ.

23. 216r2-220v13 (Диадоха Фотицкій, CPG 6107; Хил467, Хил473, Деч147, Рил 4/11)
Диадоха еп(и)скoпа фochtик-искаго слово. на възнесеніе г(оспод)а нашего Ис(у)х(ри)с(т)а. блѣ(д)о г(ослови, в(тѣ)чѣ: ~
Нач.: Приведи мнѣ(и) мѣе иудейскіе жьръѣ. годъ бо побѣдѣныхъ словецъ. принеси съмѣо црѣ(ѣ)вѣпече и х(ри)с(то)ѣ проповѣдникъ, г(лагол)ъ ли и написуи, твоиѣ крѣпкѣ истинѣ.

24. 220v14-225v20 (Иоаннъ Экзархъ; Усп, Мих, Герм, ТСЛ9, ХАЗУ IIIс22, МДА48)
Слово на възнесеніе г(оспод)а бѣ(т)ѣа сп(а)са нашего Ис(у)х(ри)с(т)а. блѣ(д)о г(ослови в(тѣ) чѣ: ~
Нач.: Всеслѣте се нѣ(ч)ѣбѣ(с)а и радуи се землѣ, понѣже послѣднюю стѣну прѣграѣдѣ раздрушивъ И(с)у.
25. 226r1-235v22 (Северный Гавальский, CPG 4211; Е.1.829, Деч147, Рил4/7, Рил4/11)

Иже Въ С(ВЕ)ТЫХ(Ь) О(ТБ)ЦА НАШЕГО ИОАННА злат(о)устаго, арх-еп(и)скопа
кнъ станина град(а). слово на с(ве)тую петидесетницу, бл(аго)(с)(ло)ви w(ть)че : ~
Нач.: Всакы убо д(ь)нь свѣтъль. слѣнчы нѣше носеши вбѣцаго свѣтъта украшаеъмьи.
тако бо вл(а)д(ы)ка украсивъ тварь. приведе посрѣд(Ь).

26. 236r1-243v11 (Златоуст, CPG 4425, PG 59.283-286/288 [Конец не совпадает]; Погод1024,
Погод850)
Тогожде Иованна злат(о)устаго слово. вѣ сказания еу(аг)т(е)льска, бл(аго)с(ло)ви, w(ть)
ч(е) : ~
Нач.: Вѣ послѣднѣй д(ь)нь великааго празд(Ь)ника, зваще І(су)сь г(лаго)лѣ, аще кто
жаждеть да придетъ къ мнѣ и пиетъ.

27. 243v12-252v8 (Пс.-Златоуст, CPG 4536; Мих, Хлуд55, Гомир)
Тогожде Иованна злат(о)устаго, слово. вѣ с(ве)тъмь д(ь)нь съ, на, н (= 50) тны д(ь)нь : ~
Нач.: Н(е)бо намъ д(ь)ньс(ь) бѣсътѣй земля. не звѣздамъ съ н(е)бъсе на землю сыщд(ь)
шемъ.

28. 252v9-258v22 (Оригинал неизвестен; Тих50, Рс645, Деч84, МДА48, Волок431)
Тогожде Иованна злат(о)устаго слово. вѣ петидесетницу, бл(аго)(с)(ло)ви. w(ть)че : ~
Нач.: Дм(ь)ховни бл(аг)т(о)(д)ати съ н(е)бъсе намъ просвѣтѣвши се. д(у)ховно бо пѣніемъ,
д(ь)ховнымъ вѣспо съ(ве)т(а)го д(ь)ха бл(аг)(о)(д)ати, ше и конец не совпадает]; 
Тих50, Рс645, МДА48, Волок431)

29. 259r1-266v17 (Златоуст, CPG 4343; Усп, ТСЛ19, Златоуст Ягица, Тих50)
на сыщвтѣнь съ(ве)т(а)го д(ь)ха слово. бл(аго)(с)(ло)ви w(ть)ч(е) : ~
Нач.: Пакы намъ въ друзья радость. пакы празд(Ь)никъ свѣтъль. пакы веселѣемъ д(ь)ховное,
чесо же ради толико веселѣемъ. понѣже съ(ве)тѣмъ д(ь)ха къ намъ снідѣ,

30. 266v18-270r6 (Василий Селевкийский/Прокл Константинопольский, CPG 6665; Тих50,
Рил4/11, Хил84, МДА48)
Василия еп(и)ск(р)опа исаврійскаго град(а) Селевкіе, слово въ томъжде :
Нач.: Честа убѣ нѣвъ успѣшна д(у)ши цв(ь)ковая позорица. учения бо сдѣрѣжане,
въ нѣже пришьдѣ прилежече и т(лаго)люще ізыкѣы.

31. 270r7-272r5 (Прокл Константинопольский, CPG 5815; Герм, Гомир, МДА48)
С(вѣ)таго w(ть)ца нашего Прокла, архіеп(и)ск(р)опа ц(ѣ)саргра(д)а слово, на
петидесетны д(ь)нь, бл(аго)(с)(ло)ви w(ть)ч(е) : ~
Нач.: Дм(ь)н(ь)съ брат(Ь)е надѣе съ(ве)т(а)го д(ь)ха бл(аг)(о)(д)ати. начинаящѣ се вѣд(ь)
нѣшао д(ь)нъ. и вѣбѣдѣшее вѣрѣмъ даже и до сего д(ь)не. и величаеъма бываѣсть.

32. 272r6-290v17 (CPG 3585, Кирхля Иерусалимский, Оглашеніе 16; TSL146)
о съ(ве)тѣмъ д(ь)съ слово. на петидесетны д(ь)нь. бл(аг)ослови w(ть)ч(е) : ~
Нач.: Дм(ь)ховно и истинъно трѣбѣвъ юс(ь)тъ дарвъ. да въ с(ве)тѣмъ д(ь)съ побесѣдуюемся не да
ѣже по дос(т)оинству реч(ѣ)мъ.
33. 290v18-297r22 (Пс.-Евсевий Александрийский, CPG 5525 = ВНГ 635с; ВМЧ/Nov., Чув1, Беломор4)
С(ве)т(а)го w(ть)ца нашего євсевиї. еп(и)скопа град(а) Алеєндріє. слово. о с(ве)т(а)го нед(ь)ди. бл(аго)c(ло)ви, w(ть)че : ~
Нач.: По утрьни въ с(ве)ту нед(ь)лю, съдешь бл(а)женому Ієвсевію еп(и)скопу, пришь(ь) Алеєндрь въпроси бл(а)женаго r(лаго)лює. r(оспод)и мои чесо ради не дѣлаетъ въ нед(ь)лю.

34. 297v1-308v23 (Златоуст, CPG 4365; ≠ Усп, ТСЛ 9, Мих; = Рил4/11)
ІЖЕ Вѣ С(ВЕ)ТѣИХ(Б) W(ТЬ)ЦА НАШЕГО Іванна злат(о)устаго. архієп(и)скопа квн’стантина града. похвала въсъмь с(ве)т(а)го. бл(аго)c(ло)ви, w(ть)че < ~
Нач.: Понеже петидесетницу с(ве)т(а)го празд(ь)ника съврьшисмо. паче же и ѣще не мимо идоще седмочислн-и д(ь)ние, и пакы приспѣ намъ м(у)ч(е)никымъ съборь.

Список сокращений

Беломор – БАН, Беломорское собрание
ВМЧ – Великие Минеи Четы
Волок – РГБ, собрание Иосифо-Волоколамского монастыря
Герм – Германов сборник
Гомир – Торжественник из монастыря Гомирье
Деч – Собрание Дечанского монастыря
Клюц – Клюцов сборник
МДА – РГБ, собрание Московской духовной академии
Милеш – Милешевский торжественник
Мих – Гомилиарий Михановича
Пого́д – РНБ, Собрание Погодина
Рил – Рыльский монастырь
Рс – Народная библиотека Сербии
САНУ – Архив Сербской Академии наук
Супр – Супрасланская рукопись
Тих – РНБ, собрание Тиханова
ТСЛ – РГБ, собрание Троице-Сергиевой лавры
Усп – Успенский сборник
ХАЗУ (= HAZU) – Архив Хорватской Академии наук
Хил – Хиландарский монастырь
Хлуд – ГИМ, собрание Хлудова
Чув – РГБ, собрание Чуванова
Чуд – ГИМ, собрание Чудова монастыря
F.I.829 – РНБ, Основное собрание
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Сербский перевод Евергетидского синаксаря в двух синайских рукописях

Известна связь между Стефаном Неманей и монастырем Богородицы Евергетиды в Константинополе. По житиям Немани и Саввы знаем, что отец и сын богато одаривали Евергетидский монастырь, и по этому считаются его ктиторами. А. Дмитриевский в 1895 году обнаружил генетическую связь между Хilandарским и Евергетидским типиконами (далее ХТ, ЕТ), что дало начало новым исследованиям. В работе Ягича 1898 года подробно представлено отношение между монастырскими типиконами Саввы и ЕТ.

А. Дмитриевский предположил, что в ктиторско-дисциплинарной части ЕТ, стараниями Саввы была переведена и вторая, литургическая часть, и что она будет непременно обнаружена. Ягич оспорил эту точку зрения, считаая, что упоминания синаксаря в ХТ не имеют большого значения, поскольку они механически перенесены из греческого подлинника. Он первым высказал мнение, что в Хиландаре использован какой-то из уже существующих славянских переводов синаксаря, наиболее вероятно, русский перевод XI–XII веков. Д. Ананасиевич с помощью даты празднования смерти св. Саввы, убедительно показал, что в Сербской церкви в XIII–XIV веках следовали Евергетидскому синаксарю (ЕС), и что во времени Саввы был переведен весь ЕТ. Мнение Ананасиевича опорожил П. Попович, опираясь на изменение взглядов А. Дмитриевского (1905). К точке зрения Ананасиевича вернулся Дж. Сп. Радоичич (1951), обративший внимание на сведения о сербском требнике с синаксарем по уставу св. Богородицы Евергетидской в описании „старой“ синайской колекции рукописей под номером 16. По его мнению это значимое свидетельство, что во время св. Саввы был переведен и ЕС.

Позднее этот вопрос был оставлен в стороне, так как упомянутая синайская рукопись была недоступна сербским исследователям, а иных доказательств, подкрепляющих такие предположения, не обнаруживалось. Так, Д. Богданович констатировал, что ЕС не был переведен. Укрепился взгляд Ягича, что сербская братия монастыря Хиландара в первые годы после основания обители использовала в богослужебной практике древнерусский синаксарь. Примечательно, что в греческом перечне 1142 года русских богослужебных книг в Силургу указаны некие „четыре синаксаря“. Под „синаксарями“ подразумевались богослужебные уставы или их части, и поэтому возможно, что речь идет о списке древнерусского перевода Типикона патриарха Алексия Студита, в названии которого также появляется слово „синаксарь“ (Пентковский 2001). Но поскольку „синаксарем“ именуется несколько разных литургических понятий, то поэтому здесь (так же как в отношении всего вопроса существования целостного ЕС в сербской редакции) следует быть осторожным. Феодосий Хиландарец определенно говорит о том, что сербская община на Святой Горе пользовалась тем типиконом, какой соблюдался в Ватопеде: Явник приходит в прелюбодейный оть Екатерина въ свои цънастьры, плаголкнй Хиланарг... съякушала же о господи елеству, и по овьгри) службе...
и пётъ оставъ уздачииншъ. икже оть Батопьа навикста. На Святой Горе того времени был распространен особый святогорско-студитский типikon (Пентковский 2001). Л. Миркович предполагал, что св. Савва получил от русских из Ватопеда славянский синаксарь, каким они пользовались в этом греческом монастыре.

Сообщение Доментиана о введении Саввой святогорских правил на родине, по мнению Р. Груича, должно быть понято в дисциплинарном смысле. Посредством новообразованной архимандритии Студеница, Савва мог в Сербии расширять и евергетидские и святогорские дисциплинарные и богослужебные традиции, в сочетании, которое он полагал наиболее соответствующим (степень приспособления хорошо видна при сопоставлении Студеницкого и Хиландарского типиков). У Доментиана имеется также сообщение о той же склонности к эклектизму в более поздней реформаторской деятельности Саввы, когда он обратился к вселенским и иерусалимским традициям, „беря от обеих лучшее“.

Конечно, привлекательна возможность, что ЕТ был полностью преведен для сербских потребностей: сначала пролог 1199/1200, а затем и синаксарь, после переработки пролога для монастыря Хиландарь (1200/1201), до ухода Саввы в Сербию. Исходя из того, что Савва после своего возвращения на родину, не располагал больше (согласно ранее высказанному нами мнению) греческим прологом, можно считать, что у него не было и синаксаря, и поэтому совокупная гипотетическая работа над этой книгой должна быть связана с святогорским периодом его деятельности. Но греческий источник, по практическим причинам, возможно, не представлял единого книжного целого. В определенный момент, сербское духовенство во главе с монахом Саввой повернулось к константинопольскому как „вселенскому“ патриарху, и в свете этого выбор целостного типикона самого почитаемого константинопольского монастыря получил бы новое оправдание, а вероятно, и новую динамику. Следовательно, над синаксарем можно было работать до отъезда Саввы на Святую Гору в 1217 году. Наиболее вероятным кажется, что Савва мог унести такой типикон в Никуе в том же году вселенскому патриарху, для ознакомления и для того, чтобы оправдать стремления и церковно-литургическую зрелость своей общины.

Сегодня имеются два синайских литургических сборника с сербославянским преводом „Евергетидского синаксаря“, из старой и новой коллекций рукописей, Sin. slav. 2 (XIV век) и Sin. slav. 14/N (XIII век), обе недостаточно известны. Первую рукопись можем изучать посредством микрофильмов, сделанных в американской миссии в монастыре Св. Екатерины в 1950 году, а касательно другой имеется только солидное описание в каталоге И. Тарнанидиса 1988 года.

Старший литургический сборник с Синай датируется первыми десятилетиями XIII века. Из этого следовала бы его прямая связь со св. Саввой. Савва посетил Синай на своем втором путешествии в Святую землю, в течение Великого поста в 1235 году. На основе факсимиле двух страниц из Sin. slav. 14/N, объявленных в каталоге И. Тарнанидиса, мы провели новую датировку, приняв во внимание несколько надежных параметров: а) изобразительная форма заглавия и инициалов в духе эпохи Милутина (имеются очевидные сходства с двумя грамотами из сокровищницы Хиландара – списком хрисовула Владислава монастырь Св. Богородицы на Бистрице, которую мы датируем 80-ми и 90-ми годами XIII века, а также список хрисовула Милутина монастырь Хиландару в свитке, который А. А. Туролов датирует.
второй четвертью XIV века); б) палеографический анализ рукописи; в) орфографический анализ (переходный фазис от ранней к зрелой рашкой орфографии в окончательной стадии, соответствующей последним десятилетиям XIII века). Сборник поэтому (пере)писан после смерти Саввы (1236). Это исключает возможность, что он является второй частью некогда единой книги с сербославянским переводом ET (первой частью был бы ХТ или СТ).

Младший сборник переписал известный писец Равула. Книга принадлежит старой коллекции монастыря Св. Екатарини (Sin. slav. 2). К целому был присоединен и фрагмент, обнаруженный в 1975 году (Sin. slav. 32/N), который И. Тарнанидис филологически датировал периодом 1360–1370 гг. Л. Цернич атрибутировала Равуле несколько рукописей: Евангелие из Парижа, Апостол-Евангелие из Дублина и Сборник из монастыря Св. Екатарини. Рукопись из Дублина некогда была списана с Октоихом, пока была в Белграде (до 1915 г.). Октоих недавно на Гарварде узнал С. Ю. Темчин. Книги, над которыми работал Равула сохраняют заметную старину. Гарвардский октоих имеет арханчичную структуру текста и тропари Канона покаянного шестого гласа Климента Охридского, также как некоторые другие сербославянские списки, прежде всего Милутинов октоих конца XIII – начала XIV века (Убийнин 2013), в отношении которого М. Йовчева установила, что особым образом отражает применение ET в сербской литургической практике.

М. Йовчева пришла к выводу, что король Милутин подарил Октоих монастырю Св. Архангела в Иерусалиме (основанном в 1312/1313 г.), и что книга позже была перемещена в Лавру Св. Саввы Освященного. По ее мнению, Октоих возник как компилляция арханчих источников, к которым можно было обратиться в монастыре Св. Екатарини. Возможно, что книга была писана на Синае на заказ Милутина, но недоумение может вызывать возникновение родственного Гарвардского октоиха в Сиринчах 1353 године. Проблему можно релитивизировать реальной возможностью цируклации сербских книг между центральной Сербией и Синаем. С другой стороны, факт, что в сербской среде достаточно долго задержались богослужебные книги, опирающиеся на Евергетидский богослужебный образец. В житии св. Саввы Домениана упоминается изображение Богородицы Евергети под монастырь Св. Екатерины, что говорит о возможном существовании культа Богородицы Евергети в синайском монастыре (а именно, Савва, входя „в монастырь Пречистой Богородицы, поклонился святой церкви и той самой Благодетельнице и святому месту где купина, горевшая в огне, не сгорела“).

Если мы сравним текст списка Равулы с тем, который частично доступен в старшем сборнике, то увидим принципиальное совпадение между ними. Все хронологические формулы о продолжительности месяцев и день, что писан приведен в каталоге, в основе совпадают с формулами в сборнике Равулы, но эти формулы в топонимах в общем близки. Обнаруживается маленькое несовпадение в рамках февраля, а самое заметное отличие имеется в заглавиях: б) к(π) тη(ν) эγκαταστάσεις тης Θεοτόκου ΤΗΣ ΕΥΕΡΓΕΤΙΔΟΣ.
значит, что на Синае (?) существовала некая традиция переписывания этого текста, но также потребность в его умножении. Главное определение Богородицы в основном один и тот же, „(Je)вергетска“, что соответствует греческому корректу. Даже можно сказать, что в заглавии младшего сборника представлен старший образец, до редакции, с которым совпадает особая форма, образованная посредством аферезиса (с потерей начальной группы je-), свойственная народному языку. Речь идет об особенности устной традиции, или об остатке более глубокой старины в книжном языке.

И. Тарнанидис в своем описании сообщил о тропаре 4-го гласа преподобному Кириллу. Тот же тропарь имеется и в младшем синайском сборнике (Θτα] плинь примкни итд.). Не все слова тождественны, но все-таки речь идет об одном и том же текстологическом варианте.

Хотя в настоящий момент у нас нет возможности непосредственно сопоставить эти два сборника, можем приблизительно сравнить их объем. В качестве достоверного образца будем использовать фотографию открытой книги в каталоге И. Тарнанидиса. Сравнение плотности и объема текста в месячесловной части обоих синайских сборников приводит нас к выводу, что у младшей рукописи в два раза более длинный текст, чем у старшей. Самое вероятное, что в сборниках представлен один и тот же сербославянски перевод EC, с тем, что в Sin. slav. 2 сохранен его более широкий вариант (в настоящий момент трудно сказать идет ли речь о раннем сокращении перевода в Sin. slav. 14/N или о его более позднем расширении в Sin. slav. 2, под влиянием других источников).


На примере праздников в декабре, можно показать месячесловные различия между сербославянским и греческим текстами Типикона, установленные посредством сравнения Синайского кодекса, н. 2 и Афинской рукописи, н. 788. Особенное внимание мы уделили замечаниям архиепископа Сергия в Полном месячеслове Востока, но и Типikonu патриарха Алексия Студита и Иерусалимскому типикону архиепископа Никодима. Выяснилось, что наш список отражает какую-то особенную, местную традицию ET, возникшую путем переработки. Большинство отклонений идет в пользу принципиального совпадения с Иерусалимским типиконом. В младшем сборнике встречаются и следы святогорского влияния на различных уровнях. В ранее интегрированном тексте месячесловя отмечена память св. Петра Афонского (12 июня) и св. отца Афанасия Афонского (5 июля). Особое значение имеют старшие славянские и актуальные сербские праздники, включенные в сам текст: Кирил Философ (14 февраля); священномученик Климент [Римский] (25 ноября), на том же месте отмечен и в греческом ET; святой Ахиил [Ларисский] (15 мая); преподобный Савва, первый архиепископ сербский (14 января); святой Симон Сербский (13 февраля); позднее Равула добавил святого Арсения [Сербского] (28 октября). Введение памяти Арсения может быть релевантным для установления нижней границы возникновения или редактирования непосредственного источника кодекса Равулы. Первая память Арсения под
той же датой имеется в праксапостоле иеромонаха Гервасия 1312/1316 (Рочкоманович 2008). Существует и несколько старшая память, но в марте, в евангелии Бунила (С. Ялесиевич). Возможно, что непосредственный источник Sin. slav. 2 был сформирован в первые десятилетия XIV века, когда, только что, начали включать в сербские месяцесловы [в рамках месяца октября] память архиепископа Арсения I, наследника Саввы на архиерейском троне.

Заметно, что атрибут Богородицы остается непереведенным, в отличие от монастырских типионов Саввы. В обоих типионах существуют доказательства того, что в справочном переводе пролога ЕТ выбран славянский эквивалент греческого атрибута Еὐερύητις. Это могло бы быть важным признаком того, что сохраненный перевод синаксаря не соответствует ни времени (рубеж XII–XIII вв.), ни переводческой мастерской, в которой возникла сербская версия Евергетидского пролога.

На примере состояния в житиях, составленных Доментианом и Феодосием, представителями различных эпох, можно понять общую траекторию отношения к этому характерному атрибуту в сербской литературе у авторов, работа которых проходила в греческо-славянской среде. Для Доментиана, как старшего писателя (был активен в 1250/1260 годы) характерно использование названия блажедательница/блажедательница. Первая форма представлена в списках ХТ второй половины XIV века, а вторая форма - в старейшем списке ХТ и СТ (Савич 2013), что значит, что он является первоначальным. В Житии св. Саввы Доментиана два раза, в экспликации и в дополнении, появляется форма квиъгетица, с элементарной адаптацией грецизма. У Феодосия, несколько десятилетий позже (1280/1290 годы), Богородица регулярно квиъгетица, и только один раз в экспликации блажедательница.

Какому из этих состояний более близок атрибут, засвидетельствованный в обеих синайских литургических книгах ((κ)κιβιγετκες)? Он принадлежит младшему слою, оппонирующему картине, представленной в ХТ и СТ, а также Доментиану. Из-за сохранения грецизма, это, принципиально, соответствует состоянию, подтвержденном в сочинении Феодосия. Во времена Феодосия мы видим уже стабилизированный грецизм, прошедший дополнительную, словообразовательную адаптацию, получив суффикс -ица: квиъгетица. В случае литургических сборников речь идет о прямой трансформации грецеского основания в славянскую атрибутивную форму, но все-таки вероятно на основе книжного отношения, поскольку заимствование произошло через номинальную форму Еὐερύητις-ς, и не через родительный падеж (Εὐερύητιδ-ος): квиъгти-κ. Типологически здесь речь может идти о переходном фазисе между корпусами Доментиана и Феодосия. В морфологическом смысле, время Доментиана ближе, но в отношении принципиального определения за грецизм вместо славянизма, на уровне совокупной частотности обоих вариантов, приближается к времени Феодосия. Приблизительно можно говорить о последнем десятилетии правления Уроша и начале правления Драгутина.

* 

Обе рукописи, и по времени переписывания и стариной формы своих составов принадлежат к временам после Саввы. Старшая рукопись переписана в последние десятилетия XIII века. О младшей рукописи известно, на основе надежных выводов И. Таррантиса, сообщенных относительно отдельного фрагмента, что возникла во второй половине XIV века. Особенно важен тот факт, что младшую рукопись переписал известный писец Равула,
переписывавший кодексы архаичного состава. Между ними выделяется Гарвардский октоих, близок октоиху Милутина, в котором особым образом проявляется применение ЕТ. Интерес к этому типику достаточно долго поддерживался между сербскими монахами (на Синае). Ставится вопрос, можно ли это отнести к какому-то особому, местному культу. В Житии св. Саввы Домениана упоминается существование иконы Богородицы Евергетиды в „монастыре Пречистой Богородицы“ на Синае.

Отношение обоих литургических сборников к греческому ЕС достаточно свободно. Между ними нет простой эквивалентности, но их тексты прошли переработку. Дж. Сп. Радоичич сделал правильный вывод „что синаксарь не составил бы 400 печатных страниц как греческий подлинник из типиcona“, и что „синайская рукопись“ по физическим причинам „не может охватывать много текста“. Радоичич увидел, что „он должен иметь характер обычных синаксарей-месицесловов, которые встречаются в рукописях“, и что речь идет о „сокращенном тексте ЕС“.

В основе обоих рукописных текста мог бы лежать один и тот же перевод, возникший, наиболее вероятно, в поздние 1270 годы. Поскольку младший сборник имеет в два раза больший объем, он или сохраняет первоначальный, более длинный текст, или является результатом более поздних переработок и дополнений. Его непосредственный источник был сформирован в прые десятилетия XIV века. В нем можно заметить элементы других богослужебных традиций, отличных от евергетидской.
Церковный раскол, как самое значительное религиозное движение в отечественной истории, вызвал к жизни острые дискуссии по целому ряду богословских и литургических вопросов. Их обсуждение не было возможным без привлечения отеческих авторитета и писаний Восточной Церкви. Наследие византийской церковной письменности давало подчас решающие аргументы в жесткой полемике. Имена и труды Дионисия Ареопагита, Иоанна Златоуста, Иоанна Дамаскина и других представителей святоотеческого наследия с первых моментов полемики вокруг церковного раскола постоянно использовались всеми сторонами, которые прямо обращались к ним в своих текстах за утверждением «истины». Именно в эту эпоху начинает регулярно переводиться и издаваться в виде сборников и монографичных изданий корпус византийской патристики на значительной части территории Slavia Orthodoxa.

Инициированный патриархом Никоном сборник «Скрижаль» должен был стать своего рода компендиумом сведений о церковной практике Восточной Церкви (греческой), а также источником исправления разных церковных «нестроений». В составе этого сборника были опубликованы, в том числе, толкования Афанасия Александрийского, защитника православия в период борьбы с арианами (IV в.), на евангельские притчи, а также некоторые избранные места из Евангеля и Ветхого Завета – важная часть весьма неполно сохранившегося эпистемического наследия этого Отца Церкви. Толкования Афанасия Великого посвящены основам христианского вероучения, которые ему приходилось защищать от врагов – о единосущии Спасителя, вочеловечении Христа как залоге спасения смертного человека, ипостасях Троицы. Кроме того, в «Скрижаль» были включены «Вопросо-ответы к Антиоху» псевдо-Афанасия (древнейший список известен в Изборнике 1076 г.) – хорошо известный и популярный памятник византийской литературы (VI–VII вв.), освещающий разные вопросы в «божественном писании» («о множих и нужных вопросах в божественных писаниях недоумеваемых»), которые должны были ведомы всем христианам (о единстве Троицы, чинах ангельских, причинах разделения христианства ересиями, признаках пришествия Антихриста и др). В источниках эпохи «Скрижаль» известна под названием «Книги церковные: Литургия Иоанна Златоуста, и о Седми тайнах церковных в толку и Афанасия Александрийского ответы о вских вещеи, и о божестве и о крестном знамении». Так, в последнем покаянном свитке Никита Суздалец признавал свою вину и сообщал [Материалы 1875: 391]: «книгу Скрижаль гостьствует похвалами почитати, понеже собою многие нам тайны, и неведомья вещи яко открывает и ум очищает, аз же <…> великаго по богословии Афанасия Александрийского, Василия Великаго, и прочих, приведенная в ней в достоверное свидетельство, ересию называх». Таким образом, с первых же эпизодов
полемики вокруг раскола постулировался великий авторитет византийских церковных писателей, словно бы санкционирующих правоту той или иной стороны дискуссий.

На долгое время и сразу же с началом раскола особую актуальность приобрели имена одного из крупнейших представителей Антиохийского богословия Феодорита, епископа Кирского (†457), и свт. Мелетия Антиохийского (†381). После распространения указа Никона о поклонах в четырнадцатницу и изменении перстосложения в феврале 1653 г. Иван Неронов в послании царю писал о недопустимости принятия троеперстия, ссылаясь на известное сказание о патриархе Мелетии Антиохийском, а также писания Феодорита. Эти тексты были основными авторитетными источниками для защитников двуперстия. Они оспариваются в разных частях сборника «Скрижаль». Наиболее простой текст на эту тему – «Слово отвещательное» патриарха Никона. В нем подчеркивается, что восточные патриархи своим соборным авторитетом указали на неистинность «Феодоритовых писаний», не утвержденных «повелением коего царя или патриарха» [Труды 2004: 93]. Никон предлагает богословское «мудрое слово», объясняющее неприемлемость толкования Феодорита о двуперстии, к тому времени вошедших в русскую книжность. Неоспоримым аргументом в «Слове» против каноничности писаний Феодорита выглядит ссылка на Деяния третьего Вселенского собора о прегрешениях Феодорита в связи с его выступлениями против Кирила Александрийского. Наконец, решение спора о правильном понимании сказания о перстосложении Мелетия Антиохийского, которое трактовалось «раскольниками» и их противниками по-разному, произошло, согласно «Слову», в день памяти свт. Мелетия на литургии в Чудовом монастыре, благодаря проповеди Макарий Антиохийский о троеперстии патриарха Мелетия.

В единственной рукописи (кон. XVII в.), в которую входят списки полемических текстов, связанных со спорами латинствующих и греофилов, находится текст неизвестного авторства, рассказывающий одну из типичных историй «исцеления» от «раскольнических» заблуждений. Текст озаглавлен «О том же крестном знамении четырех братьев Плещеевых» (ГИМ. Синод. 346. Л. 1695–1698). Можно предположить, что имеются в виду именно те Плещеевы, которые являлись духовными чадами Неронова. Перестав покориться Церкви в вопросе о троеперстном сложении, братья перешли на двуперстие, готовясь даже принять смерть. В качестве главного их авторитета в данном вопросе названы писания Феодорита Кирского. Пространное опровержение этих сочинений Феодорита построено на изложении его неприглядной роли в истории ранней Церкви, что лишь коротко затрагивалось в разных антстарообрядческих текстах второй половины XVII в., но никогда не излагалось столь подробно. Братья Плещеевы образумились после того, как прочитали проложный текст о благословении Мелетия Антиохийского. Кроме того, братья от своего имени сообщают о том, что они были на службе, возглавляющейся Макарием Антиохийским в Чудовом монастыре вместе с патриархом Никоном. В еще одном рукописном прении (нач. 1670-х гг. НИОР РГБ. Ф. 310. № 1366) представлен спор об общепринятого «капитона» и его противника из патриаршей Церкви. По мере развития диалога с православным, «раскольник» излагает основные свои воззрения, которые последовательно опровергаются оппонентом. Крестное знамение он наносил «по блаженному Феодориту», т.е. двумя перстами. В этом произведении приведены аргументы против авторитета блаженного Феодорита в вопросе о перстосложении. Опровержение писаний Феодорита опирается на его отрицательную роль в церковной

В «прении» Арсения Суханова еще до начала полемики о перстосложении был прояснен вопрос о Феодорите: «Что может быть, яко той же переведе ся в разуме добре истинно, что хотел быти святый Феодорит <…> понеже не глаголет святый Феодорит: да соединим перст наш великий первый со двема последнема, но толико: три персты – истинна Святая Троица» (URL: http://krotov.info/acts/172/1650suhanov.htm (дата обращения: 03.04.16)). Речь шла только об общей идее троицности. Согласно «официальной» церковной позиции, сам Максим Грек должен был по поручению митрополита Даниила переводить с греческого писания Феодорита

Одним из принципиальных вопросов полемики стало время пресуществления Святых Даров. Соловецкие «сидельцы» обращали внимание царя на то, что сторонники патриарха Никона «во свидетельство о сем не предложили ни единоаг от апостол или святых» [Чумичева 2009: 317]. Для составителей целебнической «Николаево злое предание» (Николая Кавасилы), на которое в значительной мере опирался в «Жезле» Симеон Полоцкий, не имело авторитета. По толкованию Кавасилы, «ще же нечис суть, вхоющий священику со Дары, на землю падающыя и аки тело и кровь Христову преносимые Дары почитающи и молящии, входом Преждеосвященных даров преложены суть» [Материалы 1895: 100]. Т.е. Кавасила говорит о допустимости поклонов на Великом входе Телу и Крови только во время Преждеосвященной литургии. В «Поморских ответах» был привлечен новый аргумент для оправдания поклонения Дарам на Великом входе. Авторы обратились к толкованию Симеона Солунского. Они подчеркивали, что обвинения в «идолослужении» в случае поклонения божественным Дарам и воздания им чести, как «возложенным» Богу через молитвы, пусть и несовершенным, неуместны, поскольку они, «якоже принесенные чрез...»
боржественные молитвы, якоже местообразные сущим тела и крови». Прибегая к авторитету Симеона Солунского, они писали, что «ще священным иконам честь и поклонение взадати долженствует множество, паче самым даром местообразным сущим» (М., 1911. С. 360). Таким образом, молча и признавая заблуждения некоторых «расколоучителей», авторы «Ответов», тем не менее, нашли выход из положения. Авторитет византийских Отцов Церкви был привлечен и в другой важнейшей дискуссии – о времени наступления Царства Христова в связи со спорами о редакциях греческого Символа веры. Так, подробно рассуждая о времени царства Христова протопоп Аввакум, опираясь главным образом на слова апостола Павла о Христе («еже предаст царство Богу и Отцу, егда испразднит всево начало и всякую власть и силу, подобает бо Ему царствовать дондеже положит вся враги под нози Его») и их толкование Иоанном Златоустом: «две бо царствия Христове толкую, едино по созданию, а другое по присвоению, не пресекается бо Его царство, царствует бо Христос верными и неверными» [Материалы 1879: 248]. Этим подтверждался тот факт, что Царство Его уже пришло. В связи с данным вопросом можно упомянуть и другой эпизод – спор о верности перевода фразы о присутствии Христа в книге Иоанна Дамаскина «Небеса», изданной Епифанием Славинецким в своем сборнике переводов византийской патристики. Епифаний основывал слово «приготоваться», а не «пришедша», соответствием греческому подлиннику, где стоит «глагол неопределенный». Его оппоненты полагали, что тем самым отрицается ныне наступившее уже Царство Христово [Время 1682: 100].


Раскол, начавшийся как внутренний церковный конфликт, далее расширился и обращался против иерархии, светских властей, самого царя, нарушающего догматы веры. Патриарх Никон изначально стремился не допустить опасных, с его точки зрения, «искажений» веры и «новин». В этих условиях особую необходимость в полемике приобретало обращение к корпусу церковной письменности Восточной Церкви как неисчерпаемому и трудно оспариваемому источнику, приобретшему особо острую актуальность для церковной жизни рассмотренного времени.
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Греческая историография после иконоклазмы и распространение христианства

Темой доклада является несохранившаяся в византийской традиции хронологическая компиляция, известная как славянская версия Хроники Георгия Синкелла. Славянский перевод текста восходит к началу X в. и связан с периодом правления болгарского царя Симеона. Основой компиляции послужило обширное извлечение из недошедшей до нас в цельном виде Хронографии Юлия Африкана (ок.160–ок.240), которое передает христианскую историю мира со дня Сотворения по Воскресение Иисуса Христа. К этому экзерпту был добавлен рассказ о последующей истории христианского мира, взятый из кодекса, содержащего вторую часть Хроника Синкелла († после 810 г) и Хронику его продолжителя Феофана Исповедника (ок. 760—817/818). Этот дополнительный кусочек, который занимает около трети всего повествования, содержит конец Хроник Синкелла до начала царствования Диоклетiana и начало Хроники Феофана до 20-го года правления Константина Великого и основания Константинополя. Доклад останавливается на проблеме о месте и времени создания самой компиляции и редакторских приемах, использованных греческими книжниками для стыковки двух (по существу трех) разных частей повествования. Специальное внимание уделяется идеологической направленности компиляции, которая по всей вероятности возникла в начале IX в. после ссылки и смерти самого Феофана в 817/818 г.
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Introduction

The research on the historical geography of the Byzantine Empire has always been an integral part of Byzantine Studies. With the foundation of the project Tabula Imperii Byzantini (TIB) of the Austrian Academy of Sciences in 1966, Vienna has evolved into a renowned center in the respective field of study. From its very beginning, the TIB has put its main focus of research on the Eastern Mediterranean, especially on the Balkan Peninsula and Asia Minor, thus linking two continents by the sea, which today turns out to be even more relevant in a unifying Europe as well as from the viewpoint of the history of the Euro-Mediterranean.

The TIB’s foremost aim is to create a historical atlas of the Byzantine Empire, to trace Late Antique and Byzantine people in their environment through time and to foster greater awareness for the need to conserve and protect the cultural heritage of the Eastern Mediterranean.

The essential part of each volume of the main series of the TIB comprises a catalogue (gazetteer) of the Byzantine names of towns, settlements, fortresses, churches, monasteries, fields, mountains, rivers and lakes in alphabetical order, which is extracted from a wide variety of sources. The information is presented in headwords (i.e. lemmata). Building on this research, a map on the scale of 1: 800,000 is produced which contains the headwords and other information of historical relevance. Whereas the structure of the volumes of the TIB has remained nearly unchanged since the 1970s, new scholarly methods and technical innovations have been introduced in the last twenty years [e.g. the Central Place Theory (CPTh), Global Positioning System (GPS), digital photography, Historic Landscape Characterization, Geographic Information System (GIS)]. The interdisciplinary project TIB stands in a symbiotic relationship to various international, renowned projects in France, Turkey, the USA and in several countries of South-East Europe.

The round table aims at exploring and discussing new thoughts and ideas within the disciplines of Historical Geography, Archaeology, Environmental Studies, Digital Humanities (GIS; HGIS), Paleobotany, and Paleozoology of the Mediterranean World, and their influence on existing methodologies as well as their consequences on current projects. The value of in-depth surveys on settlement patterns, the possible contribution of the above mentioned disciplines on shaping the respective field of study and new ways of outreach to the interested public should be examined likewise.
Mapping the French Surveys of Bithynia Online

Since the 1980s, two French research programs have been dedicated to the Byzantine region of Bithynia (Turkey), which extends from the southern shore of the Marmara Sea to Mount Olympus (Uludağ), and from the lake of Apollonias to the river Sangarios.

The first program was initiated by Jacques Lefort at the École pratique des hautes études (Paris) between 1987 and 1994. The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS) funded the field surveys, with the support of the French Institute of Anatolian Studies in Istanbul (IFEA). The results were published in an interdisciplinary volume gathering 19 studies, with the title *La Bithynie au Moyen Âge* (2003). It documents abundant archaeological material found on the sites (architectural blocks, ceramics, inscriptions), and contains paleo-geographic, topographic and economic studies up to the Ottoman times. As a result of this outstanding body of work, nearly 1,000 photographs, video recordings, and studies on written sources (e.g. travellers’ books) have been archived in Paris, all of which could not all be included in a single printed volume. The goal of the book was to study the evolution of the Bithynian landscape and society, not to record all medieval remains in Bithynia. Only the sites that had been actually surveyed feature on the final map. A lot of information gathered during the preparatory work was thus left unused for the time being, as *La Bithynie au Moyen Âge* was not meant to be a volume of the *Tabula Imperii Byzantini*.

A second programme supervised by Marie-France Auzépy (Université Paris VIII) began in 2004, was funded by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs between 2005 and 2008, and ended with a study of the inventory of the museum of Bursa (2009), since the working permits were not renewed by the Turkish authorities. The surveys intended to set up an inventory of preserved medieval monuments in Bithynia around Mount Olympus, focusing on monasteries in particular. The results were published each year in *Anatolia Antiqua*, the journal of the French Institute of Anatolian Studies in Istanbul, and are now available online. Abundant reports were compiled and sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Since 2012, they have been available on the scientific platform Hal-SHS. The team regularly presented its work at the annual meetings of archaeologists working in Turkey (Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı). But again, with almost 500 written pages and thousands of photographs taken on site, the survey is still not fully available since the documentary material that was discovered was too abounding to be fully published in print and, beside, went far beyond the subject of Byzantine monasteries themselves.

The rapid advances in digital mapping have now reshuffled the cards. This technology can help us to present our field observations online, in a scientific, collaborative and sustainable way. Our paper will describe the challenge of an online publication of the French surveys in Bithynia, as it will outline the important issue of such a process for the preservation of the Turkish heritage.
The Space Construction in Medieval Serbia in the Times of Saint Sava and Stefan the First-Crowned

Focused primarily on the reflection why medieval Serbia didn’t have one space that could be nominated capital, this research combines two methodologically different approaches: philological and architectonical. The fact the residences of the Serbian sovereigns were not treated often as a topic, is caused mostly because of the lack of conserved architecture remains and of written sources so as insufficient archaeological investigations. Basing our reflections on results of previous historical studies of the topic and archaeological researches, we would like to reexamine the question from a different point of view.

Modeling of urban character in Balkan and East Slavic middle age goes hand in hand with christianization. The most important cases are those of Preslav, Târnovo and Kiev that recall the traditional Constantinople model. We know that the seat of the Serbian states during the XII century was transferred from the Adriatic coast to the hinterland. The founder of the royal dynasty of Nemanides, Stefan had several residences, distributed in Toplica, later Ras and Kotor at the end of 1185. His son, Stefan Nemanjić was crowned in the church of Ascension of Christ (Žiča monastery) becoming the First Crowned, but he did not build a capital.

The spatial model of the Byzantine world, with the exclusion of Constantinople, center of civil and ecclesiastical power, was built on a wide network of monasteries and in the medieval Serbia really was dominant the network of monasteries connected in a more wide space of Byzantine Commonwealth with the monastic centers of Mount Athos and Palestine.

Consequently, the space construction was realized around monasteries offering a different point of view on the idea of a capital city. At that time dominated by the Byzantine crisis, determined by the Fourth Crusade, while Jerusalem was still contended between Crusaders and Arabs, the kingship could be seen as an earthly form of power administration, while the christian world, especially the monasteries, was waiting for the eschatological judgment.
Fifty years of Tabula Imperii Byzantini: Retrospect and Current Status

The idea of a research project dedicated to the historical geography of Byzantium was first presented by Herbert Hunger at the 13th International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Oxford in September 1966. Two months later, on November 23rd 1966, the Austrian Academy of Sciences established officially a research institution for this issue, the Commission of the Tabula Imperii Byzantini (TIB). Its aim was the creation of an atlas of the Byzantine Empire from the 4th century up to the Ottoman conquest. The provinces of the Empire (according to the late antique classification mentioned by the geographer Hierocles) should be depicted on a map on the scale of 1:800,000. Furthermore, extensive companion volumes should enumerate the respective toponyms of the single landscapes. But in contrast to the related research project Tabula Imperii Romani (TIR) it was intended from the early beginning to enrich these manuals furthermore with introductory chapters, providing detailed information on geography and climate, on history, church history and monastic movements, on economics and networks of communication of the different provinces. The first volume of Tabula Imperii Byzantini was dedicated to “Hellas and Thessalia”, it appeared in 1976. Up to now, twelve volumes have been published, seven of them dealing with landscapes in Asia Minor and in Northern Syria, the remaining five dealing with different parts of the Balkans and of the Aegean Sea. Six more volumes are in a different stage of preparation, “Macedonia, Southern part” and “Bithynia and Hellēspontus” should be published within the next two years. Beyond, various books, published in the series Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für die Tabula Imperii Byzantini and, since 2006, Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung, offer information on special aspects of historical geography or simply present conference proceedings. In the first decades the working method consisted mainly in the analysis of four source categories. 1. Written sources, 2. Archaeological sources and material evidence, 3. Toponyms, and 4. The evaluation of geo-physical and natural conditions of the former landscapes. But since the 1980s, new methods have been added: nowadays among others, also settlement theories and methods of digital humanities were applied, scientific studies on paleozoology or paleo botany were incorporated into the TIB-volumes.

The efforts for continuous improvement led recently to awards: last year the Tabula Imperii Byzantini was included into the exquisite scheme of Long-term-Projects at the Austrian Academy of Sciences, and in the same year the project was honoured by getting a membership of the Union Académique Internationale in Brussels.
The *Tabula Imperii Byzantini*: … Chances in a Digital Age

Since the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies in London in 2006 the worldwide scholarly community of Byzantinists has become witness to the most interesting and fascinating developments in the field of Digital Humanities. The question, which arises in the wake of the 21st century is, how and in which way Byzantine Studies should react with regard to new technologies.

This paper will discuss the contribution of computer based applications, such as Historical Geographic Information System (HGIS), WebGIS, Neogeography, visualisations and digital elevation models etc. to the scholarly work of the *Tabula Imperii Byzantini (TIB)* in particular and to the field of Historical Geography in general. Moreover, relevant thoughts to the topic will be exemplified by results deriving from the projects *TIB* as well as “Digitising Patterns of Power (DPP) – Peripheral Mountains in the Medieval World” (PI Mihailo St. Popović; http://dpp.oeaw.ac.at/) at the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

Of special importance will be the issue, if both – the “classical” Historical Geography and Digital Humanities – can be combined into a useful and visionary symbiosis for our discipline in the near and farther future or if the risk is pending that technology could substitute scholarly thinking and critical methodology.
From Villages to Towns.
Historical-Geography of the Western Territory of Constantinople during the Late Antiquity and Early Byzantine Periods

The foundation of Constantinople as new capital of the Roman Empire had an immense demographic, economic and military impact upon the province of Europa which was now turning into one of the most densely populated areas of the Late Roman period. Many settlements located on the Via Egnatia and the Via Militaris developed rapidly in the 4th century from road stations into significant settlements, and were declared cities. From backwaters during the imperial period, these settlements grew into important regional centres in the hinterland of the new capital. The increase of warfare and military campaigns in Late Antiquity strengthened their importance in the defensive network of the empire, but it also brought invaders and unrest to their gates.
Digitizing the Historical Landscape of the Central Balkans

Digitizing various data on Late Roman and Early Mediaeval sites and finds is certainly a task to be dealt with by the Institute of Archaeology, Belgrade. The development of an integral database and Geographic Information System for the Central Balkan areas is rather a challenge, as there is no up-to-date archaeological map of Serbia available. With such a strategic document missing, as like as an integral register for cultural-historical monuments in Serbia, any attempt at studying different historical, cultural, and geographic phenomena is by far more complicated, as well as the protection of historical heritage, endangered by large infrastructure works and growing settlement and industrial areas.

One should underscore that the idea for creating an integral archaeological map was born as early as after the Institute of Archaeology was founded in Belgrade in 1947. The first catalogue of the sites was prepared by Milutin and Draga Garašanin in their 1951 book ‘Archaeological sites in Serbia’, which brought together what was known at that time. In the early nineteen-fifties, systematic data acquisition and field surveys were conducted by the Institute of Archaeology in order to publish a series ‘Archaeological monuments and sites in Serbia’, the territory of which was divided into nine geographic units for that purpose. Regrettably, only two volumes were published as the result of this well-conceived project, dealing with the monuments and sites from Western (Vol. 1, 1953) and Central Serbia (Vol. 2. 1956).

In 1990, the new project aiming to produce the archaeological map of Serbia was launched by the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, which entrusted the Institute of Archaeology to perform these tasks. However, due to a lack of finances and a small number of the researchers devoted to this goal, the project was abandoned in 2002.

Leaving aside the uncompleted capital projects, the past decades saw some very successful survey projects throughout Serbia, conducted by the heritage protection institutions, museums, and research institutes. We should mention the published corpuses providing the insights into the archaeological heritage of some municipalities and counties. For example, particularly detailed are the publications, first of all by Marko Popović and his associates, dealing with the territories of
the Novi Pazar, Sjenica and Tutin municipalities in Southwest Serbia. The bulk of the papers and books presenting the results of this well-performed project comes from the last two decades of the twentieth century. On the other hand, the area of the nearby mountain Golija is still largely unknown. More recently, one should mention the efforts by Stanko Trifunović and his team in the Banat region in Vojvodina. The results of detailed surveys of the Novi Kneževac municipality were published as a monograph in 2012.

Taking into account all the good and bad examples, the future digital database and Geographic Information System should focus on clearly defined geographic units producing already processed and systematized data, and on certain topics. As a pilot project the database is being created for the Leskovac Basin. This territory saw numerous survey campaigns by the Institute of Archaeology, the National Museum Leskovac and the Cultural Heritage Protection Institute from Niš. The archaeological data was first systematized while preparing the ‘History of Leskovac and its Surroundings’, and published in 1988 in the monograph ‘Archaeological Monuments and Sites in the Leskovac Area’ by Slavenka Ercegović-Pavlović and Dušanka Kostić. In 2009 Prehistoric sites and finds were brought together in the book ‘Leskovac - Cultural Stratigraphy of Prehistoric Sites in the Leskovac Region’ by Aleksandar Bulatović and Smilja Jović, and in 2013 the ‘Roman Legacy in the Leskovac Valley’ monograph was published by Sonja Stamenković.

Along with the data from these publications, the results of the decades-long ‘Serbian-French archaeological research in Caričin Grad’ project (‘Serbian-French-German archaeological research in Caričin Grad’ from 2014) provide a solid basis for the creation of the database and Geographic Information System for the Caričin Grad (Justiniana Prima) area.

During the long decades the research of Caričin Grad was restricted to the intramural area of the town. In the last few years, however, the processing and systematization of data from its wider area are taking place, which first refers to the traces of Roman settlement in the Leskovac Basin. Along with this, a series of surveys of indicative sites was undertaken, in order to study, re-evaluate and georeference these localities.

An integral Geographic Information System was created, comprising different cartographic sources, like the late nineteenth century Serbian Headquarters Map, sets of maps by the Military Geographical Institute at the scales of 1:25,000, 1:50,000 and 1:300,000, then the 1:100,000 soil map, the 1:25,000 and 1:100,000 geological maps and the cadastral plans. All these sources were converted into the WGS84 coordinate system, currently used in Serbia. The next information level comprises the 2010 images from the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (geo-portal GeoSerbia). The Google Earth satellite imagery is integrated into a GIS package used for data processing, and digital terrain models (DTMs) and accurate hydrologic representations are also included in our system. Archive aerial photographs, field documents and sketches and single point measurements are included in the system, as well.

The second layer in the Geographic Information System comprises data on Prehistoric, Roman and Mediaeval sites from the Leskovac Basin. This database is derived from the above-mentioned literature. Prehistoric sites are registered to help the settlement processes analysis, and Roman and Mediaeval sites are grouped into the following categories: towns, fortresses, settlements, churches, cemeteries, aqueducts, roads, mines, etc.
This system provides an essential base for the research and interpretation of certain phenomena. For example, the mapping of the Caričin Grad aqueduct started only after the system was established. Tracing the canal in the landscape and topography, still in progress, enabled a successful reconstruction of the 21 km long aqueduct route. Especially important was the discovery of several bridges, the most impressive being the one by the village of Baćevidna, originally ca 80 m long and some 20-30 m high.

Another important part of our research was the survey of some Late Roman and Early Byzantine forts from the area. This was performed to study their character, fortification systems, size and even chronology, as they were partly referred to as Mediaeval in older literature. Within the course of the ArchaeoLandscapes Europe Project, the wider area of Caričin Grad and the areas of Sekicel and Radinovac were subjected to the airborne LiDAR scanning. The 24 km$^2$ were scanned in total (12 km$^2$ + 8 km$^2$ + 4 km$^2$), and the obtained DTMs enable detailed analyses of the spatial layout of Caričin Grad and five fortifications in its immediate vicinity, and various anthropogenic features.

The study of natural resources was also aimed at, as it seems that mining was one of the most important activities in this region during the Prehistoric, Roman and Mediaeval periods. From our first results it emerges that precisely the mining activities generated the settlement ones in the latter two epochs. A cluster of fortresses and Roman epigraphic monuments in the Lece area testify to that effect, as well as a number of Mediaeval churches, cemeteries and inscriptions. Together with this, numerous mines were discovered in the Lece and Tulare area, dated to the pre-Roman, Roman and Mediaeval periods.

The continuation of the work will focus on data from the written sources on settlements and population, particularly from the Ottoman defters. In later stages, it is planned to add data from other Central Balkan regions to this Geographic Information System, and to use it to study other related phenomena.
MANEUVERING THE HOLY:
SPIRITS, ICONS, INDULGENCES AND MENTAL MAPPINGS
IN FIFTEENTH-EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ORTHODOXIES
Conveners: Charles Barber, Elena N. Boeck

Charles Barber,
On Firmer Ground: Klontzas, Mohammed and Sinai

Benjamin Anderson,
Some Mental Maps in Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana Gr. VII, 22

Veronica della Dora,
 Maneuvering Pilgrimage: Agencies and Afterlives of Two Post-Byzantine Proskynētaria

Elena N. Boeck,
Containing Innovation and Inventing Traditions:
Orthodox Muscovite Dialogues with Counter-Reformation Print Culture

Nikolaos Chrissidis,
Forgiveness, Indulgence and Eastern Orthodoxy: Yes, We can!

Sergei Mariev,
Exploring the Byzantine Theory of Image through the 20th-Century Art Discourse
Introduction

After 1453 the Orthodox world underwent dramatic changes. This interdisciplinary round table investigates cultural, spiritual, and visual transformations of Orthodoxy between the fall of Constantinople and the twentieth century. This under-studied period witnessed the intense re-imagination of Orthodox topographies and a reconfiguration of accepted hierarchies. While Moscow began to advance aspirations of preeminence in the Orthodox world, the primary Orthodox loci sancti firmly remained in territories controlled by Muslims. This panel probes the discursive complexities and diverse geographies of the early modern Orthodox world, including Constantinople, Sinai, Athos, Moscow, Jerusalem, as well as early-modern Wallachia. In texts and images we witness intense engagements with distant knowledge (ranging from visualizations of sacred sites to confrontations with new print technologies), reconfigurations of sacred and imperial topographies, as well as the creation and justification of new understandings of center and periphery. The range of evidence discussed by the participants includes Orthodox travel guides (proskynetaria), post-Byzantine funerary customs, Orthodox indulgences, and examples of conceptual art that enhance our understanding of iconoclasm. Participants explore multifaceted dialogues with western European prints and new trends in Orthodox visual culture (from images of Mohammad, to visualizations of cities, to Marian miracles). In following these paths, the panel participants also probe how Catholic rivals and Muslim overlords contributed to early modern Orthodoxy.
On Firmer Ground: Klontzas, Mohammed, and Sinai

This paper focuses upon a pair of now-lost images that were owned by the Museum of Art and History in Geneva. These works should be attributed to Giorgios Klontzas. They present a panel with scenes from the life of Mohammed and a panel depicting Mount Sinai. Both panels can be closely connected to themes found in other works by Klontzas. In particular, I will use images and texts found in his Venetian Chronicle and the Moscow Chronicle fragment to help with the reading of these paintings. When read in terms of one another, the Geneva panels can be shown to argue for the superiority of a Christianity imagined through the history of Sinai. Finally, when paired, these panels invite us to see them as something other than icons, in so doing they expand our categories for the analysis of Klontzas's art.

The first panel is devoted to the life of Mohammed and the roots of Islam. The image is laden with vignettes and is extensively labeled. As such, it conveys a great deal of information. The foreground offers a complex and compressed space that mingles scenes from different eras. To the left is a verdant hill on which a Saracen - the use of the term will become evident as this paper progresses - shepherd can be found tending a flock of sheep and goats. This may be a young Mohammed, who tended his uncle's sheep before working with this uncle's caravans. These caravans might be indicated by the presence of a camel train to the right of the hill. Below this on the left is a structure with a coffered arch as an entrance or passageway. In front of this and seated on a fountain that fills a pool of water is a pale-skinned and elegantly dressed woman. She is identified as Chadiga and she is the first wife of Mohammed. Here, she is shown in conversation with Mohammed. Behind Mohammed and Chadiga is a domed and pedimented building that contains a deep and coffered hall. Set far back within this space is an elderly bearded male identified as Abraham, who has his right hand around the shoulder of a small boy, while his left hand rubs the head of a second small boy. These children are Isaac and Ishmael. In the pediment of this building is a naturalistic representation of God the Father who speaks the words written immediately below: “That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore ... (Gen. 22:17).” This text follows upon the narrative of the Sacrifice of Isaac and blesses Abraham for having been willing to sacrifice his son Isaac in obedience to a command from God. In front of the building can be seen an elderly Sarah, the wife of Abraham, sending away her handmaid Hagar, the mother of Ishmael, who carries the child in her arms. To the left of them is a third structure with a vaulted coffered ceiling. This contains a bed, and here Mohammed and Chadiga embrace one another. In the next scene on the panel painting, Chagida is seen to be distressed when she witnesses Mohammed’s epilepsy. In the next scene we find the Prophet Ezekiel. Below him is an extended paraphrase of Ezekiel 39:17:

Son of man, summon the beasts of the field and the birds of the heaven, and urge them on, saying, “Gather yourselves together and come, since I will offer a great sacrifice for you. Eat the bodies of lords and drink the blood of giants ... [fall] on the edge of the sword of the seed of Ismael”
The last part of this text is non-Biblical and points us to the specific source for this particular passage. This is the seventh-century *Apocalypse* of Pseudo-Methodius, which also happened to serve as one of the organizing texts for Klontzas’s Venetian *Chronicle*. The phrase “edge of the sword of the seed of Ismael” helps us to understand the presence of the “hunting” scene in in the upper right of the panel. The phrase is found in this passage from the *Apocalypse*, which follows upon the section I have just quoted:

In that time, therefore, at Gabaoth all the lords of the Greeks, that is of the Romans, will fall on the edge of the sword. For just as they themselves slew the lords of the Hebrews and of the Persians, so they will fall on the edge of the sword of the seed of Ismael, who has been called a wild ass, because in wrath and anger they will be sent over the face of the whole world against the men and the stock of animals and the wild beasts and to the groves and the trees and to the copses and to every kind of fruitful thing.

The image of the hunt, with butchered Roman soldiers found among the hunted animals, has now become an expression of Islam’s rampant power over the world. Finally, the Mohammed panel shows above and to the left of Ezekiel Chadiga talking to the monk Sergios and then below and to the left Hagar speaking to an angel.

As has become apparent through the course of this lengthy reading, the Geneva painting presents a complex image of Islam’s origins. Old Testament and Late Antique narratives are interwoven in a common space that is pegged by quotations from Biblical and Early Medieval Byzantine texts. The outcome is a painting that, when read in light of the context provided by Klontzas’s other treatments of this subject, makes several significant points. Mohammed is identified as a direct descendent of Ishmael. Although identified as a great power, the icon offers some of the negative tropes found within the Christian discourse on him. He is shown as a manipulative, seductive, and epileptic individual. Furthermore, the panel also reiterates Klontzas’s consistent portrayal of Mohammed as a black man.

When Abraham embraces Isaac and Ishmael, the children are clearly distinguished by color, just as the child Ishmael that Hagar shows the angel is black. When we encounter Mohammed, he is a black man among black men. The sources from which Klontzas worked do not offer grounds for such a depiction. Pseudo-Methodius, John of Damascus, and Theophanes do not mention Mohammed’s appearance. It is only in the verse account of Mohammed found in both of Klontzas’s *Chronicles* that the possibility of such blackness is introduced through an identification of the origins of the Moslems in Ethiopia. What remains unknown is when and by whom these verses were written; whether they reflect a Medieval or Renaissance addition of color to the discourse on Mohammed. I will return to this point below.

Before developing this line of thinking, I would like to turn to the second Geneva panel, which is a pendant for the life of Mohammed panel. The subject of this second panel is Mount Sinai and the holy sites associated with that region. Let me begin by introducing the content of this panel. We will again find extensive labels and many layers of time marked on to this space. The depiction of “the holy monastery” is somewhat fanciful. Within its walls one finds a rather Italianate church and other monastic buildings thronged by a large and active community. Beyond its walls are Saracens. Those to the left are drawn towards the monastery, while the one to the right leads two pilgrims who arrive on their three camels. Also outside the walls are a series of holy sites that define this landscape for a
Christian audience. Each of these, bar two, is identified by a simple label. Behind the monastery is the mountain of the Prophet Aaron, upon whose slope can be seen the Burning Bush, which is shown with the Mother of God within. Moses approaches the Bush and is also seen removing his sandals in answer to the command, which is written on to the icon, that he “remove your shoes from your feet.” The twelve water sources are marked below and to the left. Between the mountain of Aaron and the “holy and God-trodden mountain of Sinai” the landscape opens upon the “seventy trunks of palm trees.” Moses is at the top of the God-trodden Mountain, where he kneels before a vision of God that emerges from cloud and light. This is labeled: the holy summit. Below, and besides the steps cut into the mountain, is a chapel in front of which can be seen the prophet Elijah being fed by an angel. Below that is a spring, which emerges from the mountain above the monastery. On the right hand flank of the monastery is a second building, which is identified as the hermitage of the emperors. In the sky to the right of the God-trodden Mountain are two angels who carry a soul heavenwards. To the right of this monastery is the wooded Mount Nephtali and then above this, the Mountain of St. Catherine, where the saint’s body is laid to rest by three angels. Below them can be seen a monastic building that is identified with the forty martyrs of Raithou. Lower down on the mountain can be seen the chapel of St. George and a pilgrim before the hermitage of St. John of the Ladder. The land between the God-trodden Mountain and St. Catherine’s mountain is identified as Elim. Here we see the encampment of the Israelites, where they dance before and worship the golden calf, while below, Moses, confronting Aaron, is about to smash the tablets of the Ten Commandments. A longer inscription is found here: “The Hebrews made a calf at Horeb and worshipped the statue.”

This lengthy tour of the panel’s depiction of the Sinai region conveys the point that this landscape has become a Christian pilgrims’s landscape, linking past and present in a particular place that is defined by precise locations.

The landscape provides a continuing witness to events spread across a wide history, uniting them. The Exodus narratives of Moses before the Burning Bush, Moses receiving the tablets of the Law and the Israelite encampment with the Golden Calf provide a deep history. A more recent narrative is represented by the portrayal of Elijah being fed by an angel. The landscape then moves to that of Late Antiquity. We see the monastery itself, which was built in the mid-sixth century. The inclusion of the martyrs at Rhaithou is particularly important. These monks had been attacked by the local Saracens in the later fourth century. Catherine of Alexandria, whose death belongs to the first years of the fourth century, has her body transported by angels to her mountain top place of burial. And then St. John of the Ladder, a key spiritual figure of the sixth-seventh century and a monk of Sinai, is shown. Through these figures Sinai becomes re-inscribed as a place of Christian martyrdom. The continuing witness to this is proposed by the images of the pilgrims and the Italianate monastic buildings. This landscape is being given to a sixteenth-century audience.

This message is also to be found, if less obviously labeled, with other representations of Sinai in Klontzas’s work. For example, on the reverse of both his Spada/New York and Yorkshire/Athens triptychs we find a somewhat imaginary version of the monastery set within a landscape populated by the narrative of Moses and the Israelites, the transportation of the body of St. Catherine, and the present life of the community.

In Klontzas’s imagining of Sinai, it is a place inscribed with a Christian narrative that stretches from the time of Moses to the then contemporary pilgrim. In claiming this land along these lines, its
long-term inhabitants, the Saracens are marginalized, serving the monastery that is the new guardian of this place and the pilgrims that come to visit. For John of Damascus, Saracens, Hagarenes and Ishmaelites were considered synonyms. In this, he builds upon a rich Early Christian literature in which the local inhabitants of the Sinai region are identified with the Ishmaelites. For example, in the early fourth-century *Onomasticon* (*On the Place-Names in Holy Scripture*), which is one of the key texts identifying and re-defining the Biblical lands for a Christian audience, Eusebius of Caesarea describes the Saracens of this region as being descendants of the tribe of Ishmael. The theme recurs in the writings of Sophronius of Jerusalem, when he attempts to articulate the arrival of the Moslem armies in Palestine in the 630s. This then becomes a definitive statement in the account of Islam written by John of Damascus in the eighth century. As Ward has recently written: “John of Damascus ... codifies the standard descriptions of Saracens developed in the pre-Islamic period, dresses them up with the rhetoric of heresy, and packages the polemical rhetoric to be reused by future generations of Christians.” This tradition helps us to understand the continuity in the depiction of the Saracens that Klontzas has set forth in his icons of Sinai, but it does not fully explain the manner - that is the color and the costume - with which he has chosen to depict this Saracenic image of Mohammed.

Klontzas connects Ishmael, Mohammed, and the Saracens outside the walls of the monastery visually by their costume and their skin color. In the verses beneath the Moscow *Chronicle* portrayal of Mohammed we are told that his race (γενεὰ) originated in Ethiopia. This is an unusual claim. It may have its roots in a longstanding Greco-Roman tradition for identifying Ethiopia with blackness. It could also reflect relatively current usage. Kate Lowe has recently shown that the term *ethiops* is used in Venetian documents of the fifteenth- and sixteenth centuries to describe the “black Africans in domestic service in patrician households.” Furthermore, the term Saracen also became synonymous with “black African” in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Venice. In one notable instance a notarial record of 19 June 1446 describes a *saraceno* being from the “genere Etiopum.” Given the manner in which the Ethiopian is introduced into the Klontzas verses and given that Crete was a Venetian colony and deeply imbued with Venetian culture, it may be reasonable to suggest that the use of the term *αἰθίοψ* may reflect current assumptions about the blackness of Saracens.

A further thread may be introduced by way of the depiction of Chadiga. In the verses that accompany her depiction in the Moscow *Chronicle*, we are introduced to her as “a certain woman, rich and of his [that is Mohammed’s] own kin.” Although she is of Mohammed’s kin, she does not share his skin color (a point perhaps reiterated by the presence of the black woman to the left). She is also attired in relatively contemporary sixteenth-century dress. I would suggest that this ought to lead us to ask whether Mohammed’s blackness is not simply a product of a claimed origin in Ethiopia (a physical attribute of a given race), but that it may also be an expression of a “symbolic blackness” that is, in these works, being used to construct Mohammed as an inferior. The verses found in both the Moscow and Venice *Chronicles* identify Mohammed as a δοῦλος, which is to say that he is a servant or a slave. As such, one might suggest that he is here being differentiated from the wealthy and white Chadiga for reasons of class distinction. For a Creto-Venetian audience, he is a black African, an Ethiopian, in domestic service in a patrician household. In the panel, such social inferiority, inscribed on to these black bodies, resonates across time. Ishmael, the inferior son of the slave/servant Hagar, is a black child. The Saracens who serve the monastery of St. Catherine and the pilgrims who visit the God-trodden Mountain are also necessarily black. These visual echoes underline the essentially servile status of Mohammed and his people in Klontzas’s accounts of him.
This paper has been focused upon a pair of paintings and two related manuscripts. The paintings, although they are the work of a renowned icon painter, do not fit readily into our common understanding of the icon. It is unlikely that the audiences for these works would have offered prayer to an icon of Mohammed. Given the wealth of texts found on these paintings, it may be more reasonable to think of these works as having a didactic function that makes an argument regarding the relative merits of Christianity and Islam. This pairing is intended to propose an inferior status for Mohammed. He is the cunning and deceptive servant or slave. He is the descendant of a child of a servant or slave. His descendants are the servants of the Sinai community. He is an Ethiopian. He is a black man. Given this, is it then appropriate to ask whether Klontzas's image might be deemed racist? When translating γενεὰ on folio 3, I have chosen the term race. This is an acceptable translation, sanctioned by our dictionaries, but it is also a provocation, asking us to consider the significance of the play of skin color here in these images. Klontzas constructs an Ethiopian racial identity for Mohammed. This may simply be a description based upon an assumption of origins, but it may also be racist, as Klontzas has proposed a thread of inferiority that runs from Ishmael, to Mohammed, to the contemporary “Saracens” of the Sinai peninsula. Given the nature of Klontzas's particular construction of Mohammed, it is tempting to view his ideas as racist because they propose an inferior status for the black Mohammed. It is a racism built upon binary expectations that specifically adds color, a more contemporary concern, to the themes found in the early medieval theological and historical texts that had provided Klontzas's point of departure. As such, his Mohammed, although defined by these medieval sources, is here visualized in a manner that belongs to his own age.
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Das Kleine, das Beschränkte, das Morsche und Veraltete erhält seine eigne Würde und Unantastbarkeit dadurch, daß die bewahrende und verehrende Seele des antiquarischen Menschen in diese Dinge übersiedelt und sich darin ein heimisches Nest bereitet. Die Geschichte seiner Stadt wird ihm zur Geschichte seiner selbst; er versteht die Mauer, das getürmte Tor, die Ratsverordnung, das Volksfest wie ein ausgemaltes Tagebuch seiner Jugend und findet sich selbst in diesem allen, seine Kraft, seinen Fleiß, seine Lust, sein Urteil, seine Torheit und Unart wieder. Hier läßt es sich leben, sagt er sich, denn es läßt sich leben; hier wird es sich leben lassen, denn wir sind zäh und nicht über Nacht umzubrechen. So blickt er, mit diesem »Wir«, über das vergängliche wunderliche Einzelleben hinweg und fühlt sich selbst als den Haus-, Geschlechts- und Stadtgeist.

Nietzsche’s portrait of the antiquarian models a relationship between subject and city along multiple, intersecting axes: temporal and spatial, private and collective, material and spiritual. The result is a kind of mental map, which both includes and exceeds the visual form of the city. Such a map cannot be distilled into a single picture. Rather, it describes a logic that can unite multiple and various images of a city: its form in general and at specific moments, views of individual streets and buildings, legends that exist outside of time even as they inform the actions of people in the present.

As a type, Nietzsche’s antiquarian bears comparison to the “philosopher” of medieval Constantinople, for whom the city embodied a kind of family history, and for whom the decaying armature of late antiquity was a source of strength and vital knowledge. This knowledge was both material and topographical, and cultivated on the bases both of the urban form as a whole, understood as the divinely inspired work of the founder, and of the curiosities tucked in its nooks and allies: a statue “in the part near the steps known as Topoi, in the neighborhood of the holy Archangel,” or the place “where now columns and an arch stand, near the house now called the house of Krateros.” But there are also distinctions between the mental map of the antiquarian and that of the philosopher. For example, if the antiquarian’s knowledge testified to future continuity – hier wird es sich leben lassen – the philosopher was as likely to discover in ancient remains the “stories of the city’s end.”

After the Ottoman conquest, and despite the forced displacement of whole communities and neighborhoods, the philosophers’ knowledge was preserved and developed by the city’s Greeks, and adapted by its new inhabitants, both through courtly translations and through conversations in the streets and markets. At the same time, patriographic and apocalyptic texts that assumed the philosophers’ intimate familiarity with the physical fabric were copied and studied in Greek communities beyond Ottoman rule by people who never saw Constantinople. This was also a kind of translation, in which the texts were cut loose from their material and topographical moorings and freed to discover new conceptual and visual anchors. Their readers must attract the sympathy of the modern historian, who shares the frustrations of building a picture of an ancient city from texts that were written for its familiars.
Exile from Constantinople necessarily provoked a range of reactions, from melancholy nostalgia to the search for new cities, which could also co-exist unresolved within a single community or person. One artifact testifies to the full complexity of a highly informed reaction in Venetian Crete: a manuscript intended to transmit Byzantine knowledge of Constantinople within a Greek community that hardly knew the city’s physical fabric. If the manuscript’s representations of Constantinople are compared with those of Jerusalem and Chandax (Heraklion), the mental maps that inform each come into relief and reveal their peculiarities.

Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana Gr. VII, 22, often called “the codex of Georgios Klontzas,” is a leather-bound volume containing 217 paper folios, each measuring roughly 20 centimeters by 15. The title at the top of the first page announces the “precise account by our holy father Methodius, the bishop of Patara, concerning the dominion of the barbarous nations.” Indeed, much of the text that follows is taken directly from the seventh-century apocalypse of “Pseudo-Methodius,” which has here been massively expanded through the insertion of additional texts, and of drawings executed in ink by a confident hand.

If read from front to back, the manuscript presents a Christian history of the world, beginning with the expulsion from the Garden of Eden and concluding with the Last Judgment. The intervening pages express a recurring interest in the city of Constantinople and its rulers, both Byzantine and Ottoman. The manuscript’s presiding authorities are the bishop Methodius and “the most wise Leo, emperor of Constantinople,” the latter a legendary author of a series of figural and textual oracles that are here understood to foretell the reigns of the sultans. The codex consistently renders the figural oracles as discrete emblems, but some also appear as monuments within an urban landscape, as when Leo is depicted pointing at a sculptural version of the oracle of the serpent and ravens that presaged the rule of Bayezid.

After detailed renditions of the Byzantine-Ottoman wars, and of a plague-ridden Chandax ruled by Duke Geronimo Kapello (1592-95), the codex leaves recorded history behind to detail the sequence of the last emperors, the destruction of Constantinople, the reign of the Antichrist, and the final dispensation of divine justice. A subscription at the close of the text announces: “the hand of Georgios Klontzas has written these [lines] / you who are holding this, remember me kindly.” We are thus placed in the ambit of a prominent Greek painter of sixteenth century Crete, who was born in the 1530s to an affluent family that owned multiple properties in the suburbs of Chandax. Klontzas signed some 14 works and many more have been attributed to his hand. In September of 1587 he appears in the archives of the Venetian administration purchasing a building “in piazza di San Marco,” which he had previously rented as a painter’s workshop, and which he sold to the Venetian government in the following month. Klontzas died in 1608 leaving extensive properties to his sons – including, it would seem, the Marciana codex itself.

The codex includes two remarkable bird’s eye views of Chandax, both of which are explicitly set in Klontzas’s own lifetime. In the first, the city serves as temporary harbor to a Holy League fleet during the Venetian-Ottoman war of the early 1570s, while the second depicts a city stricken by plague in the early 1590s. Both images are marked by a careful topographical specificity, as in their consistent rendering of the course of the Venetian fortifications, and in their slightly divergent renditions of the harbor with its arsenals, and of the main streets and structures, including the Piazza San Marco with its clock tower and cathedral. The most substantive distinctions between
the two views do not reflect physical changes in the built fabric, but its activation under different types of emergency. In the earlier image, for example, the canons are carefully rendered, two to each bastion. In the later image, by contrast, one lone seaward-facing canon remains, and the bastions, squares, and streets are filled instead by litter-bearers who deliver their grisly cargo to the gravediggers wielding picks and shovels in gridded plots outside the walls. A third aspect of the city appears in a drawing of the Corpus Christi procession, in which first-hand knowledge of the inhabited fabric is deployed at street level, in the carefully differentiated banners and devices of the celebrants, the equally differentiated palatial facades, and the peopled loggia. All three drawings depict, as Maria Georgopoulou writes of the plague view, “a town that is lived in, a real place for the people to occupy.” Their primary axis of difference is not so much temporal as communal: a question not of historical epochs, but of modes of civic life.

If mere decades separate the codex’s drawings of Chandax, its two views of Jerusalem span an epochal gulf. The first represents a Biblical subject, the submission of Joachim to Nebuchadnezzar, while the second represents modern history, the Ottoman conquest of the city under Sultan Selim. Despite the millennia that separate the events, the fabric of the city is nearly identical in both images, with the result that multiple buildings stand as glaring anachronisms in the earlier image. (Even if the Dome of the Rock were understood as the “Temple of Solomon,” no similar account could be proposed for the Anastasis Rotunda.) Jerusalem is furthermore a city without inhabitants: in both scenes all the people appear outside, with the sole exception of Sultan Selim in the second, whose mounted figure at the city’s center more resembles an equestrian monument than a living person. The topographical specificity and consistency of the two images suggests a shared exemplar, and indeed Athanasios Paliouras identified a specific engraving that may have served as the source. Through the comparison of its two iterations, however, a distinctive conception of Jerusalem emerges: a fundamentally material and spatial entity, uninhabited and impervious to historical change.

Just as the codex exhibits no first-hand knowledge of Jerusalem, so too is its Constantinople a city known only by report. However, this is where the similarity between the two mental maps ends. Whereas the Jerusalem of the codex is topographically differentiated and unchanging, its Constantinople exhibits a temporal shift from a generic to a differentiated fabric.

Multiple drawings in the codex depict Constantinople as the setting for momentous events, past and future: sieges by Arab and Turkish armies, the fall of the city in 1453, the awaited return of the Peaceful Emperor. The city’s walls and hills figure prominently in all of these images, the former consistently figured as a plain circuit punctuated by round towers and arched gates, the latter as lumpy outcroppings that emerge from the urban fabric but are themselves desolate of buildings. Among the distinctions between images, some may be insignificant. For example, the walls appear without crenellation at the first Arab siege and the awakening of the Peaceful Emperor, but with crenellation at the second Arab siege, the two Turkish sieges, and the Turkish conquest.

However, at least one distinction obeys a temporal logic. In the images of past events, the city’s urban fabric is articulated by formal distinctions – a dome here, a gable there, the occasional tower – but it is impossible to identify known landmarks (such as Hagia Sophia) or even generic buildings that consistently appear in the same place. The urban fabric is differentiated, but to a generic effect, with the result that the seven hills become the city’s true identifying feature. In the image of the Peaceful Emperor, by contrast, two individual buildings are clearly distinguished: a gridded dome
above which a cross hangs by a chain from a concentric ripple in the sky, and a slender obelisk twice as tall as the surrounding structures and set beside a lone hill. The drawing anticipates the two images of the city’s destruction by flood and fire. In the first, two angels lift an altar from the torrents that sweep away a gridded dome below; in the second, a single, attenuated obelisk casts its shadow upon the waves, surrounded by ships at sail. Neither image depicts a single hill.

The distinctions between past and future mark a shift in the status of the urban fabric. In the images of the past, Constantinople is always under siege or already fallen, and defined by those seven hills that were constantly lamented in Byzantium and after, as on multiple pages of the Marciana codex, with variations on the stock phrase: οὐάι σοι πόλις ἑπτάλοφε… In the distinctions between its buildings there are necessarily signs to be read, but these are jumbled and unclear, shifting from one rendition to the next. Only in the future, during the brief period of just rule that precedes the final cataclysm, does the image stabilize. While a lone hill remains to establish the continuity of scene, the focus shifts to two clearly marked structures, whose significance becomes clear in the final destruction. The student of apocalyptic might recognize Hagia Sophia and the Column of Constantine, the latter indestructible on account of the relics that it shelters, but neither is named in the texts that accompany the drawings. Their identification is therefore secondary to the visual logic: two monuments that were always there, and must indeed stand now, will in future be distinguished from the rest. Upon reaching these last images, then, the reader is encouraged to return to the depictions of past events. Perhaps it was this dome, perhaps this tower.

This temporal logic also informs the codex’s street-level views of Constantinople. Thus the monumental rendition of the serpent and the ravens, mentioned above, may allude to the Serpent Column of the Hippodrome; however, it does not appear as a part of Byzantine history, but as a sign of the reign of Bayezid whom it foretold. Similarly, a tableau representing the reign of Selim II includes a prophetic column carved in relief that may recall the Forum of Arcadius. As Francesco Sorce has shown, the ensemble of figures and monuments in the foreground of this image is intimately related to one of the Prophetiae seu vaticinia XIII. tabellis expressa… printed in Cologne in 1591; while the background, I am convinced, was directly copied from one of the Vaticinia sive prophetiae Abbatis Ioachim et Anselmi Episcopi Mariscani printed in Venice in 1589. Here Constantinople appears as one prophecy laid on top of another.

The mental map that underlies the codex’s various depictions of Constantinople differs in many respects from the philosophers’ city. It is not based on a direct knowledge of the physical fabric. The depictions of the serpent and relief columns lack topographical context, while general views of the city, like those of the sieges and conquest, lack consistent articulation. However, the use of published prophecies to represent city and column carries forward the philosophers’ oracular interpretations of monuments. Like the future distinction of dome and obelisk from the surrounding fabric, they repeat one of the philosophers’ most characteristic gestures, which Gilbert Dagron christened “l’affirmation a posteriori d’une prévisibilité.”

In its mental map of Constantinople, the codex proposes a response to exile that avoids the twin poles of melancholy and suppression. Perhaps the people who produced it never saw the city, nor even a faithful representation of it. But in this they were no different from its inhabitants, past and present. The city was by its nature hidden in plain sight, both visible and inscrutable. Thus the philosophers’ knowledge was translated into something wholly new, so different in kind from
Nietzsche's antiquarian that the two no longer bear comparison. The new knowledge was not based in specific objects – this gate, that column – but in a general proposition about the nature of the city's urban fabric.

The codex's mental map of Constantinople was not informed by the communal, civic knowledge that is imparted in its images of Chandax, but its peculiarities can not be attributed only to the challenge of depicting a city never visited in person. If the two images of Jerusalem depict a city that has been fully legible since antiquity, its images of Constantinople depict a city whose meaning remains hidden until some deferred future. In the former the topography is fully articulated and consistent, while in the latter the significance of buildings emerges individually and sporadically. Thus the codex maintains the ancient distinction between “the sanctity of place and the sanctity of buildings” that Robert Ousterhout has identified in the medieval development of the two cities, while simultaneously mobilizing that distinction to resolve a new set of quandaries developed by the shifting geopolitical conditions of the early modern world.
Maneuvering Pilgrimage: Agencies and Afterlives of Two Post-Byzantine Proskynētaria

The word ‘proskynētarion’ encapsulates the nature of the journey it describes. Differently from western pilgrimage (peregrinatio), the focus of the Greek Orthodox proskynēma is not on the process of reaching the shrine, but on the shrine itself, and more specifically, on the act of veneration at the shrine, that is the act of bowing down before a relic or an icon—proskynein.

Proskynētaria, pilgrims’ travel guides featuring sequential descriptions of Orthodox shrines, are one of the most characteristic genres of post-Byzantine ‘sacred geographical writing’. Initially produced in manuscript form and focussed on the holy sites of Palestine and later encompassing non-biblical places (such as Mount Athos and Meteora), proskynētaria developed and flourished between the 17th and 18th centuries. These centuries of internal stability in the Ottoman empire saw the affirmation of a new cosmopolitan and highly mobile class of Greek clergy, diplomats and merchants, and a revival of pilgrimage practices. At the same time, however, they also saw the struggle of major monastic foundations to sustain themselves, oppressed as they were by increased taxations. Proskynētaria developed as a reflection of and a response to both phenomena.

This paper focuses on two proskynētaria of biblical and non-biblical holy places respectively. The former, Daniēl’s Proskynētarion tōn Aghiōn Topōn (1666) was one of many similar manuscripts that used to circulate in and beyond Palestine at that time. The latter, John Komnenos’ Proskynētarion tou Athōnos, was first printed in Wallachia (1701) and reprinted in Venice few decades thereafter (1745), and it is the first proskynētarion dedicated to Mount Athos and its monasteries.

While both books have been object of individual studies, taken together they speak of a pan-Orthodox world which outweighed the locale. More significantly, they shed light on a characteristically post-Byzantine topographic way of seeing, experiencing, and imagining space. This topographic mode, whereby space is experienced from ‘ground level’ as a sequential movement through places, can be linked to older (Eastern and Western) spatial traditions, including itineraria, periploi, and isolarii. Indeed, proskynētaria can be thought of as dynamic textual maps activated through the act of leafing through their pages. Yet, as with any map, they are by nature selective; they include presences and silences; they produce and promote distinctive worldviews (by including only Orthodox shrines, for example, Holy Land proskynētaria promoted the importance of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem as their guardian throughout the Christian world; and by using a similar pattern to describe Athos and its monasteries, they turned the Holy Mountain into an extension of that same sacred network).

Far from being static representations, I argue, proskynētaria were cultural artifacts that travelled across space and time and enshrined powerful agencies. Firstly, they informed and directed the journeys of their users. Secondly, vividly coloured illustrations of shrines and other sacred topoi
(in the Palestinian manuscripts) and opening rhymed verses (in Komnēnos') made these books effective mnemonic tools and ‘instruments of salvation’ whose agencies extended to ‘all pious Orthodox Christians’, including non-pilgrims. Thirdly, they were material objects that circulated through extensive pan-Orthodox networks stretching across and beyond the empire, as far as to Russia. As such, not only did proskynētaria promote pilgrimage, but they also played an important role in fundraising and thus in the survival of Orthodox foundations such as Athos’ monasteries (a function later expanded by topographic engravings to which proskynētaria were directly connected).

In other words, not only did proskynētaria help pilgrims move around sacred places, but they also moved sacred places around and had a direct impact on them.
Containing Innovation and Inventing Traditions:
Orthodox Muscovite Dialogues with Counter-Reformation Print Culture

This paper analyzes important visual and intellectual confrontations that took place in seventeenth-century Russia. Appropriations of western print culture by Orthodox intellectuals forever transformed the visual culture that Russia inherited from Byzantium. The paper analyzes engagements with print culture and encyclopedic compilations both at the Muscovite court and in popular culture. It contrasts officially sanctioned imagery with innovative representations of the Mother of God. These productive confrontations contributed to forms of Marian veneration that simultaneously merged Byzantine, Muscovite, and Counter-Reformation intellectual trends with a pre-Enlightenment movement to collect and catalogue the amazing variety of divine manifestations throughout the world.

Muscovite authorities experimented with various strategies for managing the spread of new print technologies, new images and new ideas. First the authorities unsuccessfully attempted to control imagery, then they attempted to regulate facets of Orthodox icon veneration that heretofore were implicit. These efforts were unsuccessful in part because both the court and the population were receptive to new images entering into Orthodox culture. In the last decades of the seventeenth century Orthodox consumers were increasingly confronted with unfamiliar iconographies and new geographies of the sacred. Counter-Reformation prints and compilations produced in the West provided a new understanding of sacred geography and introduced post-Reformation imagery into Muscovite lands. Confrontations with unfamiliar images and competing narratives of divine favor became a catalyst for the creation of new intellectual products - encyclopedic collections of manifestations of the sacred. These processes accelerated by the 1670s and encouraged Russian intellectuals to confront and contest Western narratives that accorded little recognition to Muscovy in either the divine plan or the republic of letters.

Elite encounters with foreign images took a very different route than the path of popular culture. Elite encounters were primarily shaped by Ukrainian intellectuals who deployed the new print technology for official commissions. They created innovative and flattering images of authority by translating and adapting counter-Reformation imagery and rhetoric to the tastes of elite consumers. This section of the paper focuses on the key cultural intermediary between counter-Reformation, central Europe and Moscow - Lazar Baranovych, the Orthodox archbishop of Chernihiv. For decades he controlled a very active printing press, patronized numerous engravers (many trained in Jesuit strongholds), and shaped the Muscovite market with his Baroque books.

The second part of this paper analyzes encyclopedic compilations as an intellectual response to the challenges posed by the print culture of the Reformation. The drive to collect and catalogue miraculous manifestations of Marian imagery began in the wake of Protestant efforts to deny established forms of image veneration. First Jesuit scholars, then Orthodox intellectuals mobilized evidence for divine grace in the form of strength in numbers. By gathering evidence of hundreds of visual manifestations of the miraculous they encouraged an encyclopedic understanding of the global spread of divine grace.
A unique hand-written and hand-illustrated compendium of Mariology, *Zvezda Presvetlaia* [The Most Brilliant Star] will serve to illustrate the learned response. The text was originally composed in the second part of the seventeenth century in east Slavic lands outside of Russia and only circulated in manuscript format. This type of text would have been both beguiling and disconcerting for a Russian audience. Though presented in an Orthodox guise, its universal and ecumenical defense of Marian imagery challenged assumptions about the Mother of God’s special favor toward Russia. This manuscript reveals the extent to which counter-Reformation prints were starting to transform Orthodox visual culture: from representations of Jesus in a papal tiara to trees covered with rosaries. Like the compendia icons, this text was an Orthodox answer to Catholic, counter-Reformation, Marian compilations. This manuscript will be discussed in scholarship for the first time.
Forgiveness, Indulgence and Eastern Orthodoxy: Yes, We can!

The custom of placing a written prayer of absolution in the hands of the deceased right before burial is attested in Russia since medieval times. The text of the prayer varied even after the appearance of printed liturgical books. The presentation analyzes the text of the prayer as it crystallized by the 19th century (and is in use to this day) and compares it to Eastern Orthodox synchōrochartia (patriarchal letters of absolution). The conclusion is that since the late 19th century (if not before) Russians have been buried with an Eastern Orthodox indulgence.
Exploring the Byzantine Theory of Image Through 20th-century Art Discourse

I would like to begin this presentation on a somewhat less serious note. I would like to remind you that people have been using images probably as long as they have been using all other sorts of every-day objects, like chairs or trousers. However, I do not think that there has ever been a historical epoch or civilization in which the question “What is a chair, actually?” has ever attracted anyone’s attention. In sharp contrast to this, a seemingly very similar question “What is an image?” has repeatedly and persistently haunted people throughout a series of distinct episodes in the history of European civilization. To what extent this has also been the case outside Europe I cannot say. Without trying to present a complete list, I would like to point out that this question was explicitly asked and answered several times during the Iconoclast Era in Byzantium (ca. 726 – 843). The same question, explicitly or implicitly, has dominated art discourse in Europe for at least the last one and a half centuries, if not longer.

This fact alone makes it tempting to look for some significant parallels between the questions asked and solutions proposed by the Byzantine theoreticians of images, on the one hand, and some influential figures in the history of 20th-century art. The enquiry I am about to undertake is deliberately a-historical, and deliberately anachronistic. Its objective is in fact, on the one hand, to understand better the Byzantine theory of image and, on the other, to look for some differences and similarities between the acute conflict over the veneration of images in Byzantium and certain breaks and continuities in the modern aesthetic discourse.

Before I proceed further, I would like to clarify briefly what I, for the purposes of this presentation, consider to be the essential core of the Byzantine theory of image.

As most of you know, in an attempt to answer the fundamental question “What is an image?” (as explicitly formulated by John of Damascus) or “What is it that we see in an image?” (Theodore of Stoudios), both the defendants and the opponents of icon veneration in Byzantium developed a number of very different views about the nature of pictorial representation. John of Damascus, for instance, saw the essential character of pictorial representation in the resemblance of the image to its prototype and, at the same time, stressed the necessary difference between the two, but he did not specify the nature of this difference. The iconoclast theoretician Constantine V insisted on the identity of substance between the image and its prototype. In his opinion, only one “image” was capable of fulfilling this requirement, namely the eucharist. This position implied, in a paradoxical way, that all pictorial representations are not images, which was the ultimate goal of his argumentation. Theodore of Stoudios and Patriarch Nicephorus, who belonged to a new generation of Byzantine theoreticians of image active during the Second Iconoclasm (815–843), elaborated an even more sophisticated theory. They maintained that an image should be defined in terms of its resemblance to the hypostasis of the person represented in the image and, at the same time, in terms
of its difference in substance with respect to the prototype. They further defined the “resemblance” in terms of the category of relation. After the end of the Iconoclast Period in the 9th century, a number of Byzantine philosophers, most notably John Italus and Eustratius of Nicaea (11th century), turned their attention once again to the problem of pictorial representation and devised answers that were different from the canonical views inherited from the Iconoclast Period. So what attracts our attention in these views if we look at some of these positions with the “tools” that 20th century art offers us?

I would like to spend some time on John of Damaskos and Joseph Kosuth. John of Damaskos was the first Byzantine theoretician of the Iconoclast Period who explicitly formulated the question “What is an image?” in the 1st and 3rd of his three Orations on images and provided a formal definition of this concept. He distinguished between the image, on the one hand, and its prototype, on the other hand, and specified that an image should bear a resemblance to its prototype while at the same time it should not be identical with it. In other words, he defined the image in terms of difference and similarity between the image and its prototype. For John of Damaskos this analysis was dictated by the needs of the doctrinal polemics in which he was engaged. With the help of the distinctions he made, he was able to defend the veneration of images by making reference to the similarity of image (an icon of Christ) with the prototype (Christ) and at the same time to argue against the accusations of idolatry that were advanced by the iconoclasts, by pointing out that there existed a difference between the image (an icon of Christ) and the prototype (Christ).

And now to Joseph Kosuth, one of the pioneers of the Conceptual Art movement. The question “What is an image?” stands also at the center of his famous work entitled “One and three chairs”. This work was created in 1965 and is at present on display in The Museum of Modern Art, New York. It comprises a chair, a photograph of this chair and a dictionary entry for the word “chair”. Joseph Kosuth’s instructions regarding this work specify that one should take a chair, place it in front of a wall, take a photograph of the chair, enlarge this photograph to the size of the actual chair and place it on the wall to the left of the actual object. The text of the lexicon entry “chair” should also be enlarged and placed on the wall to the right of the chair. A similar procedure can be followed with a different object as well. The Lisbon Museum of Modern Art, for instance, has on display Kosuth’s installation entitled “One and three plants”. It consists of a cactus, a life-size image of this cactus on the wall to the left of the actual cactus and an enlarged lexicon entry “plant” to the right of the cactus. His installation, which marked the initial phase of the Conceptual Art movement, as traditionally interpreted by the critics, extends the inquiry into the presumed priority of prototype over representation that had been earlier proposed by the Surrealist Rene Magritte in his “Treachery of images” (1928/29), with its image of a pipe above the inscription “Ceci n’est pas un pipe”. Actually, Kosuth’s work does more than merely continue the discourse about the nature of representation that had been initiated by Magritte. It actually manages to make visible the “nature” of the representation itself. In a deliberately anachronistic way, Joseph Kosuth’s work can be taken as an illustration or even a modern reading of the concept of image that was vigorously defended by John of Damaskos and later enhanced in the works of the iconophile theoreticians of the Second Iconoclast Period. The prototype (chair, cactus) and the image (photograph of the chair or cactus) placed beside it “make visible” the relationship of similarity and difference between them. The life-size photograph on the wall faithfully reproduces the appearance of the chair or the plant while at the same time clearly indicates that it is not identical with it. The similarity and difference that are so important
both to the iconophile apologists of icon veneration and modern specialists of aesthetics become at once visible or even tangible. The third constitutive element in Joseph Kosuth's work, namely the dictionary entry for the word “chair” or “plant” to the right of the actual chair or plant, can not be further explored in relation to John of Damaskos's concept of image alone, but reveals its importance in connection with the ideas that were proposed in the writings of the iconophile theoreticians of the Second Iconoclast period, such as Nicephorus and Theodoros of Stoudios. These thinkers discussed at significant length the question whether, and if so to what extent, the name Jesus Christ can be applied both to the image of Christ and Christ himself. They reached the conclusion that the name Jesus Christ can be applied both to the image and its prototype. In one case, i.e. when it is applied to Jesus Christ himself, it is applied “kyrios”, that is in a proper sense. In the other case, when it is applied to the image, it is applied in a homonymous way. These considerations also constituted, according to Nicephorus and Theodore of Stoudios, a proof of the legitimacy of icon veneration, or more precisely a proof that Christ can be venerated in or by means of his image. Owing to time constraints, I am not going to dwell further on the possible interpretations of the role the dictionary entry “plant” plays in Joseph Kosuth's work. I only limit myself to pointing out the link many critics drew with Magritte's “Ceci n'est pas un pipe” and contrast this artistic gesture with the iconophile assertion “This is not Christ in the proper sense of the word”.

Going beyond this particular example, I would like to stress that the rich history of 20th-century European Art does offer an impressive amount of material that is capable of shedding new light on or even bringing to life some complicated distinctions that attracted the attention of the Byzantine theoreticians of image, both on the iconophile and the iconoclast sides. The iconoclast thought that is much too often ignored when reconstructing Byzantine theories of image -- simply because so little of it has actually been preserved, -- is particularly open to a “dialogue” with the twentieth century's artistic discourse. In this context one may point, rather predictably, towards Malevich’s “Black Square”, as a painting that underscores the denial of “figurative” art and which was, quite intentionally, viewed by its creator as an icon of the Suprematism movement and even exhibited in the “red corner”, i.e. in the place of an Orthodox icon during the salon of 1913. Or less predictably perhaps, towards Auguste Clésinger's “Woman bitten by a snake”, which can be taken as an illustration of Constantine V's insistence on the image being not merely similar to its prototype but being its “paragogon”, a derivative of its model, just like the “Woman bitten by a snake”, a plaster cast moulded from life, can be considered a “paragogon”, much in Constantine V’s sense, of Apollonie Sabatier. To conclude, I would like once again to stress, on the one hand, the importance of a thoroughly historical methodical exploration of the Byzantine theory of image and, on the other, the problems and advantages of the anachronistic “dialogue” between twentieth-century art and Byzantine discourse on images. Thank you for your attention.
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Introduction

In this round table, we want to discuss the transformation processes which evolved during the different conflicts between Byzantium and the Islamic world. In the 7th and 8th century, major parts of the Byzantine empire were occupied by the Arabs and Syria and Egypt were culturally-religiously Islamized as well as linguistically Arabized. In the 10th century, northern Syria and Iraq were reconquered by the Byzantines, and in the 11th century the Turkish expansion into Anatolia set in, which in the end led to the conquest of Byzantium by the Ottomans. The relations between Byzantium and the Islamic world were characterized by various political, cultural, and social transformation processes which will be analyzed in the panel by taking into account selected historic events and examples. We will focus on two regions, Northern Syria/Mesopotamia and Anatolia. Thus, the regional differences in the developments are taken into account.

In the region of Northern Syria, we will discuss to what extent the Byzantine reconquest in the 10th century led to new transformations in this area. We are especially interested in the question how the Byzantines reintegrated into their state the mixed population on their border, which had been living under Islamic rule for centuries.

Concerning Asia Minor, we will discuss changes resulting from Turkification and Islamization processes on the one hand and the simultaneous continuity of Byzantine-Christian population and cultural substrate on the other hand.
Orthodoxy or Empire? Nikon of the Black Mountain 
and the Construction of Orthodox Identity in the Monasteries of Northern Syria

The Byzantine reconquest of northern Syria involved not only the integration of peoples who had long lived under Islamic rule into the basic structure of the state (taxation, law, etc.), but also the reconstruction of the imperial church via the patriarchate of Antioch. Concurrent with rebuilding the official church was an attempt to make Antioch and its vicinity one of the centers of Byzantine monasticism once more. Unlike all the other major centers of Middle Byzantine monasticism such as Constantinople and the Holy Mountains (Athos, Ganos, Latros and Olympos), the monasteries of Northern Syria in the tenth and eleventh centuries during the period of Byzantine rule were populated by a cornucopia of confessional and ethnic communities outside of the Greeks themselves, including: Armenians (both pro- and anti-Chalcedonian), Georgians and various Aramaic- and Arabic-speaking Christians.

The copious writings of Nikon of the Black Mountain, including a just-published edition of his *Taktikon*, attest to the monastic reformer’s attempts to navigate this variegated confessional and linguistic landscape in the last half of the eleventh century. The withering and then collapse of imperial rule in Northern Syria on the eve of the First Crusade meant that the region’s Orthodox monastic community, whose dominance had hitherto been at best tenuous, had to contend with the loss of the local support of the state. In this context Nikon’s works, in which he often dealt with questions of cultural conflict within the monastic communities of the Antiochene hinterland (e.g. could Armenians and Georgians be orthodox), show an attempt to construct a local Orthodox identity capable of accommodating the various cultural and ethnic groups inhabiting this border region. While recent attempts at defining Byzantine identity (notably Anthony Kaldellis’ *Hellenism in Byzantium*) have underlined the role of state allegiance in its construction, Nikon’s writings provide a powerful counterpoint to this theory. By drawing on Late Antique precedents from Palestine and Syria (particularly that of St. Symeon the Younger), Nikon developed an expansive version of Orthodox identity centered around the history and traditions of Late Antique north Syrian monasticism, which downplayed the prominent role elsewhere of Hellenic culture and language. In addition, unlike other roughly contemporary monastic leaders (Athanasios of Athos, Christodoulos of Patmos), Nikon did not actively seek state patronage (imperial or otherwise), and only grudgingly cooperated with the local church authorities.
Reassessing a Lost Century: 
Archaeological Evidence during the Byzantine Reconquest of North Syria, 950-1050 C.E.

In North Syria between 950-1050, the Byzantine reconquest, political and economic fragmentation of the northern regions with the ‘Abbasid central authority leading to the rise of local dynasties, and the shift towards nomadism with the influx of Turkic and Arabian tribes has led to an observable decline in the settlement and material evidence of the region. Some scholars have argued that these trends echoed throughout the Islamic Near East, amounting to a “Lost Century.” However, variations on a sub-regional level show that not all areas experienced an decline, rather, specific areas witnessed economic development into the twelfth century and later. This paper will compare settlement patterns from surveys including the Amuq, Syrian Jibāl (Dead Cities), Kahramanmaraş, Balikh, and Middle Euphrates - all regions that show a significant discontinuity of sites with earlier periods. Archaeological invisibility of camp sites and poorly understood key ceramic types of this period will be considered in efforts to overcome some generalities in the data. Yet, excavation evidence from Tüpraş Field/Hişn al-Tināt on the Mediterranean coast, Anṭākiya/Antioch, and recent evidence from the Nahr Quwayq hinterland of Ḥalab/Aleppo shows increased commercial vitality and local manufacture during this “lost century.” This paper will suggest that certain political-economic changes with the brief period of Byzantine reconquest after 956, establishment of Little Armenia, rise of local dynasties like the Ḥamdānids, and commercial influence from the Fatīmids in the south forged trans-frontier and maritime strategies that helped to override the more observable decline of landscape and successfully develop specific economic corridors.
Byzantine despoinas in the Mongol world: marriage as a diplomatic tool

After the reconquest Constantinople in 1261 Byzantium sought to establish new relations with her eastern neighbours. Of these, the most important were the relations with the Ilkhanid state, the chief guarantor for safety of the Byzantine eastern borders. What lies behind the unusual Byzantine reverence towards the Ïlkhāns? Was that just a recognition of the international and cultural prestige of Iran, or were there closer political ties that served as a springboard for Pachymeres’s laudatory prose when he described the reforms of the Ilkhan Ghazan (1295-1304)? After the battle at Sultanhanı in 1256, when the Seljuk army was destroyed by the Mongols, both Michael Palaiologos and ‘Īzz al-Dīn Kay-Kāwūs II fled to the Nicaean territory. When ‘Īzz al-Dīn Kay-Kāwūs II was still in Nicaea during the winter-spring of 1256-7, a Mongol embassy, sent by Hūlegū, arrived. Emperor Theodore II managed to use the embassy to the Nicaean profit, and advanced the project of a marriage between the Ïlkhān and the Nicaean ruling dynasty. It was the new Emperor, Michael VIII Palaiologos (1259-1282), the participant of the Sultanhanı battle, who finally concluded the marriage. Towards the end of 1264 - beginning of 1265 his illegitimate daughter Maria, the future Lady of the Mongols, went to marry the Ïlkhān Abaqa. All the primary sources noted the exceptional opulence of her arrival.

A reevaluation of an important evidence of Step’annos Orbēlean concerning Maria Palaiologina strongly suggests that her lingering in Tabriz, the Ilkhanid capital city, lasted longer than it is usually believed. The traditional date of her departure for Constantinople is thought to have taken place sometime after the death of her husband Abaqa in 1282, but the evidence in Orbēlean shows that she personally eyewitnessed the struggle between the Ilkhans Baydu and Ghazan in March-September 1295.

An examination of her court titles in the extant Byzantine documentary sources and the mosaics in the church of the Holy Savior in Chora (Kariye Cami) suggests that the position she enjoyed in Constantinople, when she returned from Tabriz, was not the one of a noble Byzantine lady but rather of a plenipotentiary foreign ruler. She truly was a representative of the Ïlkhāns in Constantinople.

Moreover, she established a new tradition for the Byzantine princesses married to the Mongol rulers, who now received a new title of daspina-khātūn, a vivid combination of the Byzantine and Mongol court practices. It was Maria, who managed to conclude a matrimonial alliance with the Ilkhan Öljeitū. According to Qāshānī, a certain Tesbina-khātūn, dukhtar-i qayṣar-i Ḹūṣṭānṭiniyya (‘despoina-khātūn, daughter of the Emperor of Constantinople’) was the twelfth wife of the Ïlkhān. The new bride received the same unique title daspina-khātūn as Maria Palaiologina before her. Maria’s legacy outlived her in the Empire of Trebizond, which created the chain of the alliances with the petty Muslim emirates along the Empire’s southern border in the fourteenth century. Maria, sister of the emperor Alexios III (1349-1390) of Trebizond, married Qutlū Beg of the Aq-qoyunlu (c. 1360-1389) in 1352. She received the same title despoina-khātūn as the Byzantine wives of the Ïlkhāns before her. It might have been that the powerful Theodora Grand Komnena, the ulu hatun (‘chief wife’) of Uzun Hasan of the Aq-qoyunlu (1457-1478), also enjoyed the same title.
Change and continuity in the city of Trebizond after 1461

The empire of Trebizond in 1461 faced the same fate as Constantinople in 1453, when the last emperor, David, surrendered the city to the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II. Following this takeover, Mehmed sent many Turkish settlers to this area, made a clear division between the Christian and Muslim population, causing thus demographical changes.

The integration of the Muslim population in the city followed the transformation of the city's topography. Churches were converted to mosques, common public spaces reorganized for administrative purposes and Muslim foundations were established to fulfil the needs of the newcomer population. Consequently, the fall of the city and its integration to the Ottoman Empire caused many socio-political changes to the former capital. These changes reordered the functional and symbolic aspects of the city's topography in the process of its conversion from a byzantine city to an ottoman one.

The city of Trebizond was adapting to this new reality and its new status quo in the new empire. This adaptation process reformed the urban space, and the city went through a noticeable transition, which is well recorded in the archaeological material. Although the city went through many reforms, some aspects of it remained unaltered. The church continued its previous deed and in addition to that, new institutions appeared, which served the needs of the remaining Christian population, such as the charity institutions. Furthermore, the city as a commercial and trading centre remained so, due to its geostrategic location on the southern coast of the Black Sea and its connection to the Silk Road. Finally, the city of Trebizond never lost its political significance. From the capital of the byzantine empire of Trebizond it ended up as a capital of the Vilayeti of Trebizond under the Ottoman rule.

This paper will deal with the transition of Trebizond from a Christian Byzantine capital to an Ottoman Muslim provincial capital. The consequences of the new adjustments, namely the division between the Christian and Muslim population, the removal of indigenous population, the installation of new groups from outside along with the new foundations, and the transformation of the city's topography, will be analysed through the examination of the archaeological material and the study of the written sources. An interdisciplinary approach offers a more historically accurate image of the city before and after its siege, as well as a better understanding of the social and political factors that reformed the order of Trebizond's urban space.
Some Thoughts Towards a New Interpretation of Manzikert (1071)

In Byzantine history the battle of Manzikert is considered one of the biggest military setbacks between the Islamic conquests of the seventh century and the fall of Constantinople in 1453. Large parts of Asia Minor, which according to modern Greek continuity concepts are perceived as deeply Hellenized regions, permeated by the Christian-Orthodox faith and Constantinopolitan cultural values, were irreversibly lost to barbarian enemies. In the historical discourse of the Republic of Turkey, Manzikert stands for the beginning of the Turkification and Islamization of Asia Minor. In this paper I will concentrate on two crucial questions, which seem to have been only superficially discussed in the scholarly literature: How does the battle of Manzikert fit into the broader context of the Turkish penetration of Asia Minor and the Byzantine defensive strategy? It is more or less commonly held that Emperor Romanos IV sallied forth to rout Sultan Alp Arslān’s army in order to restore Byzantine control over the eastern provinces. But was this really the case? No source claims that the imperial government would have been able to regain the borderland through a pitched battle; nor is there any evidence indicating that the emperor intended to directly attack the sultan or vice versa. The second question is related to the battle’s symbolic and ideological dimension. What were the original ideas Byzantine, Eastern Christian, and Muslims authors wished to convey to their audience with respect to the battle’s outcome? In this way we can point out some glaring discrepancies between medieval and modern interpretations of the battle.
Why did the Melkites commemorate new martyrs in the early Islamic period and other Christians did not?

During the Umayyad and early ‘Abbasid periods, the Melkites of greater Syria produced a large number of new martyrologies. These commemorated the execution of Christian saints at the hands of the Muslim authorities, including martyrs killed for apostasy and blasphemy. Among the most important were Peter of Capitolias (d. 715), a priest from the Decapolis who publically disparaged the Prophet Muhammad; Elias of Helioupolis (d. 779), a young layman who allegedly converted from Christianity to Islam and back; Bacchus (d. 786), the child of a religiously mixed family in Palestine who chose his mother’s Christianity over his father’s Islam; the Twenty Martyrs of Mar Saba (d. 788/97), a group of monks massacred during a Bedouin raid on their monastery; and Anthony al-Qurashi (d. 799), a Muslim aristocrat from Damascus who reportedly converted to Christianity and was executed by Harun al-Rashid. There are many other accounts of Melkite martyrs preserved in Greek, Arabic, and Georgian texts, ranging from saints’ lives to liturgical books.

While the Melkites enthusiastically commemorated new martyrs in the early Middle Ages, other Christian communities did not. There is only martyr of the period closely tied to the Syrian Orthodox church: Cyrus of Harran (d. 769), another Christian who allegedly converted to Islam and returned to Christianity, whose life appears in the Chronicle of Zuqnin. Nestorian Christians in Iraq and Iran did not commemorate new martyrs at all, which is striking given that they had produced so many martyrologies during the Sasanian Period, recording tensions with the Zoroastrian ruling elite.

What accounts for this imbalance among the Melkites, Syrian Orthodox, and Nestorians? Did these communities experience different levels of violence under the Umayyads and ‘Abbasids, and therefore, commemorate different numbers of new martyrs? Or does the disparity reflect differing strategies of identity formation in the face of early Muslim rule, with the Melkites most enthusiastically seizing on martyrdom as a core part of their new worldview.

This paper seeks to explain why the Melkites turned to martyrologies as a literary response to the rise of Islam, especially during the eighth and ninth centuries. It will consider whether the Melkites’ ongoing connections to the Byzantine Empire made them suspect in the eyes of the Muslim authorities, and more importantly, whether these connections made it harder for them to make peace with their new subordinate status under the shari‘a. The core message of the martyrologies – namely, resistance to Muslim faith and Arabic culture -- uniquely suited the Melkites as they attempted to live as imperial Christians in a post-imperial, post-Byzantine world.
Evolution of the barbarian?
Changing Image of Kaykhusraw of Ikonion
in different versions of Niketas Choniates’ History

The Seljuk rulers of Ikonion praised Ghiyath al-Din Kaykhusraw I (1192-1196, 1205-1211) as a “martyr” in their inscriptions. According to the present consensus, this sultan died near the walls of Antioch-on-the-Meander in 1211 in the battle with Theodore I Laskaris. Interestingly, “martyr” sultan Kaykhusraw enjoyed good reputation not only among his descendants, but also with the Byzantines. Prominent among those was Niketas Choniates, who praised the sultan in his History.

The primary aim of the present paper is to trace the changes in the image of Kaykhusraw in the different version of Niketas Choniates. In the first version of the History (written before 1204) Choniates depicted the sultan as a failed son of a successful father, powerful Kılıç Arslan II of Ikonion (r. 1165-1192). According to Choniates, after Kaykhusraw I came to Constantinople to beg Alexios III Angelos for help, he received some assistance but did not manage to capture the throne back. Same image is present in the redaction of the History that dates back to 1204. However, in the last edition of his work, Choniates altered the image of Kaykhusraw I significantly. The writer pronounced that the sultan of Ikonion was a Christian by mother and just ruler. In History, Kaykhusraw cared for his Byzantine prisoners and cut wood for the captives during a harsh travel through the winter hills of Anatolia. According to Choniates, Kaykhusraw settled the prisoners in Philomelion, provided them with tax exemption for five years and was benevolent towards his Christian subjects.

The paper argues that the profound change in the image of Kaykhusraw can be explained in connection with other changes in the later version of History of Niketas Choniates. As Alicia Simpson proved, Choniates altered his History after 1204 to put more blame for the Byzantine decline on Alexios III Angelos. It seems likely that the positive features of Kaykhusraw allowed Choniates to contrast him with the negative qualities of the despised emperor. At the same time, Choniates might have had another reason to alter the image of Kaykhusraw in the last version of History. After the fall of Constantinople Niketas found refuge in Nicaea of Theodore Laskaris. When Choniates corrected the image of sultan in the last version of his History, he probably knew about the new balance of power in Western Asia Minor that Theodore I Laskaris and Kaykâüs of Ikonion established after the death of Kaykhusraw.
Coranus Graecus – Transformation of Religious Knowledge in Byzantine Syria

The Byzantine Translation of the Qur’an, dating back at least to the 9th century or maybe even before, is a prime example of a process of transformation between Byzantium and the early Islamic world. Since the rise of Islam, Orthodox Christians and Muslims entered into intercultural contact and, thus, interreligious dialogue about the right faith. While earlier apologetics, like John of Damascus, Theodor Abu Qurrah, and Theophanes Confessor, concentrated on the picture of Islam and its teachings in a more general way, we find a very accurate and detailed engagement with the Muslims’ holy scripture in the anonymous Greek translation of the Qur’an.

This translation was transmitted only indirectly and fragmentarily and, furthermore, in a very tendentious source, namely the polemics of Nicetas of Byzantium against the Qur’an «Ἀνατροπὴ τοῦ Κοράνιου». It is the oldest and main witness of the, as it seems, very first translation of the Qur’an ever, preserved in a single manuscript now in the Vatican Library. However, as Nicetas is quoting large parts of the Qur’an in Greek we are able to reconstruct this translation up to a certain extent.

The philological-theological analysis of the translation and the comparison with the Arabic text shed light on different aspects of the knowledge transfer between the Byzantine and Islamic worlds regarding their ‘revelation knowledge’ (‘Offenbarungswissen’) of the respective other religion. It became clear that the Greek translation of the Qur’an, made by an anonymous author, is a result of several steps of transformation on an intellectual level at the borders of Byzantium. While generally very accurate, the translation contains some textually subtle, but theologically highly important differences with respect to the Arabic text. It seems, thus, to be the outcome of a Christian hermeneutical reading of the Qur’an inserted into the Muslim text by an Eastern Christian of the Greater Syrian region (bilad ash-Sham).

The paper aims to interpret the results of the textual analysis within the historical framework in Middle Byzantine times in the Eastern parts of the Empire. The research is related to Byzantine and Qur’anic studies as well as Christian and Muslim theology and the philologies of Greek and Arabic languages. It presents the different steps of knowledge transfer between Byzantium’s Christians and their direct neighbors, the Muslim Arabs, through the example of the Greek translation of the Qur’an by examining the various transformation processes and contextualizing them with the intellectual-religious life of that time and the Byzantine cultural-political exchange with the Islamic world.
Byzantium in the 10th and 11th Century Arabic Poetry: 
The “Byzantine Poems” (ar-rūmiyyāt) of Abū Firās al-Ḥamdānī 
and Sulaymān al-Ḡazzi

In this paper the image of Byzantium in the writings of two Arabic poets of 10th and 11th century Syria and Palestine will be discussed. Abū Firās al-Ḥamdānī (320/932-357/968), the cousin of the Ḥamdānid ruler of Aleppo Saif ad-Dawla, is one of the most famous Arab poets of the 10th century. He is especially renowned for his so called “Byzantine Poems” (ar-rūmiyyāt), which he wrote during the four years that he spent in captivity in Constantinople. Although he also regularly refers in his other poems to his frequent campaigns against the Byzantines, the rūmiyyāt provide us with specific information about his attitude to the Byzantines, his encounters with Nikephoros II Phokas, his situation as a captive and his relations with his relatives. Indeed, it seems he also had Byzantine uncles, as his mother was a former slave of Byzantine origin.

Much less known is Sulaymān al-Ḡazzi. From his work we learn that he was a Melkite and lived in Palestine in the first half of the 11th century. At an advanced age he became bishop of a see somewhere in Palestine, probably Gaza. While he wrote several theological treatises, his most original work however is the diwān, his collection of 79 religious poems. In these poems he presents the Melkite community with descriptions of their Orthodox faith in a way that was meant to enhance their understanding of it. Rituals and feasts are described in the poems, as well as many impressions of the religious life of the Melkite Christians are given. Especially notable is Sulaymān’s particular concern for the Christian sacred geography of Palestine. Furthermore, he refers to persecutions endured by Palestinian Christians during this period. Sulaymān also shows a certain allegiance to Byzantium. He praises the virtues of the emperors and explicitly attributes the decay of Palestine to the fact that the land has lost its true rulers, namely the emperors.

Byzantium’s increasing cultural influence in Northern Syria in the course of the Byzantine conquest of this area can be detected for example in an extensive effort to translate Greek works into Arabic and vice versa. But also beyond its borders Byzantium was prominent as an enemy or as protecting power for the Oriental Christians under Muslim rule not only in historiography but also in Arabic poetry.
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Introduction

The Byzantine (world) chronicle has always been of particular interest to current research. At first it was considered to be a historical source providing data which were collected for modern historical works on Byzantium. Contradictory data led to a thorough and detailed examination of the sources, in the course of which the researchers identified the sources of the chronicle and analysed the authors’ relationship to his sources, i.e. whose works he used and how he used them. A secondary branch of the research was an attempt to identify the authors of works often passed down anonymously or to connect certain pieces of a historiographical corpus to (the) authors. As the number of works is limited, after a while historians turned away from chronicles, which could no longer provide them with new data. The chronicle was taken over by editors and literary critics. The editors prepared excellent critical editions incorporating new achievements and adopting (partly) new methods of textual criticism. Literary historians used to examine the common features of works classified as belonging to the genre by Krumbacher in order to define the genre. In the course of the examination new approaches and new methods of literary criticism also emerged in Byzantine literary history. The work yielded some significant, partly disputed, partly rejected preliminary results concerning the various types of the chronicle, its relationship to other literary genres, its authors and readers, literary plagiarism and imitation (mimesis) as well as the relationship between the chronicle and the imperial propaganda or Kaiserkritik. However, the definition of the genre is still a subject of discussion.

The concept of the open text was brought about by a new approach in literary criticism, which focused on the work and later on the reader rather than on the author. As the chronicle contains collected texts, it is suitable for the examination of the interpretative reader and of the writer as the user of borrowings (excerpta, citata, allusions), adapting (and manipulating) the texts of other authors. There is hope that these new directions (e. g. the research in Byzantine narrative) will yield results that can contribute to a better understanding of the Byzantine (world) chronicle.

When defining the genre one must consider the rare but priceless loci where the Byzantine authors themselves write about narrations that discuss past events in various genres. Examples of these can be found in several passages of Chronographia, where Psellus remarks: *I would rather walk in the middle path between those who formerly wrote of the reigns and achievements of the elder Rome, and those who today are accustomed to compile chronicles, or history is a simple and true narrative, or the historical style should not be too polished* (transl. by Joan Hussey). At the same time certain earlier comments on the presence or absence of rhetorical devices, the presence of the narrator or the (seeming) detachment of the text should not be utterly rejected. Collingwood’s remark on the
characteristics of Christian historiography seems to be especially useful: *Any history written on Christian principles will be of necessity universal, providential, apocalyptic, and periodized.* (…) *All these four elements were in fact consciously imported into historical thought by the early Christians* (for example by Eusebius of Caesarea).

In possession of the new results it is again the historians’ turn to study the chronicle, though this time not in search of data, but to find answers to completely new questions.
Plus ça change …

This paper will compare and contrast Byzantine world chronicles from the sixth and the fourteenth centuries in an attempt to assess the rationale behind the texts’ construction.
Movable History: The Author of Theophanes Continuatus I-IV and the Reuse of Ancient History for the Iconoclast Period

There has been an intense debate on the authorship of the so-called Continuation of Theophanes, at least since the late Ihor Sevcenko started thinking about the publication of the text, some decades ago. We all agree now that the only manuscript of the text (Vat. gr. 167) consists of at least three parts: Part I, composed by an anonymous writer of Constantine VII’s team and dealing with the reigns of Leo V, Michael II, Theophilos and Michael III; part II dealing with Basil I and written to a great extent by Constantine VII himself; and part III, added at a later period (perhaps through the agency of Basil Lekapenos, as suggested by Michael Featherstone) and dealing with several reigns from 886 to 963.

If we were to look for a person responsible for most of the writing of Part I (let us call him for the sake of convenience “the Continuator”), we should date his activity to the time of Constantine VII’s reign, probably in the fifties of the 10th century, for the man worked after Genesios finished his work. In fact, Genesios boasts about being the first person who wrote about the period and the Continuator works on the same dossier of sources Genesios used.

To identify who the Continuator was is not an easy task. In fact, the Continuator, as Constantine’s collaborator, considered his task secondary and concealed his name: all the historical work was put under the name of the learned emperor. We are not even sure that the Continuator was just one person, for the proem of Part I is written in plural. And there are differences between the style of the different books. Despite all these caveats, scholars have been looking for an author of part I, a close collaborator of the emperor working in the fifties. There are some methodological problems with this enterprise.

To begin with, we have to cope with the problem of the dependence from the sources: How can we be sure that this or that expression or literary image was of the Continuator and not taken from his sources? This is always a problem when dealing with historians. In our case, however, we tread some solid ground because we know that Genesios and the Continuator used the same common source: a dossier of texts dealing with the history of the second iconoclasm. Accordingly, when both authors agree in some expression, they have taken it from this common source. Literal coincidences are, however, infrequent, for Genesios took much trouble in creating a baroque style and completely rewrote the original wording of the common source. But at least, the coincidences in content give us a clear guide about the procedure followed by the Continuator when he wrote Part I. Usually, the Continuator rewrote the sources at his disposal but avoided rhetorical excesses. He used supplementary sources (most of them hagiographical) unknown to Genesios. His task can be described as professional or standard, and does not give us many clues about the author.

However, the Continuator did no limit himself to a plain rewriting of his sources, but also added personal remarks or images that are completely absent in Genesios. These are the “personal
“mark” of his style and allow us to draw a profile of him as author. These additions are mostly amplifications of the narrative of the sources and personal comments on historical facts. For instance, the Continuator always tries to characterize each emperor according to a fixed pattern of his personality. However, these comments, once the leitmotif of each emperor is identified, are constructed in a very predictable way and do not serve, accordingly, to isolate the style of the Continuator from the classicist mainstream of his age. The same can be said about the tendency of the Continuator to duplicate words, using pairs of synonyms to express a single idea (for instance in Cont. I.2 ἐπληρώθη κατηφείας καὶ ἄχλυος… πλήρης ἀθυμίας καὶ θλίψεως). These “doublets” are lacking in Genesius, but they appear in other Byzantine writers, so that we cannot make any conclusion on authorship based on them.

It is an interesting fact that the Continuator uses proverbs and phrases which are also absent from Genesios. Many of them are, curiously enough, also present in the works of Arethas, but this does not mean that the Continuator and Arethas are the same person. It could be that they both consulted the same collection of proverbs and sententiae, or simply that to quote proverbs was à la mode in the period. However, this fondness of the Continuator for sententiae (again absent in Genesius) is remarkable and, as the so-called doublets, a feature of his style.

In any case, the most important clue for establishing a profile of the Continuator is his reuse of passages taken from ancient Greek historians of the Roman period for colouring the historical episodes he found in his sources on the period of Second Iconoclasm. I will consider four instances, all of them taken from Book I. The authors from whom he reuses or copies material are Dionysius of Halicarnassus (a passage of his Roman Antiquities, where the dictator Camillus speaks in front of his army, encouraging them to oppose the Gauls, who were attacking Rome in 367 BC), Plutarch (a passage of his Life of the Lesser Cato, where Cato is besieged in Utica by the troops of Caesar in 46 BC), Polybius (the proem of his History) and Diodorus Siculus (a passage of his Library, where he describes how the Athenian general Phormio was “puffed up with pride” after defeating the Spartans in a naval battle at the entrance of the Corinthian Gulf in 429 BC).

My guess is that the Continuator did not come to these authors by perusing their works, but that he looked for inspiration at the historical excerpts of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, and particularly, in two instances, at the volumes On speeches (Περὶ δημηγορών) and On sieges (περὶ πολιορκιῶν) (see Németh, A. 2013. “The Imperial Systematisation of the Past in Constantinople: Constantine VII and his Historical Excerpts”, in König, J. and Woolf, G. eds., The Encyclopaedia from Antiquity to the Enlightenment, Cambridge, 232-258).

My suggestion is that the Continuator consulted these histories through the corresponding volumes of the encyclopaedia of Constantine. Moreover, that he could be one of his compilers. We cannot even exclude that the emperor himself was responsible for these literary adornments of the text, which are specially present in Book I.

The analysis suggests in any case that the compilation of the historical excerpts could have been conceived as a way for providing materials for historians and that ancient historical texts were reused as a repository of history.
Defining Byzantine Chronicles:
 a Challenge for Historians of Byzantine Literature

I would like to begin this talk with a lament about a regrettable situation in which I believe all of us who study “Byzantine chronicles” find ourselves today. I refer to the fact that we, as historians of Byzantine literature, actually do not have at present a concept of this genre. We traditionally speak of a number of Byzantine texts as chronicles, but we are not able to agree on the key features that constitute a chronicle and we are equally unable to draw a clear dividing line between chronicles and other historiographical works from the Byzantine period. This has not always been the case.

During the period following the publication of Karl Krumbacher’s Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur, there existed, albeit for a short time, a comprehensive concept of this genre that was universally accepted by historians of Byzantine literature. I would like to place a special emphasis on the word “comprehensive” and explain briefly what I mean. The concept of monkish chronicles that Krumbacher had proposed not only invested chronicles with a very specific literary identity. It also provided clear criteria that allowed their easy differentiation from works of history and permitted them to be viewed in close connection with a specific group of people within Byzantine society, namely monks, whose spiritual interests and mentality chronicles supposedly reflected and expressed. Monks, who wrote chronicles for other monks, according to Krumbacher, were, on the one hand, “poorly educated” and, on the other hand, “were thirsting for religious instruction”. The simple language in which chronicles were written and the choice of subjects treated in them became easily explicable on the assumption that these texts had been written by monks and for monks. Even the value of studying these texts consisted, according to Krumbacher, in gaining access to the mentality of Byzantine monks.

It was not difficult to criticize this somewhat simplistic and yet comprehensive concept of the “Byzantine monkish chronicle”. Hans-Georg Beck, a successor to Krumbacher’s chair of Byzantine Studies in Munich, did so by pointing out that of approximately 21 authors considered by Krumbacher, only six, i.e. less than one third, actually were monks or became monks towards the end of their lives, and that at least five names on Krumbacher’s list (including several ‘monks’) had earlier in their lives belonged to the same social and intellectual elite which, according to Krumbacher’s view, would have felt nothing but scorn for such low and unlearned texts as chronicles. Beck’s intention was presumably to single out only one strand in Krumbacher’s argument, namely that we have no sufficient evidence to suppose that chronicles had been mostly written and read in a monastic milieu. However, by demonstrating that we have no sufficient evidence to support Krumbacher’s assumption, he brought down the entire conceptual edifice that Krumbacher had erected upon this assumption. The low style of these texts can no longer be explained by pointing out the lack of literary education on the part of their supposed authors and readers, namely poorly
educated monks. The same holds true for the constant and recurrent references to the creation of
the universe, the history of the Jewish people, church festivities, and omens and portents that are
frequently found in chronicles. Most importantly, we lack one of the main reasons to view chronicles
in opposition to works of history, since we can no longer maintain that these two groups of texts
were written in two different milieus. With Beck’s criticism, the conceptual edifice that had been
erected by Krumbacher fell to the ground, converting an entire section of the history of Byzantine
literature into nothing more than conceptual rubble.

The need to have a clear concept of this literary genre is acutely felt by anyone who seeks
to write a systematic overview of the history of Byzantine literature. After Krumbacher, the next
attempt to write this kind of work was made by Herbert Hunger. It is of little surprise, therefore, that
while working on his monumental oeuvre “Hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner” he
formulated a new concept of the chronicle genre, in which he proposed considering chronicles as a
kind of Byzantine “trivial literature”. As I have previously demonstrated in greater detail, however,
his concept of chronicles does not constitute a real alternative to Krumbacher’s. Upon closer
inspection, it reveals close similarities with Krumbacher’s view and actually appears to be nothing
more than a slightly modernized version of the same. While Krumbacher had viewed chronicles
as works written for poorly educated monks, Hunger believed that they had been written for what
he termed an “average sort of fellow” (“durchschnittlicher Zeitgenosse”). The simple language of
chronicles, interest in wonders and portents and similar supposedly essential features of this genre
were explained by Hunger along much the same lines as by Krumbacher, namely as a consequence
of the author’s attempt to satisfy the taste of average, poorly educated people. Comparing Hunger’s
view with Krumbacher’s, we notice that Hunger no longer makes any affirmations about the writers
of chronicles, of whom we admittedly know very little. However, he still has much to say about their
supposed readers, whom he somewhat disparagingly characterizes as average people of Byzantine
times. What makes both concepts so similar to each other is the central role that both of them
attribute to the lack of education in general (in Krumbacher’s view) or lack of literary education in
particular (in Hunger’s view) when defining the literary nature of chronicles.

It is not my intention here to engage in an extensive polemic against Hunger’s view, as the
shortcuts of his approach are rather obvious and have already been discussed by me elsewhere. To
my knowledge, no other comprehensive concept of Byzantine chronicles has been proposed since
the publication of Hunger’s “Hochsprachliche Profane Literatur der Byzantiner”. This fact constitutes
the regrettable situation I mentioned at the beginning of this talk. We are now well aware of the
flaws and disadvantages of the two approaches to Byzantine chronicles that had been advanced in
the past, but we have nothing else to offer instead. So it would not be an exaggeration to say that
we are facing a tremendous challenge. Our task is to elaborate a new comprehensive concept of this
genre or, alternatively, to stop talking of Byzantine “chronicles” as a genre altogether because this
concept has been proven to be devoid of any substance.

I would like to use the opportunity offered by this round-table to present for discussion another
approach that I hope may prove useful for defining the literary identity of a majority of historical
texts that have been referred to as chronicles since the publication of Krumbacher’s Geschichte der
byzantinischen Litteratur. I believe that Byzantine chronicles can be defined as a genre -- and also
differentiated from works of history -- in terms of what I would like to call here their “literary point
of reference”. To state the case briefly, I propose to define chronicles as texts whose main literary
point of reference is the early Christian chronographical tradition, as represented by the works of Julius Africanus and Eusebios, and which often remains outside the boundaries of histories of Byzantine literature which (following Krumbacher) begin their exposition with the era of Justinian.

Some additional explanations are necessary at this point. When I speak of the “literary point of reference” of a Byzantine chronicle, I take as my point of departure a rather obvious observation that any given literary work at the time of its creation is linked to the preceding literary tradition through a number of works that had been familiar to its author at the time of writing. The “interaction”, or the way in which any work positions itself with respect to the preceding tradition, is not limited to citations from previous works or seeking to imitate or surpass them. The term “interaction” here is broader in scope than the term “literary mimesis” that is very familiar to all students of Byzantine literature. It can also be used to indicate that an author intentionally produces a text that is significantly different from some other text or even group of texts seen as a whole on account of some specific features. Trying to avoid some patterns and consciously preferring to follow instead some others can also be considered as an “interaction” -- this time understood in a converse sense -- with a preceding literary tradition.

Even though the scope of individual texts known to us as Byzantine chronicles and the interests of their authors vary significantly from one work to the other, I believe that we have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the majority of these texts do have one literary point of reference in common, namely the early Christian chronographical tradition. Let me provide some examples.

The historical work of John of Antioch, even though its main emphasis is on the history of the Roman Republic and Roman Empire, does contain some material that derives from the work of Julius Africanus. The presence of this material in John of Antioch’s corpus is a clear sign that he wanted to link his own work – a product of his own historical research and a compilation of the sources available to him -- with the tradition of Christian chronographical writing represented by Julius Africanus. The historical work of John Malalas begins its chronological structure with Adam, and, in Books 1-9, provides an account of Biblical history from a Christian perspective. The literary interaction of the Paschal Chronicle with an earlier, formative phase of Christian chronological writings is also clearly apparent. This chronicle is not, strictly speaking, a scientific treatise on the intricate problems of chronography, and especially chronography viewed from a Christian point of view, but rather appears to be a Constantinopolitan city-chronicle, whose author was most attentive to the life of the Byzantine capital. However, the intention of its author to establish a link with the early Christian chronography is not difficult to demonstrate. In this chronicle we frequently encounter a running total of the years since Creation, dating by the cycle of Olympiads, notices of indiction and regnal years, etc. The author carried out many of his own calculations, establishing, for instance, the creation of the world as 5509 BC and the crucifixion as annus mundi 5540.

These examples could easily be multiplied in a fuller exposition of the question. For the present, I believe that the three examples I have provided are sufficient to make evident the pattern that I consider to be essential for an understanding of the literary identity of Byzantine chronicles. In each of the texts I have mentioned, and, of course, in many others, we can easily discern two “elements” or two different kinds of material. One of them points towards the early Christian chronographical tradition. It demonstrates, in my view, the intent of the writers of the chronicles to establish a literary link with this tradition. This kind of material deals with such questions as the beginning
of time, Biblical history, dates and relative chronology, etc. The other element or the other kind of material that constitutes a Byzantine chronicle significantly varies from one text to another. The differences are so significant, that it is virtually impossible to find a common theme or subject that would be present in all texts that we call chronicles from John of Antioch to Ephraim of Ainos. In John of Antioch, for instance, it is an interest in the Roman Republic and later in the history of the Roman Empire. In the Paschal Chronicle it is the events that revolve around the public life of the Byzantine capital. The impression that Byzantine chronicles leave on their readers seems to tell us that their authors frequently started off writing a text similar to Julius Africanus or Eusebios and then gradually developed their own, very particular, individuality. So it does make sense, after all, to speak of Byzantine chronicles as a literary genre. Its distinctive feature is the literary interaction with the works written during the formative period of Christian chronography. However, the orientation towards this literary tradition does not prevent chronicles from developing very different individual traits, a kind of literary character that is particular to each individual work.
Studying the Byzantine Chronicles: Some Preliminary Remarks

"Un livre ne commence ni ne finit: tout au plus fait-il semblent."
Mallarmé

A separate batch within Byzantine historiography, both in terms of its bulk and its significance, is constituted by the so-called “chronicles” (chronikon, chronographikon, chronographeion, chronographia). The examination of Byzantine chronicles has in recent years become one of the most popular topic within Byzantological research. New text editions have been published, large-scale research has been launched to process the oeuvres of individual authors and to prepare the publication of one or another work, and, meanwhile, there has been an encouraging increase in the number of new translations of the source texts into living languages. Several of the participants of the present roundtable have contributed to this development substantially themselves. On the other hand, it is regrettable that besides an investigation of individual authors and texts that is more thorough than ever, the research into the genre itself has been pushed somewhat into the background. We can still not define the concept of Byzantine chronicle in a way satisfactory to all parties involved, and we find it equally bewildering to establish why and how one or another work to be researched should be deemed a chronicle, rather than a text belonging to some other genre. This, of course, is neither accidental, nor a fault of the negligence of Byzantinists. Far more appropriate is to highlight the fact that the authors, works, or groups of works traditionally linked with the genre display such variety of content, form, and language, that it is nearly impossible to find their common denominator. On the present occasion, we will barely outline some general aspects in terms of examining the genre of Byzantine chronicles.

In order to illustrate the inherent difficulty of defining the term Byzantine chronicle accurately, as a literary genre considered independent by scientific consensus, let us pick some random examples of works consensually placed into this category. Nota bene, as regards the generic classification of individual works, literary histories (Krumbacher, Hunger) and reference books do not always agree. What can be taken for granted is that the number of chronicles defined as such by all runs to at least twenty, but may actually reach as much as forty.

The inaccurately named Chronicle of Cambridge, for instance, is considered to be among the Byzantine chronicles, whose Greek text is preserved in two manuscripts (Vat. Gr. 1912; Paris BN Suppl. Gr. 920). Its anonymous author collected notes pertaining to the period between 827 and 965, focusing primarily on the Greco-Arabic wars in Sicily, complete with chronological data. The Chronica Monembasia is another chronicle, where the anonymous author, presenting a local historical work, provides a brief description of the Peloponnesian events between the reigns of Justinian and Nikephoros I. The Chronicle of the Morea can also be classified as a chronicle: the Greek version of the work preserved in four languages (Greek, French, Italian, and Aragonese) presents the history of the Christian state founded on the Peloponnese in some 9,000 lines of versus politicus.
The peculiar language of the text is remarkable in itself, for it amalgamates classical Greek and the Byzantine vernacular, while also borrowing many western (primarily French) expressions. The title of Chronica Toccorum also indicates this generic label, in which some 4,000 lines of versus politicus recount the history of the Tocco family ruling in Epeiros between the end of the 14th century and the beginning of the 15th. The Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans, written in the late 16th century, can also be considered a chronicle, discussing the sultans who reigned between 1373 and 1513. Yet another type of chronicle can be identified in the one by Konstantinos Manasses. The author, who lived in the court of Manuel I Komnenos (1143–1180), surveyed the history of the world from the creation down to the reign of Nikephoros Botaneiates (1078–1081) in 7,000 lines of versus politicus. The text, composed at the request of the emperor’s sister-in-law, Eirene Komnene, had gained considerable popularity by the 14th century; its Bulgarian translation was prepared at around that time. And the inventory could be continued endlessly without even having mentioned the best-known items of the genre (Malalas, Chronicon Paschale, Theophanes, Skylitzes, etc.).

Thus the texts belonging to the genre of chronicle vary on an extreme scale in their volume (from a few lines to several hundred folia), form (prose, versus politicus), as well as authorship (renowned scholars/clerics or anonymous records). In this conspicuously chaotic field, A. Kazhdan attempted to establish some order (in: ODB s. v. chronicle), but that is as far as can be considered (perhaps) generally accepted in regard to the genre today: “As a conventional term, chronicle can designate any one of the following types of works: (1) historical works describing world history from creation, that is the so-called world chronicle (Malalas, Georgios Synkellos, Glykas etc.); or historical works describing large sections of past history that for the most part were not based on the author’s personal observations (Theophanes Confessor etc.); The sections of ancient history were derived primarily from Iosephus Flavius, Iulius Africanus, Eusebios of Caesarea and Zonaras; (2) short chronicles that narrated in an annalistic form political events within a limited chronological period; (3) short lists of dated events beginning with the ancient past (ancient empires, emperors, patriarchs, popes etc.); (4) private notes with chronological dates (a list of the children of I. Alexios in Moscow).”

Henceforth disregarding the other types, let us here address the category featuring in the title of the roundtable, i.e. the Byzantine world chronicle, a historic work whose narrative, in keeping with the chronological order of the Old Testament, begins with the Creation, then tells of the coming of the Christ, excurses into the main events of Roman history as well as Jewish and Greek events, and finally surveys Byzantine history down to the author’s own age.

First of all, it must be clarified what makes Byzantine world chronicles Byzantine. In my view, the main reason is that the author of a given world chronicle was active in the realm of the Byzantine Empire while that Empire existed. Despite continuous shifts, the geographical framework seems more solid than mere chronology. The latter would only allow an establishment of terminus ante quem, which was the fall of Constantinople (1453). Since all Byzantine world chronicles necessarily presume the fairly broad extent and free practice of the Christian religion, I date the emergence of the genre (choosing symbolic dates) to a period subsequent to the Edict of Milan (313) or, alternatively, the establishment of Christianity as a state religion (380). The exclusive language of Byzantine world chronicles was the official language providing the geographic and chronological context for their emergence, i.e., Greek. If any one of the above three criteria (place, date, language) should prove invalid for a given work, then that work cannot be considered a Byzantine world chronicle.
In terms of the other characteristics occurring in the literature, however, I am more sceptical. As regards the recurrently mentioned linguistic simplicity, rustic or colloquial character of the chronicles, from which some have concluded that either the authors or the reading audience, or both, must have been uneducated, I think the truth lies elsewhere. I assume that the authors of the Byzantine world chronicles consciously and deliberately follow a usage characteristic of the *simple style* (ίσχνόν, gracile) since this is the most fitting for the genre, and this can reach out most effectively to the target readership, that is, the readers of the Scriptures.

Let me explain the last statement. I believe the intellectual demand that first created this genre lay fundamentally in the phenomenon that formerly accepted chronological systems (lists of consuls, list of archons, Olympic games, etc.) were rapidly repressed with the spread of Christianity. The recent converts of the new religion had not lost their roots completely: they remained Greek, Roman, or Jewish and kept their interest in their own history and culture; nor did they abandon their curiosity for the past. The customary frameworks to date events had, however, proved to be unacceptable for them, and the chronological system had to be adapted to the religious persuasions determining the fundamentals of their everyday lives. In practice, such adaptation is a nearly routine procedure as historic events can be rendered into charts or parallel columns according to individual conceptions of timekeeping. But then, in the shorter or longer connecting texts appended to such columns, it would be alien to use either the sublime or the middle register, I believe.

And finally, a few thoughts concerning world chronicles as *open works*. To our knowledge, the terms closed (*Geschlossen*) and open (*Offen*) works were coined by Heinrich Wölfflin, first applied to creative artworks. This “openness” was later considered to be the fundamental characteristic of all works of art by Umberto Eco, who grasped its essence in that any given work “opens up” an infinite number of various interpretative possibilities according to the activity of the receiver. But in the case of Byzantine chronicles, I consider openness to consist in something else. Due to the peculiar nature of textual traditions, it is *the text per se* that is open, insofar as even the copier was entitled to remove from it elements he deemed insignificant, or add elements thought important, without further ado. The impermanent, open character of the text may influence the volume of the work in both directions. A chronology is a history of events discussed in an orderly manner, but even a mere inventory of names can be freely continued and complemented, even with data contemporary with the person making those amendments. And the opposite is conceivable, too, when someone prepares an abstract from a longer work according to one or another aspect, thus substantially shortening the original volume. If anything, Byzantine world chronicles – due to their annalistic and chronological character – can, indeed, be argued to display the above concept of openness.

Evidently, the changes made in the text may easily draw along a shift in interpretation as well. With this, however, we arrive on a terrain even more swampy than the previous one.
Open Text Problems of a Chronicle

The Chronicon Paschale confronts researchers with the problem of its text creation and the intention of the author of such an inhomogeneous work. The quantity of information differs in parts of the work, and even these data seem not to be critically revised. Furthermore, under the perspective of an open text, accessible for additions and corrections, the question arises if the version, which was transmitted in Byzantine period and only once copied (the well known codex Vaticanus graecus 1941), represents itself as the result of an open text reworked and modified. The question is justified if one takes into account the differences between detailed historical descriptions on the one hand and nothing more than a list of the calculates years for a very long period on the other hand; moreover, the unbalanced structure of the work becomes significantly apparent in the bulk of information in the contemporary period of the supposed author's lifetime, including inserts beyond the dimension of any other quotation in this or similar chronicles. Thus, the character of the work fluctuates between fasti consulares, annals, and historia. The preface – which was in detail studied by a French research group under Joëlle Beaucamp (Temps et histoire 1: Le prologue de la Chronique pascale, Travaux et Mémoires 7 [1979] 223-301) – reveals at least one intention of the anonymous author: a correct calculation of the dates year by year starting from the creation of world and a mathematical concordance of the historical year, period and era calculations – as used in former chronicles and lists – in reference to the cycles of sun and moon.

In the very case of this Easter Chronicle we are confronted with a triple open text aspect:

1) The sources of the chronicle's author as base of his own work: an open field of works that needed continuation and updating (like the lists); even a work that aimed at a more or less literary level might nevertheless have been anonymous as our chronicle (is this anonymity to explain only due to the defective transmission of the preface of the work or was the work generally intended to be anonymous, an open data collection with an amended sequence of dates?).

2) The work as published in the version of the supposed author in Constantinople at the 7th c. A.D. might or not be corrected and altered by followers, at least until a copy of the whole codex (?) was written at the end of the 10th c. (a first impression seems however to exclude that the scribe of this codex, the mentioned Vaticanus, was himself working on the text or revising it; on the contrary, the scribe was obviously commissioned to just copy an existing manuscript; it appears that he was overstrained by this task at least as regards the correct copying of Greek orthography (provided that the master copy was not already corrupt); if discrepancies as well as linguistic, stylistic, and content-related variations are so extraordinarily striking, critical text analysis must highlight these ruptures and try to find the solution in an author's intention or a post-author reworking. Or, from another point of view, but still under the perspective of open text use, do these ruptures reflect nothing more than the patchwork of an author who quoted his sources tale quale, supplementing his
crucial calculation by relevant data (now correctly harmonised in a “logical” diachronic sequence) regardless of stylistic adaption. Language and style are only the negligible mediators for the more essential dates and their corrected sequence.

3) The written manuscript as open text free for further additions: in fact, the codex unicus of the Chronicon Paschale contains such additions and updates, partly already known as the mysterious passages of a Megas Chronographus (this aspect is omitted for this contribution, it will be focused on by Erika Juhász in her paper)

Behind the background of possible manipulations or open text revisions (by the way best documented in the problematic reconstruction of the mysterious Megas Chronographus) it becomes apparent how helpless research is if the first existing manuscripts dates from centuries later than the supposed author’s lifetime (if the last dates of the work really coincide with the author’s lifespan). In solving these problems, aspects of the author’s originality, including closeness to his source or excluding it by stylistic reworking of quoted sources, and of a later review are continuously overlapping and contradicting.

The present contribution is dedicated to this provoking problem and to paths of approaching a result at least of the version the author, interested in the harmonisation of different periodisation used by his sources, concluded with a personal preface.
An Intriguing Passage in Chronicon Paschale

The text of the Chronicon Paschale written in the 7th century can be regarded as an open text from several viewpoints. The anonymous author did not leave a complete, finished work to posterity. The structure of the text preserved in a 10th century manuscript (Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1941) and the contradictions in the content of some passages suggest that the chronicler did not manage to finalize his material. A draft had been handed down to posterity that could serve as a basis for the author, for the later readers or even for the scribe(s) to provide further additions.

Now we do not intend to discuss the straightforward scribal errors due to which former marginal notes had been added to the text. However, in the chronicle a longer passage can also be found, the author of which is still under debate: In the main text, starting from the verso of folio 240, the author of the Chronicon Paschale discusses the reign of Emperor Justinian. The text ends abruptly on the verso of folio 241, at the end of line 24 – in the third year of Justinian’s reign, and a space for seven lines remains empty on this page. The next page is also empty, and then on the verso of folio 242 we can find a 14-line long passage with troubled grammar starting with the fifth year of Justinian’s reign. The lower part of the page (17 lines) is left empty, and the original text continues only on the recto of folio 243.

In the spaces left empty by the 10th century scribe the fragments of the chronicle attributed to the so-called Megas Chronographos can be found. With all probability, the glosses inserted in the left margin of the verso of folio 272 and in the left margin of the verso of folio 286 also belong to the same work. The text consists of sixteen short passages.

Posterity has interpreted the sixteen passages in various ways, and the scribes and editors of the text have selected those following different principles. All of the fragments have been edited only by Peter Schreiner, who also added a commentary and a German translation to these passages in the three volumes of CFHB. Seven years later Michael Whitby also published the Greek transcription of the 14 fragments copied in the blank spaces of 241v-242v together with textual parallels added in the footnotes.

In his paper published last year, Christian Gastgeber deals with the scribe of the fragments and with the person of the possible Megas Chronographos in details – thus, in this presentation we do not intend to discuss these questions. However, it is important to note that with all probability the passages inserted later and attributed to the Megas Chronographos were written by an 11th century hand. Apart from the characteristics of the handwriting, this dating can also be supported with another passage inserted later: on the verso of folio 140 in the Vatican manuscript a list of Roman emperors can be read. On the basis of the handwriting the compiler of the list could have been the same person who also inserted the fragments of the Megas Chronographos. Now the list ends with Michael IV Byzantine Emperor, because the end of the text was lost from the lower margin of the page when the codex was rebound. However, from the 16th century copies of the Chronicon Paschale
we know that the list originally ended with Constantine IX Byzantine Emperor. Thus, the *terminus ante quem* of the insertion of the fragments is the second half of the 11th century, so the passages were definitely written before this date.

Since in the fragments the last event reported is to be dated to 750, the work was composed around the middle of the 8th century at the earliest.

The researchers have tried to narrow down the dating of the composition on the basis of textual criticism. Primarily they studied how the work is related to Theophanes, thus two opposing views evolved: according to the first one, the *Megas Chronographos* was the source of Theophanes, while according to the other it was the unknown author who used Theophanes as his source. This scholarly debate has not been settled yet. In this presentation, we do not intend to argue for either of these two views. However, it is important to mention them since 'Theopanes' chronicle cannot be neglected even in the discussion of the passage inserted between the *Megas Chronographos* fragments.

The place of the 14-line long text is controversial. The majority of the events mentioned in the *Megas Chronographos* fragments (four earthquakes, the Nika revolt, a pestilent epidemic and the collapse of the altar in the Hagia Sophia) happened during Justinian's reign. These events are missing from the *Chronicon Paschale* or are presented in another way. Thus, it is no accident that before the first fragment the title "Ἀλλως ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου χρονογράφου" is written. With all probability, not only the blank parchment pages, but also the content of the text influenced the 11th century scribe when he decided to insert the fragments exactly in this place. A further binding element is provided by the identical introduction of the Nika revolt in both sources: “In the fifth year of Justinian's reign.”

The fact that the scribe intended to follow the main text can also be supported with his other – already mentioned – entry. After folio 140 the *Chronicon Paschale* presents Iulius Caesar as the first Roman monarch, and the 11th century scribe copied a list of emperors to the blank space.

The significance of the scribe of the *Megas Chronographos* fragments does not only lie in the fact that he handed down an otherwise unknown source to posterity. By picking this place instead of other (still) blank folios for the preservations of the passages he also directs our attention to a more thorough study of the fragmentary text of the *Chronicon Paschale*.

We could see that the 14-line long text is isolated in the upper part of the verso of folio 242. On the basis of the events in the chronicle we can confirm that some text is missing between the verso of folio 241 and the recto of folio 243. After 241v we can only find a consular year on 246v the next time. On the basis of the consular lists it can be deduced that two years are missing between the two dates. These two years were indicated with the postconsulate of Lampadius and Orestes. This could have confused the chronicler, since according to his dating only one year is missing: the 4th year of the 327th olympias, which must have been the 9th indictional year and the 4th year of Justinian's reign at the same time. The numbering runs in continuation with the previous and subsequent pages according to all three chronological systems.

The examination of the lacuna leads to the supposition that something is missing both before and after these 14 lines. However, researchers claimed that the scribe left these two and half pages empty, and he attempted to supplement the text from other sources. According to Mary and Michael Whitby, finally he did not manage to find another text, thus he decided to insert only these 14 lines to the blank space, in the upper margin of the verso of folio 242. Mary and Michael Whitby suppose
that this passage might have also appeared in a corrupt exemplar either in an abridged form or in a longer version that was already fragmentary. Paul Maas and Alan Cameron – following in the footsteps of Maas – claimed that the 10th century scribe adopted the passage from Theophanes’ text.

In the Vatican manuscript the short passage starts with the breaking out of the Nika revolt in the fifth year of Justinian’s reign. The author describes that when the circus parties took their places in the Hippodrome, the Greens started to agitate against Calopodius; he quotes their agitation word by word. The interpretation of the so-called Akta dia Kalopodion has not been settled among the researchers of Byzantine studies for more than 100 years. The complete text is only available in Theophanes’ work: there is a relatively long dialogue between the speaker of the Greens and the representative of Emperor Justinian. Since in the Chronicon Paschale this passage shows word-by-word agreement with some parts of Theophanes’ text, Paul Maas and Alan Cameron supposed that Theophanes’ chronicle could serve as a basis for the 10th century scribe for the selection of the passage.

Upon the thorough examination of the passage we can observe that the text breaks at several places in the Vatican manuscript. At the beginning of the heated dialogue, after the Greens wished a long life to Justinian, they claim that they had been offended, but they do not dare name the offender. In Theophanes’ text, the representative of the Emperor tries to claim that nobody could have offended them, but finally the speaker of the Greens names Calopodius as the offender. The Chronicon Paschale presents only this latter sentence from the dialogue, then the dialogue ends there. Then we can find a description reporting that after further blasphemy, the Greens left the Hippodrome, while Justinian and the Blues continued to watch the chariot race. The last sentence that is attached again inorganically to the preceding part on the surface reports that the Emperor sent some people out to see what/why some are shouting. We do not know who the Emperor sent and who are shouting. Here ends the text on the verso of folio 242.

In the Vatican manuscript the next page starts with the expression ὡς ἔτυχεν, then we are again in the middle of a dialogue, where somebody gives an advice to the Emperor, then Justinian orders them to go out and find out against what they are revolting. Basileides executes the order and speaks to the rebels.

The question arises why the scribe did not cut off the blank folio 242, if he did not manage to supplement the lacuna. In the manuscript we can find examples where the penultimate folio of a quaternio was cut off without the mutilation of the text. On the other hand, if the 10th century scribe had indeed attempted to supplement the missing events on the basis of another source, perhaps he could not have been satisfied with such a short and troubled passage.

It is a further question why the scribe adopted and inserted only such a short passage, although he could have supplemented even the whole lacuna on the basis of the text preserved in Theophanes’ work. Thus, Mary and Michael Whitby’s argumentation seems more plausible: the 10th century scribe of the Vatican codex did not insert these 14 lines from another source (from Theophanes); the passage was rather already organic part in the manuscript of the Chronicon Paschale he used. This argumentation leads to two possibilities: the passage was either part of the Chronicon Paschale originally, or it was inserted later, but before the time of the 10th century scribe.

We could see that the fourth year of Justinian’s reign (at least the beginning of it) is lost from the chronicle. It seems strange that the passage inserted in the lacuna starts with the dating pempto ete tēs basileias luitustinianou. The editors and Maas tried to correct this problematic place by
supplementing the fifth year next to the fourth year of his reign before the passage. This is, however, an incorrect solution of the problem, because 7 and a half pages later, on the verso of folio 246 in the chronicle under the first year of the olympias 328, the 10th indictional year, the fifth year of Justinian's reign is written, and there are no traces of the scribe's modification of the text here.

The dating πέμπτῳ ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας Ἰουστινιανοῦ is generally not characteristic of the chronicler's style. His usual practice was to indicate the year with all data possible, then if he could attach any remarkable event to the given year, he introduced it with such expressions as ἐπὶ τούτων τῶν ὑπάτων or ἐπὶ τῶν προκειμένων ὑπάτων. If he intended to report more than one events within a single year, he introduced them with such introductory phrases as καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ ἔτει or τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει. After he introduced the consuls, he never used in the narration such expressions that would date an event purely with the Emperor's regnal year. Rarely we can observe that before the events reported instead of the usual phrase in this year the phrase in this … year of the reign of … occurs, but even there the author added τούτῳ τῷ in each case, and it always followed the year specified with the olympias, indiction, regnal year and name of the consuls.

On the basis of what has been said above, the short passage does not belong to the original text of the Chronicon Paschale. In this case, we have to count with the other possibility: a later hand inserted it into the codex seen by the 10th century scribe. But we cannot suppose either that the earlier interpolator intended to supplement the chronicle with such a troubled text. It seems more probable that this interpolated text is also corrupt.

It seems that the passage on the recto of folio 243 cannot continue the last sentence on the previous page. However, in the Bonn edition nothing indicates in the main text that the text here is corrupt and the sentence has no sense. In the apparatus, we can read that at the beginning of the subsequent page Du Cange deleted the part starting with ὡς ἔτυχεν, and he only continued the text from the end of line 3. The first editor, Rader did the same. He had no choice, because he worked from a copy made by the infamous 16th century bookseller, Andreas Darmarios, the Cod. Mon. Gr. 557, and there he already found the text in this state. Darmarios made three copies of the Chronicon Paschale and he tried to solve the problem in the same way: he joined the two passages reporting that the emperor sent somebody out to the crowd, deleted the part between them, and from then onwards he copied the text continuously.

According to Cameron, although the 10th century scribe excerpted Theophanes' text on the verso of folio 242, the last sentence was the scribe's own supplementation so that he could replace the grammatically unrelated passage in the next three lines; in the scribe's presentation the text continued with the moment when Basileides went out to negotiate with the rebels upon the emperor's order; the signs in the margin might indicate that the first three lines of the recto of folio 243 are to be disregarded.

This theory is questionable from several viewpoints. If the scribe wanted to give a reason for the sending out of Basileides, why should have he inserted a new binding sentence, when the sentence before Basileides' leave contained similarly the emperor's order and could have also given the transition in the same way? This question already implies the next objection: in our opinion, based on such theory we cannot delete a passage that was written by the scribe in the main text and is correct both regarding grammar and content. We should rather start out from the fact that the passage on the recto of folio 243 mirrors the state of the copied manuscript, and we should find an explanation for the inconsistencies in the previous passages with this fact in our mind.
We cannot reconstruct the layout and the *fasciculi* of the manuscript copied, but it is remarkable that in the Vatican codex 5 folios earlier, on the verso of folio 237 the events of ten years are missing from the text. Since the previous *lacuna* is not far from the passage under examination, perhaps in the exemplar transcribed the *bifolio* (or possibly *bifolios*) of the same *fasciculus* could have been damaged. Thus, the scribe of the Vatican manuscript did not leave the places mentioned blank with an additional supplementation in his mind; he rather left some empty space in accordance with the amount of the damaged text in his exemplar he was transcribing. It is possible that the last sentence in the verso of folio 242 was added by the scribe to the end of the short passage. However, the function of the sentence was not to provide the continuity of the events by deleting the subsequent passage. It rather summarizes the content of the next few lines to provide a smooth transition. This seems to be a more innocent modification; the scribe tended to modify the text with similar reason in his mind in other passages of the manuscript, as well.

Based on what has been said above, we might assume that the passage originally belonged to a longer report, the so-called *Akta dia Kalopodion*. This text was probably not part of the original text of the *Chronicon Paschale*; it was added to the text of the *Chronicon Paschale* between the middle of the 7th century (the assumed date of the composition of the *Chronicon Paschale*) and the 10th century (the date of transcribing the Vatican manuscript). In the text available to the 10th century scribe the passage discussing the 4th year of Iustinian’s reign and the text of the *Akta* were damaged, thus the scribe could only transcribe fragments. We do not need to suppose that he intended to supplement the missing part; this was not his usual habit. It is more probable that he could only see this amount of text, and he supposed the loss of this amount of text before and after the fragmentary passage.

We cannot specify exactly when and on the basis of which source the supplementation was written. We cannot disregard the word-by-word agreements with Theophanes, but the origination from Theophanes (not through the 10th century scribe) and the assumption of a possible common source is similarly possible. Naturally both theories raise the question from who the text took its origin. Since both John of Antioch and the original work of Malalas, which are mentioned in the literature as possible sources, are now lost, this question seems to remain open forever.
Plutarch’s *Vita Alexandri* as ‘Open Text’ in Zonaras’ *Epitome Historiarum* – Some Minor Observations on Zonaras’ Source Handling

Due to Byzantologists’ persistent research, today the works of Byzantine chroniclers are read in a different manner. We already know, for example, that chroniclers’ writings – although they may claim otherwise – are more than mere summaries and simple abstracts of past chronicles and historical writings. Readers must be alert and aware: what they are reading – as always, regardless of the genre – is the interpretation of the author or, more precisely, the chronicler, and this interpretation may at times be radically different from the original message of the used source. Various excellent studies use picturesque examples to illustrate how Byzantine chroniclers could reinterpret their sources by reorganizing the context, inserting (or omitting, for that matter) an adjective or adverb, changing the chronology or using other linguistic or editing tools – even if they cited them almost literally. These modifications and small changes in the text not only proved how the chronicler related to the historical personality, event, period or the author chosen as his source, but also, they naturally shed light on how the period in which the chronicler worked interpreted its past.

The present paper examines (reads) the *Epitome Historiarum* written by John Zonaras, one of the most significant chroniclers of the middle Byzantine period about the history of the world from the Creation to 1118, the death of Emperor Alexius I, taking into consideration the above mentioned aspects. More precisely, it only discusses a brief section of the *Epitome*, the chapters of the chronicle dealing with Alexander’s life (*Epitome* IV, 8–14). Except for on anecdote that he probably borrowed from Arrian’s *Anabasis* (cf. *Epitome* IV, 14, 353 [3–8]; Arr. *An*. VII, 27, 3), Zonaras wrote the Macedonian king’s story based on Plutarch’s biography. The Chaironeian historian’s biography of Alexander may have offered the Byzantine chronicler an excellent material to work from – similarly to the other Plutarchian biographies used as sources in the *Epitome*, namely Artaxerxes, Romulus, Numa, Publicola, Camillus and Aemilius Paullus. As written in his biography about Alexander, Plutarch in fact was driven by similar guidelines to those of the chronicler when composing the biographies: the ancient biographer also warns his readers that he will not write a detailed account about all the famous events, but will only outline some of them; furthermore, he avoids the great descriptions of battles and long speeches in his narrative, just like Zonaras does later on in his chronicle (cf. *Alex*. 1, 1–3; *Praef*. 1). Despite the similarities in their approach, the Byzantine chronicler naturally modifies or reinterprets his source several times, even if not radically. In the following, I will use some excerpts to explore the traces that offer us some insight into the (interpretative) process, in which the chronicler makes the source document his own. But first let me say a few words about the position Alexander’s story assumes in the *Epitome*.

Zonaras recounts Alexander’s course of life as a detour imbedded in the story of Jews. As he informs his readers in the sentence introducing the story of the king of Macedon (cf. *Epitome* IV, 8, 329, [9–16]), he intends to give only a brief account (κατ’ ἐπιδρομὴν διηγήσασθαι) of Alexander’s deeds (πράξεις), character (ἠθη) and lineage (ὅθεν κἀκ τίνων ἔφυ), after which he returns to the
mainstream of his narration (ἐπαναγαγεῖν τὸν λόγον πρὸς τὴν συνέχειαν), and tells Alexander’s visit to Jerusalem based on Flavius Josephus. It becomes clear from this short introduction – and the reference in the prooimion (cf. Praef. 3, 10 [21]–11 [7]) – that it was partly Josephus’ – historically doubtful – record to offer relevance to the ‘Alexander ekphrasis’, according to which the Jewish people met the world conqueror Macedonian king directly once in history (cf. IA XI, 8, 3–6). Beyond the visit, the traditional syllabus of world chronicles also justified the brief outline of Alexander’s story, in which Alexander, who concurred the Persian Empire and this way fulfilled Daniel’s prophecy was granted a steady position.

Faithful to his promise in the introductory sentence, Zonaras begins his record with Alexander’s lineage, but not quite as his chosen source, Plutarch does. Quoting the public opinion (τῶν πάνυ πεπιστευμένων), the ancient historian begins by tracing back the Macedonian king’s origin to Heracles on the paternal line, and to Neoptolemus on the maternal line (Alex. 2, 1). However, this datum has no trace at Zonaras; the Byzantine historian settles for ascertaining that Alexander’s father was Philip and his mother was Olympias, then with the expressions μυθεύεται and τοῦτο μῦθος he introduces the stories and dreams that recount the circumstances of Alexander’s birth and also connect his origin to Ammon, that is Zeus (Epitome IV, 8, 329 [17]–330 [7]). Reversing the order provided by Plutarch, Zonaras first mentions Ammon’s visit to Olympias in the form of a snake, followed by Olympias’ dream, in which the queen’s womb was struck by a thunderbolt that started a vigorous fire, and finally describes Philip’s dream where he pressed a seal with an emblem of a lion on his future wife’s womb. We can only guess why Zonaras, who almost always follows Plutarch’s account precisely, changed the order here. However, it seems curious that although the chronicler considers his ancient source’s information an old wives’ tale, he still takes it down, probably because he regarded all three of the stories as amusing and interesting, contrary to Plutarch’s dry list of data about Alexander’s hero ascendants, that he omitted from his chronicle. By the way, Zonaras seldom refers to mythical figures in his Epitome. According to Iordanis Grigoriadis (Linguistic and Literary Studies in the Epitome Historion of John Zonaras. Byzantine Texts and Studies 26. Thessalonica 1998.) the lack of mentioning myths is not due to the author’s ignorance, but on the one hand, the nature of his writing, on the other hand, maybe to his carefulness to avoid the suspicion of infidelity (104). Zonaras apparently does not adapt from Alexander’s biography either the stories that connect the Macedonian king with the characters of some myth like, Amazons, for example. However, in my opinion, this is not due to carefulness – at least in this case –, but the fact that even Plutarch himself and his sources doubted the authenticity of the story. (cf. Alex. 46, 1–5) Nevertheless, Zonaras’ word use, namely the expressions μυθεύεται and τοῦτο μῦθος reflect well the 12th century chronicler’s attitude towards such (pagan) accounts like, for example, the stories about Alexander’s divine origin.

As I mentioned above, Zonaras seldom disrupts the order of Plutarch’s account. If, however, he does do it, the highlighted section never stands out of the new context, as illustrated by the following example. Plutarch also embeds Olympias’ malicious remark on her son’s divine origin in the anecdote describing Alexander’s lineage (cf. Alex. 3, 4). Zonaras also includes the queen’s question – that reads as follows: “οὐ παύσεταί με διαβάλων Ἀλέξανδρος πρὸς τὴν Ἡραν;” – in his writing but he puts it at a different place than Plutarch. We meet Olympias’ words much later in the chronicle than in Plutarch’s biography. After his account of Alexander’s visit to the Siwa Oasis, the sudden rain in the desert, the birds guiding the lost king and his companions to Ammon’s oracle and the priest of the oracle who, due to a slip of the tongue, greeted the Macedonian ruler as Zeus’ son (Epitome IV, 10, 337 [9–21]), Zonaras writes the following rephrasing the first section of chapter 28 of Alexander’s biography:
κάκεινος πρὸς μὲν τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐμεγαλαύχει τὴν γένεσιν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς καὶ τὴν Ὁλυμπιάδα λέγειν “οὐ παύσεται διαβάλλων με πρὸς τὴν Ἡραν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος” πρὸς δὲ τοὺς Ἐλλήνας τοῦ λόγου ἐφείδετο. (Epitome IV, 10, 338 [1–4]; I cite M. Pinder’s edition.)

In his chronicle, Zonaras found a new place for the queen’s question where it fitted well – maybe even more than in the original Plutarchian context where readers may face some confusion in understanding the chronological order. (Namely about when Olympias uttered these words.) However, highlighting the section and inserting it in a new context proves the creativity of the excerptor, and shows that the chronicler was able to use and reorganize his source freely but competently.

The following examples allude to how the chronicler could modify the accents and meaning of his source document with the help of minor changes. Although Zonaras, as he warns us already in the prooimion, refrains from citing long speeches, short one-sentence quotes and few-line dialogues occur in the Epitome various times. These, on the one hand, serve to exhilarate the author’s narration, and on the other hand, describe the characters. Zonaras could choose whatever he liked from Plutarch’s biographies that were full of phrases (ῥήματα) illuminating the nature of characters. His selection and modifications of various degrees, however, suggest a highly conscious excerptor and author who at certain times even afforded to equip his characters with short sentences using the narrative sections of his source, this way somewhat changing the meaning and message of the original text.

For example, after summarizing the siege and destruction of Thebes in a short phrase (cf. Epitome IV, 9, 332 [15–16]) – abiding by his other guideline defined in the preamble, that is, to avoid long descriptions of battles –, he, similarly to Plutarch, devotes long lines to the encounter of Alexander and Timocleia, the Theban woman brought before him as a captive, who pushed the Thracian captain who had raped her into a well and hurled heavy stones into the well until the captain was dead (cf. Alex. 12, 1–6; Epitome IV, 9 332 [17]–333 [6]). Plutarch describes the dialogue between the king and Timocleia in indirect speech, while Zonaras composes Timocleia’s answer to Alexander’s question of who she is in direct speech:

> ἦν δέσιμον πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀχθεῖσαν ἠρώτησεν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἢτις εἶ. ἢ δὲ ἀτρέστως “Θεαγένους εἰμι ἄδελφη” ἀπεκρίνατο, “ὅς πρὸς Φιλιππὸν ἡρέθη στρατηγὸς καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἑλληνῶν ἀγωνιζόμενος ἐλευθερίας ἔπεσεν.” (Epitome IV, 9, 333 [1–4])

Although Zonaras remains faithful to the source document, with the oratio recta he renders Plutarch original scene more dramatic, and places Timocleia, the female character of the story even more in the centre. He modifies the discussion of Alexander and his general Perdiccas in a similarly subtle way. Following Plutarch, Zonaras describes that before going on board to lead his navy to Asia, the Macedonian king distributed land, villages and money deriving from taxes to his Companions. Then he continues with Perdiccas, who asked the king what he had left for himself. Alexander replied that he kept hope. But let’s see how Zonaras phrased the anecdote:

> Ὅρμησας δὲ εἰς τὴν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ στρατεύειν οὐ πρότερον τῆς νησὶς ἐπέβη πρὶν τῷ μὲν τῶν ἐταῖρων ἀγρὸν ἀπονεῖμαι, τῷ δὲ κόμην, τῷ δὲ πρόσοδον ἄλλην. τοῦ δὲ Περδίκκου “τί δ’, ὦ βασιλεῦ, σεαυτῷ καταλείπεις;” εἰπόντος, “τὰς ἐλπίδας” ἐκείνος ἀντέφησε. (Epitome IV, 9, 333 [14–18])

And these are Plutarch’s words:
Comparing Zonaras’ text with Plutarch’s, beyond wording and syntactic differences, we can discover the following two important changes: (1) Zonaras describes Alexander’s one-word answer in *oratio recta* instead of *oratio obliqua*, and (2) he omits Perdiccas’ reply. These two minor interventions immediately change the meaning of the story. Although Plutarch discusses Alexander’s generosity to his friends and soldiers in chapter 15 of the biography, in the short dialogue with Perdiccas he emphasises – through Perdiccas’s answer – the Macedonian soldiers’ commitment to their king. In Zonaras’ text, however, Alexander remains the protagonist – the answer reflecting the king’s character is not followed by any reply that would draw the reader’s attention away from the king.

In the following I will examine how Zonaras adjusts the pagan Plutarch’s text to his own historical approach. But before comparing and analysing these texts, let me say a few words about the Byzantine chronicler’s historical approach and its linguistic manifestation in the *Epitome*. Examining Zonaras’ style, GRIGORIADIS pointed out that the Byzantine historian’s preference of passive sentences is probably linked to his approach to historical events, since he did not regard them as deeds of people but rather as happenings that affect people’s lives. “Passive syntax” – writes GRIGORIADIS (117) – “provides an ideal word structure for an historian whose philosophy concentrates not on human actions but sees humans more or less as the recipients of the course of their destiny.” As it also becomes obvious from the *Epitome*, Zonaras, in harmony with the period’s Byzantine historical approach, interpreted world history as the accomplishment of God’s plan that will be completed with the second coming of Christ (cf. *Epitome* III, 3, 214 [7–10]), while he identified his own period with the fourth kingdom of Daniel. The following modifications made by Zonaras in Plutarch’s text should be examined based on the above considerations.

Although Zonaras does not tire his readers with lengthy descriptions of battles, he obviously mentions Alexander and Darius’s first great fight in his work, and like Plutarch, he also describes the battlefield briefly, which, besides Alexander’s talent as a general, also assumed an important role in the victory at Issus. Zonaras writes the following:

Ἐν Ἰσσῷ δὲ τῆς Κιλικίας τῆς μάχης συγκροτηθείσης, πολλὴν μὲν καὶ ὃ τόπος διὰ τὴν στένωσιν παρέσχε ῥοπήν τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, πλεῖω δ’ αὐτὸς ἔαυτῷ δεξιῶς στρατηγήσας.

(*Epitome* IV, 9, 335 [11–13])

Plutarch describes this as follows:

Ἀλεξάνδρῳ δὲ τὸν μὲν τόπον ἡ τύχη παρέσχεν, ἐστρατήγησε δὲ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς τύχης ὑπαρχόντων πρὸς τὸ νικῆσαι βέλτιον, . . . (Alex. 20, 7)

According to Plutarch, *fate donated* (ἡ τύχη παρέσχεν) Alexander the location, who, owing to his talent as a strategist, exploited *the circumstances offered by fate* (τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς τύχης ὑπαρχόντων). The active subject (τύχη) in the first clause of the Plutarchian description is left out of Zonaras’ record, instead, the object of Plutarch’s sentence becomes the subject in Zonaras’ text; in other words the *location* (ὁ τόπος) is what – due to its scarcity – offered the Macedonian king an advantage (παρέσχε ροπήν) in the Byzantine chronicler’s work. So Zonaras, who, as mentioned above, considered history as the accomplishment of God’s plan, banished τύχη, the force of Hellenistic
origin that shapes history and is difficult to reconcile with the Christian historical approach, from its narrative. The passive participle of the genitive absolute in the clause ἐν Ἰσσῷ δὲ τῆς Κιλικίας τῆς μάχης συγκροτηθείσης may refer to Zonaras’ position, who also thinks that this decisive battle occurred based on the predestination of some higher power – although not the one defined by Plutarch. The passive participle probably reflects the chronicler’s view according to which the events follow an already defined plan – and the planner is no other than God, the implied agent of these passive structures. It may not be by accident that Zonaras uses the same genitive absolute when describing the third, really decisive battle:

τῇ δ’ ἐπιούσῃ τῆς μάχης συγκροτηθείσης, ὡς μὲν τινὲς φασιν, ἐν Ἀρβήλοις, ὡς δ’ ἔτεροι, ἐν Γαυσαμήλοις, οἱ βάρβαροι ἐνέκλιναν, καὶ ἦν αὐτῶν διωγμός. (Epitome V, 11, 339 [21]–340 [2]).

We can discover similar passive structures at the following places: Epitome IV, 9, 335 (17–19) (cf. Alex. 20, 11); Epitome IV, 10, 336 (10) (cf. Alex. 24, 4). However, the last sentence of the section relating Alexander’s life is the most significant:

Ὅ μὲν οὖν Ἀλέξανδρος οὔτως εἰς μέγα τύχης προαχθεὶς ἐτελεύτησεν. (Epitome IV, 14, 353 [9–10])

In my opinion, the passive participle referring to Alexander in the sentence closing the detour almost as a sphragis implies all that Zonaras thought about Alexander’s fate and – maybe it is not an exaggeration to say – about history, and it also serves as an explanation to why the chronicler changed Plutarch’s text as seen in the examples above. In the historical approach suggested by the expression προαχθείς the types of sentences – described by Grigoriadis’s spirited remark or “formula” (117) – like “X did Z” earned little space, while the linguistic formulas like “Z was brought about by X” seemed more adequate where, I think, although it is not stated, X = God.

I have only analysed some chapters, or rather, a few sentences of Zonaras’ monumental work. I am aware that such a narrow sample can hardly serve as the basis of general statements, therefore, I put aside any such endeavours and refrain from phrasing such theses. In summary, I can only note that, although within certain limits, Plutarch’s biography of Alexander served as an open text for Zonaras. And together with various other factors, it was the excerptor-chronicler’s creativity, historical approach and interpretation that developed an old-new text out of its source and turned it into history.
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Les problèmes de la datation et de la localisation des manuscrits grecs (Cod. Berat 15, NBKM gr. 18, Cod. D. gr. 150)


Le premier manuscrit c'est le Prophetologion du XIIe siècle, NBKM gr. 18.


Dans le Catalogue de l'exposition « Le Rayonnement de Byzance », nous avons daté le manuscrit du XIIe siècle sur la base des ressemblances entre le Prophetologion de Sofia et les manuscrits de Calabre, malgré l'apparence de certaines lettrines delta (ff. 180v, 181, 183v-184, 185v), qui nous laissaient perplexes et dont je n'arrive pas pour le moment à trouver des parallèles. Si nous avions précisé la datation du premier quart du XIIe siècle, attribuant le manuscrit aux codices calabro-siciliens des Xe-XIe siècles, l'écriture et certains éléments de la décoration nous incitent à nous montrer très prudents, en formulant cette conclusion.

En l'absence d'un colophon indiquant l'identité du copiste et l'année de la création du manuscrit et à cause de la similitude des paramètres codicologiques des manuscrits, issus de l'Italie du Sud, de l'Épire et de la Grèce continentale, il est très difficile, voire risqué, de les attribuer, en raison de leur aura culturelle commune, due à la proximité de ces régions. C'est-à-dire, que je laisse ouverte la question de la localisation : l'Italie du Sud, au sens large du terme ou l'Épire.

Le deuxième manuscrit c'est l'Évangéliaire, Cod. D. gr. 150 du Centre « Ivan Dujčev » de Sofia, XIII-XIVe siècles (?)

Compte tenu des analogies au niveau de l'ornementation qui existent entre les manuscrits provenant de l'Épire ou de l'Italie du Sud, nous laissons ouverte la question de la localisation du manuscrit.

Le troisième manuscrit est un Tétraévangile à commentaires, de la deuxième moitié du Xe siècle, Tirana, ANA, Berat 15.

Écriture : minuscule droite, aux formes traditionnelles, dont certaines offrent des analogies lointaines avec la bouletée (P. Canart), ou avec la minuscola quattrata (Aletta).

Ornementation : dix tables des canons et quatre en-têtes.
A mon avis, le Tétraévangile Berat 15 présente un intérêt particulier, à cause du répertoire ornemental bien rare, utilisé dans les Tables des Canons et les en-têtes, qui nous ramène à un diapason géographique assez vaste. Après les premières datations, proposées par T. Popa et Mullen (XIIIᵉ siècle), et K. Aland et Sh. Sinani (XIIᵉ-XIIIᵉ siècles), nous avons suggéré dans notre catalogue la datation de la deuxième moitié du Xᵉ siècle. Elle pourrait, à la suite d'une analyse plus détaillée de l'écriture, être modifiée et rapportée au milieu du XIᵉ siècle, sur la base de l'observation rigoureuse de modèles antérieurs, en usage au temps de la Renaissance macédonienne. En d'autres termes, le Berat 15 du XIᵉ siècle a-t-il été exécuté dans un style retro, ou dans le style de la Renaissance maniérée de la deuxième moitié du Xe siècle, à partir de modèles antérieurs ?

Ce manuscrit est-il actuel ou éclectique et à quel endroit a-t-il été créé ? A notre avis, le Tétraévangile Berat 15 a été exécuté dans les provinces byzantines orientales, où les traditions précédant la Renaissance macédonienne sont encore vivantes et cohabitent avec les innovations de l'art de la capitale. En d'autres termes, l'exécution du manuscrit a été influencée par des modèles antérieurs.

Quelle que soit la réponse à ces questions, nous sommes en présence d'un manuscrit curieux qui représente une véritable épreuve pour les spécialistes en la matière.
Parchment of the 'Hodegon type':
Methods for Disseminating Capital City Production

The results of lengthy research into production of the ‘Hodegon type’ parchment were summarised in the monograph collection of articles on the Greek New Testament from the Historical Museum in Moscow, Syn. gr. 407 recently published (2015). In line with the issues under discussion at the Round Table ‘Centres et ateliers de copie balkaniques: scribes, ornemanistes, miniaturistes’ my paper will focus attention on one particular aspect of this theme: the means of using and methods for disseminating the ‘Hodegon type’ parchment (and its special technology) beyond the confines of this monastery’s scriptorium.

With reference to the Greek manuscripts that have undergone restoration at State Scientific Restoration Institut (GosNIIR) and subsequently at Grabar Art Conservation Centre in Moscow, a previously unknown technique of preparing primed parchment was discovered and studied. Its main characteristic is white-coloured primer that was applied to the parchment in a dense layer so that the hair and flesh sides of the sheets look identical.

Primed parchment was discovered in the manuscript Moscow, Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts, F. 1607, no. 14 during restoration at GosNIIR between 1975 and 1985, when the content of the substance (white lead) was established for the first time. The hypothesis about the use of an analogous technique in book production at the Hodegon scriptorium was based on combined research on the Collection of Byzantine Hymnography at the State Historical Museum in Moscow, Syn. gr. 429 (the Moscow Akathistos), during the restoration process at GosNIIR between 1990 and 1994. Examination of the method employed to process the parchment for this manuscript, and specifically the priming with white lead at the final stage, allowed us to formulate a hypothesis on the widespread use of such techniques in book production at the Hodegon scriptorium.

As the result of research conducted in various collections worldwide, we are currently aware of 52 manuscripts that were either written on primed parchment or include later additions from this material:

Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Library, MS 134; Athens, National Library of Greece, cod. 2603; Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Chis. R.V.29 (23), Vat. Chis. R.VIII.56 (47); London, British Library, Add. 11868, London, British Library, Burney 18 + Metz, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 4; Madison, Library of Drew Theological Seminary, no. 1; Modena, Biblioteca Estense Universitaria, Gr. 37 (α. M. 9. 2), Gr. 104 (γ. M. 1. 19), Gr. 126, ff. 293–294v; Moscow, Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts, F. 1607, op. 1, no. 14; Moscow, Russian State Library, F. 201, no. 21, F. 304/III, no. 26; Moscow, State Historical Museum, Mus. 3647, Syn. gr. 50 (Vlad. 405), Syn. gr. 222 (Vlad. 166), ff. 1–18v, Syn. gr. 225 (Vlad. 12), ff. 1, 287–437, Syn. gr. 231 (Vlad. 265), Syn. gr. 279 (Vlad. 261), Syn. gr. 407 (Vlad. 25), Syn. gr. 429 (Vlad. 303), Syn. gr. 511; Münster, Institute für Neutestamentliche Textforschung und Bibelmuseum, Ms. 2 (Minuskel 676); New York, Metropolitan
Museum of Art, MS acc. no. 2001.730; New York, Pierpont Morgan Library and Museum, M. 340; Oxford, Christ Church, Gr. 61; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Coisl. 195, ff. 158–160, 382–383, Par. gr. 12; Par. gr. 47; Par. gr. 311; Par. gr. 348; Par. gr. 411; Par. gr. 1242; Patmos, cod. 49; Roma, Vallicel. F. 17; Saint-Petersburg, Library of the Academy of Science, RAIK, No. 2; Saint-Petersburg, Russian National Library, Gr. 540; Sofia, D. gr. 132, D. gr. 212; Sofia, Ecclesiastical Historical and Archival Institute of the Patriarchate of Bulgaria, cod. 901; Tirana, Albanian National Archive, Br. 13, Br. 79, Vlorë 10, ANA, Vlorë 11; Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Hist. gr. 8, Hist. gr. 16, Hist. gr. 66; Suppl. gr. 4, ff. 48–55v, 208–223v, 331v, Suppl. gr. 50*, ff. 16–23, Theol. gr. 94, Theol. gr. 132, Theol. gr. 138.

Without any doubt this group will become larger after further investigation. The fact that the majority of these manuscripts are from the Hodegon scriptorium or linked to it in some way justifies our use of the term 'parchment of the Hodegon type', bearing in mind that it is to some extent conditional. The origins of the majority of Hodegon Monastery manuscripts already studied or the connection with its scribal tradition show that mass production of new parchment was organised at this scriptorium, from which the material could be supplied to capital city customers outside the monastery, and in rare cases to peripheral areas.

On the basis of observations made so far we suggest that primed parchment be considered as an important codicological characteristic. On the one hand primed parchment used for the creation of a manuscript serves as an argument to prove its metropolitan origin. (So far I know of only a few exceptions, which I will return to later). On the other hand, the use of this material when repairing an ancient book allows us to determine with greater probability the place where this was carried out, and to establish its history with greater precision.

During repairs primed parchment could be used to replace lost texts, for protective sheets and flyleaves, for patches (glued fragments), etc. Inserts made from this material looked noticeably different from ordinary parchment. And if it was chosen to repair a richly illustrated ancient manuscript, clearly there was no other kind of parchment available in the workshop concerned. In this respect the following repaired manuscripts are significant: Moscow, State Historical Museum, Syn. gr. 225, turn of the 11th to 12th c. from the group of 'patriarchal lectionaries' (repaired in 1321); Lectionary from the second half of the 11th c., Moscow, Syn. gr. 511, formerly held by the Hagia Sophia library in Constantinople; and the New Testament with Psalter at Moscow, Syn. gr. 407.

The recently discovered miscellany with the Homilies of Basil the Great at St. Mark's Library in Venice (Marc. Gr. Z. 53 (coll. 454)) must be included among the manuscripts repaired in this way. As seen from the colophon, this manuscript was copied by the scribe Athanasios in the year 968 (f. 366r). The text is written in two columns on high-quality parchment of the traditional 'Byzantine' type. In the 15th c. it belonged to Cardinal Bessarion (note on f. I). We have no information as to where the miscellany was kept between the 10th and 15th cc. For some reason the outer margins of many folios were damaged and subsequently trimmed, a process that also removed the end of each line. The lost margins were replaced by pasted strips of new parchment that overlapped the folios with text (ff. 46, 57, 74, 100, 112, 144, 151, 160, 176, 352, 366, etc.). At the pasted areas letters or parts of letters were written anew in brown ink similar to the original in colour. It is evident that the corrector strove to imitate the hand of the main text and thus make the additions less noticeable. But his goal was not fully accomplished, since the new parchment differs from the
original in appearance. During photography with back lighting traces of the sweeping brush strokes by which the primer was applied are clearly visible. It follows from this that the workshop where the miscellany was repaired had a considerable store of primed parchment, yet was unable to access even a few folios of traditional parchment. The presence of primed parchment leads us to conclude that the manuscript was repaired in the 14th c. in Constantinople, after which it was taken to the library of Cardinal Bessarion.

The fact that not all the manuscripts with primed parchment come from the Hodegon scriptorium and may have been created in another Constantinople workshop is shown by a copy of the New Testament at the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Par. gr. 47. The colophon on f. 444 states that it was written and completed in the capital, at the τῶν Μαγγάνων monastery, in 1364 and given by Nicephorus Cannabetes to the monastery at Mystra (τῇ μονῇ τοῦ ζωοδότου Χριστοῦ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Μυζθρᾶ τῆς Λακεδαίμονος κάστρῳ). There was a superb library at the extensive Constantinople monastery of St. George τῶν Μαγγάνων, but most of the known manuscripts were received as a donation. We are aware of only two manuscripts with inscriptions verifying production in the monastery itself: Athos, Stavroniketa, cod. 15 (Lambros 880) and Par. gr. 47. The New Testament Par. gr. 47 is embellished with cinnabar ornamental initials. However, the decoration was never completed: a blank space remains prior to the Gospels (f. 47, 74, 120). The intention may have been to insert coloured headpieces at these lacunae, possibly with depictions of the Evangelists. This is indicated by the epigrams on the Evangelists Mark, Luke and John written on the facing folios and commonly seen in such instances:

Ὄσσα περὶ Χριστοῦ θεοφόρος ἔθνεα Πέτρος (f. 46 v);
Λουκᾶς ἡπιόθυμος ἀκεστορίης ἐπίστωρ (f. 73 v);
Βροντήεις θεόφωνος Ιωάννης πανάριστος (f. 119 v).

In all probability the scribe working in the monastery τῶν Μαγγάνων was unable to find a way of decorating the manuscript with the necessary illuminations after receiving parchment of the ‘Hodegon type’ for his commission.

There is one more manuscript where a new technology was used, the Four Gospels at Tirana, ANA, Br. 79. The manuscript features two full-folio miniatures, originally an integral part but excised during the second binding: Luke the Evangelist (f. 147v) and John the Evangelist (f. 238v). The parchment of all the folios has been primed in the same way as manuscripts from the Hodegon scriptorium. However, this feature alone links the codex Tirana, ANA, Br. 79 with the manuscript tradition of the above-mentioned book-copying centre. Palaeography and artistic decoration of the codex reflect the main tendencies in book production of the mid-14th century. The ‘in negative’ type of decoration (f. 1, 91, 148, 239) are consistent with the development of capital-city book illumination from the 1340s to 1350s. A composition with analogous ornamental motifs can be seen in the Athens, EBE, cod. 2115, f. 67v, dated 1340. The motif of a lily on a tall stem tied with a knot (f. 1) which acquires a whimsical curve and three-quarter angle appears to indicate assimilation of the adroitness of capital-city masters working in the first quarter of the century, as shown in the decoration of Moscow, State Historical Museum, Syn. gr. 407. Apart from the primed parchment there is no data to link the Tetraevangelion with any particular workshop. So far the Tirana, ANA,
Br. 79 manuscript remains as unique proof that ‘Hodegon type’ parchment was circulated outside the Constantinople area, and possibly it was prepared in the periphery.

The new technology brought cardinal changes to the way parchment manuscript looked, so that the outer appearance more closely resembled that of modern books on paper. Quite possibly this innovation was initiated or supported by important donors or scholars who were also bibliophiles. With the aid of a thick white primer the difference between recto and verso sides of the folio was completely eliminated, and consequently any distinction between the facing pages of the book.

A new artistic concept of parchment as the visual analogue of paper was formed. This can be demonstrated if we look at the lavishly illuminated Lectionary Sofia D. gr. 212, created in 1378 by the scribe Ioasaph II. Miniatures of the Evangelists from another manuscript that evidently dated from the mid-11th c. were added to the manuscript in the final stage of production. The ancient miniatures were considerably smaller in format, so they were glued to frames that enlarged them to a size commensurate with the Lectionary folios. With regard to our main topic it is important that the two miniatures on ff. 2 and 3 were inserted into frames of primed parchment, the others into paper frames. Thus the primed parchment and paper act as visually analogous materials on an equal footing to those used in aesthetically important parts of the manuscript.

A very interesting reverse method can be seen when paper was primed in the same way as ‘Hodegon type’ parchment. Such paper has been discovered in the Four Gospels at Tirana, ANA, Br. 38. Bearing in mind the artistic style and other particularities of this book, we can ascribe its production to the second half of the 14th century. The character of primer application and the external appearance of both sides of the folio are similar with parchment covered by white lead. However, without special analysis we cannot be sure of identical techniques. In any case, the manuscript Tirana, ANA, Br. 38 serves as an example of double imitation — the glossy sheet of paper reproduces the appearance of a sheet of primed parchment, which was originally meant to resemble paper. Clearly a new concept in the manuscript folio's appearance was formed in the metropolitan scriptorium and then found implementation outside the capital.

Hence the existence of the ‘Hodegon type’ parchment is an important codicological characteristic that allows us to substantiate localisation of the manuscript, or possible links between its creators and the Byzantine capital. It is advisable to take this fact into consideration also when studying folios that contain no original texts, additions or insertions to a codex, and also when there are no signs of repair work.
The aim of my participation in the ronde table is to put some issues in relation to the illustration of the manuscripts and their product sites. The subject presents problems, because manuscripts are moveable objects, which means that it can be prepared in another place that they are today.

It should be noticed that the study of writers, writing workshops and production sites of the manuscripts is well advanced, but it is not the same as studying the illustration. The issue is not so much the marginal illustration, the titles and the initial letters as the full-page and the parenthetic miniatures, which have been incorporated afterwards to older manuscripts. Scholars refer to the relationship of monumental painting and miniature painting (f.e. Weitzmann, Galavaris and others), but it is not considered if the illustration of the manuscripts was executed by painters of monumental painting or if miniaturists have copied from the monumental painting. The problem is also if there were miniaturists in the monumental painting laboratories, because a specialization was indeed necessary.

For the understanding of this issue is necessary to proceed in an investigation based on stylistic analysis and on the information given from the manuscripts themselves. Due to time constraints was chosen to investigate Thessaloniki and Mount Athos in the first half of the 14th century, because at this season the painting was in its best time of production, at least in monumental painting. Therefore we compare works at both places and make the first conclusions with the hope the investigation to be continued.
Παραγωγή και διακίνηση χειρογράφων. 
Κέντρα παραγωγής και εμβέλεια διακίνησης

(No text)
Making Manuscript on the Balkans: 
Post-Byzantine – Slavonic Relations (15th – 17th Century)

The paper considers some artistic manifestations in Slavonic manuscripts of the Byzantine heritage – that of the Byzantine epoch proper and that of a later time, coinciding with the Ottoman rule on the Balkans. Focusing on a selection of illuminated manuscripts within this frame, some local centres of manuscript production will be discussed in order to estimate the present state of research and its perspectives. Arguably there are enough reasons to follow the traces of the Greek tradition through the South Slavonic manuscript making, even in this late epoch, because the particular pictorial tradition in the Bulgarian manuscripts is undeveloped, especially before the mid- and late 14th century when the few extensively illustrated manuscripts definitely depend on Byzantine models. The format of these communications allows an outline, so this will affect inevitably the depth and scope of its conclusions. Also, acknowledging the recent appearance of an exhaustive monograph by Zoran Rakić on the 16th and 17th century Serbian miniatures, the examples from the Balkan centres will concern less studied manuscripts or more controversial topics.

A salient feature of the miniatures painted during the long Slavonic Middle Ages, especially the portraits of the evangelists, is their preference to Palaeologan/late Palaeologan patterns. Trying to explain the ways of their transmission or adaption, many scholars assume a key role of the artistic activities in the Holy Mountain even when the Athonite origin or early acquisition of Greek and Slavonic manuscripts is not fully substantiated. So, at the outset it must be recognized that, concerning the period, many details of the relations between the Greek and Slavonic literary communities on the peninsula and in the hinterland are still obscure.

The Nicodemus Gospel from the Bulgarian National Library and the Museum of Applied Arts in Belgrade, dated to the first decades of the 15th century, is signed by the priest and hieromonk Nicodemus of Starčeva Gorica, on the island Starčevo in the Skadar Lake. None of his other manuscripts is accompanied by miniatures and the fact that these are on single folios supports the idea of a later addition. Their suggested 16th century origin was recently confounded by watermark analysis pointing at a 15th century dating. The stylistic features of the portraits, obeying to the late Palaeologan stylistic paradigm, betray a provincial origin. According to Džordže Radojčić the miniatures are Greek, but one would think they were painted for a Slav commissioner since the inscriptions on the evangelists’ books are in Cyrillic. Zagorka Janc suggested a Greek icon or Greek miniatures as models but despite the notable resemblance to icon painting, no reliable authorship has been established until now. The closest perhaps is the parallel with the miniatures from Ambros. F. 61 sup., a Gospel from 1322.

St John’s image with the personification of God’s Wisdom from the Nicodemus Gospel falls thematically in a group of Serbian frescoes and manuscripts of the 14th and 15th century. According to some scholars, the interest in the subject was within the context of the Hesychast teaching about
God's energy. Without stopping on the often quoted examples from manuscripts, I would point out that all miniatures, later ones including, show a great iconographic variety. It is worth noticing that not only the composition in the Nicodemus Gospel seems particularly close to the fresco image of the evangelist in the Assumption of the Virgin Church in the Matka Monastery, but other details also correspond. As far as the bad condition of the frescoes allows any trustworthy comparison, the observation is not valid for their style, assigned by Gojko Subotić to the Ochrid School of the late 15th century.

The 16th century Benčevo Gospel is a manuscript insufficiently studied, with miniatures of the same subject. Despite of their simplified painting, they reveal a master hand. The only information about the origin of the manuscript is the colophon of the anonymous copyist, mentioning the old monk Spyridon from the Rila Monastery. Even if it has been a lively literary centre in the 15th and early 16th century, with Spyridon as one of its active scribes, no artistic presence is attested in the monastery at that time. One exception are the frescoes of 1491 in the Orlica Metochion, which lately have been ascribed to a travelling team of the Kratovo literary and artistic centre, whose painters' nationality has not been ascertained. The remarkable female representations of the heavenly inspiration in the Benčevo Gospel distantly echo Late Antique allegoric figures. They could be compared to the miniatures in the Kumanić Gospel or to miniatures in some Russian Gospels – one of them probably copied in Moscow and the others of Novgorodian origin. Nevertheless the Benčevo images present an isolated case in their Slavonic environment and nothing proves that Spyridon's book was copied in the Rila Monastery. A detail, only indirectly linking the miniatures with the place, is the three-beam halo of Christ Emmanuel in whose image the God's Wisdom – Sophia – appears in the Tower of Hreljo (1335–1342). A recent hypothesis tried to link the manuscript with one of the ateliers of the 16th century Sophia literary centre. Just as in the Nicodemus Gospel, the miniatures painted on single sheets have assumed a Palaeologan or late Palaeologan model. And once again, if the Slavonic inscriptions rather exclude some outside Greek artist, the calligraphic ending in Greek on fol. 360 suggests that a well educated Slavonic scribe has made the copy in a first-rate workshop where Greek manuscripts have been available.

Apart from the images of God's Wisdom, the evangelists in Nicodemus and Benčevo Gospels demonstrate the adoption of several types, utilized in some of the masterpieces of the Palaeologan miniature painting and proved to be very productive. As the miniatures in both Slavonic and many Greek manuscripts show, these patterns have become conventional to such a degree that their later repetition was turned into copying, accessible to less skillful artists or even scribes who, very possibly, used stencils. Perhaps the most often re-used image is the evangelist writing on his knee and holding up the book with the other hand. The pattern is repeated twice in the Gospel of the Bulgarian king George Terter II of 1332, in the miniatures of which George Parpulov sees a local interpretation of the Palaeologan style. Also a very popular item is the evangelist sitting upright with his feet crossed and unfolding a scroll with his two hands. Byzantine prototypes, implemented or reactivated by the Palaeologan Renaissance, appear through in the images of the evangelist reading from a book hold closely to his eyes or lowly bent down in the process of writing.

Speaking of conventional types, a whole group of illustrated 16th century manuscripts comes to the fore. They are unified by an even more simplified water-colour technique, a specific combination of figures and architectural background, some distinctive decorative elements, profaned rendering (driven to an extreme by the miniatures in the Radovište Gospel) and a common type of script. While
Serbian scholars ascribe them to the so-called literary school at Lesnovo Monastery, new arguments point to the Pčinja Monastery as an alternative for their origin. Rakić has added to the same group the miniatures of Mileševo Gospel, which, in my view, display somewhat different characteristics. However, to verify any of the concurring hypotheses further codicological analysis is needed.

Other research perspectives lay hidden even in the best studied manuscripts of the travelling priest Ioann from Kratovo whose latest works were accomplished in Craiova. For instance, the marked differences in the manner of painting in Ioann's manuscripts suggest a scribe–artist collaboration: this could trigger new investigations of the organization of work in the prominent Kratovo literary school.

Another group of Gospels with the portraits of the evangelists yet should be introduced in the realm of speculations. A Gospel kept in St Paul Monastery on Mount Athos, has given, I believe, the start of a series of late 16th and early 17th century copies of its miniatures and (at least one) of its headpieces. The script allowed me to attribute the manuscript to a scribe, who just once has signed himself as Peter daskalos. The Byzantine background of the images is not so essential as is the linking of manuscripts with unknown origin. They are tied down, like in a detective story, by numerous snarls–script and ornament including–leading to the literary centres in Sophia, Vratsa and Etropole, all on Bulgarian territory. Following this plot several important points emerged. First, even though his position is not entirely clarified, Peter daskalos must have been a more prominent and influential figure than usually considered. Second, the readily accepted idea that the lost Gospel from Belgrade was copied by the Sofia scribe djak Vladko, whose manuscripts are fifty or more years older than those of Peter, should be refused. Third, establishing the origin of Peter's Gospel and the place of his training becomes crucial for understanding the role of St Paul Monastery as a centre, authoritative for the Balkan scribes.

‘Athonite origin confirmed or refuted’ is the topic about a series of 17th century manuscripts in which the Kratovo type headpiece was implemented by an altered formula. Serbian scholars regard a good number of its representatives as products of the Hilandar Monastery. It must be stressed that this traditionally adopted view has some weak points as is it often based on conjecture. A Liturgicon of 1627 kept in St Catherine’s Monastery and a Psalter of 1635 in the National Library in Plovdiv, make the earliest dated examples of the kind. The first of them is signed by the “sinful Dimitar” to whom recent inquiries convincingly attributed the Psalter. Two of his manuscripts were commissioned by Bulgarians from Bulgarian settlements and besides, a very probable kinship has been guessed between him and priest Avram Dimitrievic, who, in the 1660s, worked in the Bulgarian village Sushitsa near Karlovo. Thus the “Athonite theory” was shaken, if not refuted, and now its reconsideration provokes questions such as: what has been Dimitar’s commitment? Was it on Athos or in another centre where a core of copyists and painters issued a particular manuscript design? Whose authority stood behind? What have been the ways of this far-reaching artistic promotion and translation, and should we regard the local center in Karlovo as a more important mediator in these processes?

With the illustrated Orahovica Monastery Liturgicon of 1635, copied by the same sinful Dimitar, we come to a group of South Slavonic Liturgicons in which another new pattern has changed their traditionally poor artistic appearance. The complications of manuscripts signed by or attributed to the copyist and the authorship of their miniatures will now be skipped in order to concentrate on Slavo-Byzantine interrelations. Even a simple comparison reveals the typological affinity of the
Slavonic manuscripts to the large series of Greek Liturgicons with standardized illumination, many of them being luxury objects, which were current from the late 16th to the first decades of the 18th century. While their style, originally mastered by Luke the Cypriot, has assimilated heterogenous motifs from the Byzantine, Slavonic and Western European artistic vocabulary, the pattern adopted and repeated in the Slavonic manuscripts is distinguishable by an affinity to either simpler interlace ornaments or interlaces of the ‘late Kratovo’ version and by different rendering of the human figures.

The reviewed South Slavonic illuminated manuscripts demonstrate a gradual moving away from the Palaeologan paradigm to reach, as the selected 17th century examples show, a distinctive visual language, which is even more evident in manuscripts outside the scope of this survey. Taking into account the diversity of more individuated 15th and 16th century replicas of Byzantine models, the method of copying appears to be widely practiced, ensuring quantities of manuscripts which were or imitated expensive items. But if the ‘mass-production’ of Buzău School with its offsprings and the increased number of representative Slavonic manuscripts for liturgical use, could have had a common catalyst such as the intensified pilgrimage to the Holy Land and Holy Mountain, there are other factors – political, religious and ethnical – which have determined the observed ‘self-identification’ manifested by the illumination of the Slavonic codices. To accurately detect and systematize these factors, to analyze how they affected the processes in the local Balkan literary centres on a large scale would be, in my view, a good perspective for academic research cooperation of the countries sharing the Byzantine artistic legacy.
Manuels d’enseignement dans une bibliothèque monastique du nord de la Grèce :
le cas d’un livre illustré d’histoire naturelle et de morale chrétienne

Nous ne savons que peu de choses sur les centres de copie et les bibliothèques dans le monde byzantin et post-byzantin. Les manuscrits ont été éparpillés à plusieurs reprises, que ce soit après la quatrième croisade ou à la chute de Constantinople en 1453.

Cependant, grâce à d’anciens catalogues, des inventaires ou de simples listes de manuscrits, on peut rétablir les fonds de certaines bibliothèques. Par ailleurs, quelques très rares bibliothèques byzantines et post-byzantines ont échappé à cet éparpillement et l’ensemble, ou du moins la grande majorité de leurs manuscrits, se trouve, encore de nos jours, conservé sur un même lieu.

Tel est le cas de la quasi totalité des volumes de la bibliothèque du monastère de Saint-Jean Prodrome, près de Serres, et de celle du monastère de Kosinitza, près de Drama.

Ceci permet dès lors d’entamer des recherches diachroniques sur les fonds desdites bibliothèques, ainsi que des études sur les goûts littéraires de leurs lecteurs. Dans le cadre de la présente communication, seront présentées quelques informations inédites sur la bibliothèque du monastère de Kosinitza et sur l’usage de certains manuscrits de contenu scientifique par ses moines.
The Discovered Charter from Great Lavra (Athos) of XIth century: a Guard-Sheet in the Manuscript from Moscow State Historical Museum (Vlad. 355)

The contemporary stage of codicology and paleography gives us an opportunity to examine not only palimpsests, but also washed off texts on the sheets of parchment, which had been used to binder and to repair manuscripts. Original Greek acts of the Byzantine period hitherto were unknown in the collections of the manuscripts in Russia. Only post-Byzantine documents were found by now (B.L. Fonkich).

In the codex from the Synodal Greek collection of the State Historical Museum in Moscow – MS Syn. gr. 391 (Vlad. 355) – I found the original Greek document on the parchment, the text of it had been washed off, and the charter had been folded in half as a guard sheet.

The codex Syn. gr. 391 (Synaxarion on September – March) originates from the Esphigmenou monastery in Athos, and was acquired in the mid of the 17th century by Russian monk Arseny Sukhanov. The codex is dated 1433, and was written by two scribes, the second one leaved a triple colophon (one cryptographic, the second one – monocondyle, and the third one with ekphonetical notation) with date and his name. The cryptographic text had been decrypted by the Russian scholar Mstislav Shangin in 1937: "ἐτελειώθει τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ Γρηγορίου τοῦ Ἀλλιατοῦ ἐν μιᾷ ἱαννουαριᾷ ἱνδικτίῶν สร้างความ (6941=1433)". The second scribe was the future protopsaltes of Great Church in the mid of the 15th century Gregory Bounes Alyates (PLP, II, 714; RGK, III № 145). Judging by the paleography the manuscript was made in Constantinople. The commencement of the text decorated with the head-peace in Balkan style. The watermarks ("scissors", “three mountains”, “unicorn”) could be identifying according the inventories of R. Stanković: the analogies could be found in the codices of the 15th century from “Centre for Slavo-Byzantine Studies ‘Prof. Ivan Dujčev’” and from the Serbian Hilandar Monastery in Athos.

For a long time this manuscript had been considered in the Russian historiography as the product of a scriptorium of Southern Italy, but the type and the level of the both handwritings leave no doubt that this is a codex from Constantinople or Balkan region. It’s possible that the manuscript was made in Esphigmenou monastery in Athos (the E. Lamberz’s guess), but the skills and experience of both scribes were likely obtained in Constantinople.

The text of the act was written in the style Perlschrift, which had been used from the second half of the 10th to the end of the 11th century. In the UV-light I had an opportunity to read the date of the act: “… month June… 6540 (=1032)”. I identified at least seven signatures, but some of them not so sufficiently. All these signatures were written by different hands, and this observation surely indicates that it is an original act. The scribe of the text is monk John, who wrote another act from Great Lavra.
Among the charter’s witnesses five names could be identified confidently: “+[Γεώργιος (μονάχος) ο Ζυγου]”, “+[Νηφων μο(να)χ(ός) του Ζυγου]”, “+[Ιγνάτιος μο(να)χ(ός) της μονής Αγίου Νικολάου]”, “+[Ησαΐας μο(ναχός) της Χροιμίσσης μ(αρτυρέα)ρ(ῶν) υπεγράψα]”,”+[Θεόδουλος (μο(να)χ(ός) κ(αὶ) πρ(εσβύτερος) μο(νής) Υπ(ερ)αγί(ας) Θ(εοτόκου) τῶν Καλαμίτη(ῶν)]”. George the monk of the Monastery of Iviron was the abbot George II of the Monastery of Iviron. The monk Niphon is known as a person signed as a witness two charters from Great Lavra in Athos, dated 1015 and 1035. Ignatius was the monk and the abbot of the Monastery of St. Nicholas. The monk Isaiah signed one charter from Lavra, dated 1030. The monk Theodulus also signed one document from Lavra, dated 1037. The membership of witnesses displays that the act was probably descended from the Great Lavra of St. Athanasius the Athonite. This act possibly is a deathbed testament; it is possible to read the combination of words: “…μέχρι τέλους ζωῆς αὐτοῦ…” / “to the end of his life” and similar words and expressions, used in the wills. In the report I’ll present a reconstruction of the extant text of this act, and the detailed analyses of the group of witnesses.
THE EVALUATION OF SIGILLOGRAPHIC DATA FOR RESEARCH ON THE HISTORY OF BYZANTIUM
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Introduction


Thematisch sind die für die table ronde angekündigten Beiträge vielfältig. Mehrere konzentrieren sich auf einen bestimmten geographisch-administrativen Wirkungsraum und versuchen aus dem einschlägigen Siegelbefund in synchroner und diachroner Weise lokale Verwaltungsmodelle.
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Vier Präsentationen betreffen Verwaltungsstrukturen des Balkanraums: Bisher unbekannte Siegel in der Ermitage liefern zusätzliche Informationen zu den administrativen Einheiten Thrake und Makedonia (gelegentlich in kombinierter Form) (L. Stepanova).

Mit dem Zeitpunkt der Einrichtung des Themes Drougoubiteia, seiner genauen Lokalisierung und der Konnexion zu den Themen Strymon und Thessaloniki, sowie der Frage, warum die meisten bisher bekannten Siegel von Funktionären dieses Verwaltungsbezirkes auf heute bulgarischem Territorium gefunden worden sind, befasst sich A. Gkoutzioukostas.


Neue Aspekte in die Geschichte der armenisch-georgischen Familie Theodorokanos wiederum bringt der neue Lesesatz eines bisher teilweise unzureichend entziffernten Siegels, weil er eine Verbindung des bekannten Dux Khatchatour (um 1071) zu dieser Familie herstellt (W. Seibt).


Dasästhetisch und inhaltlich anspruchsvolle Siegel von Theodoros Styppeiotes protonobellìsimos and megas sakellarios (später mesazon Kaiser Manuels I.) ergänzt den bisher bekannten cursus honorum dieser Persönlichkeit (I. Leontiades).

Ausgehend von einem auf Siegeln (aber auch sonst) selten bezeugten Beruf, nämlich dem des Goldschmiedes (chrysoglyptes) wird dieser systematisch anhand aller greifbaren Zeugnisse erfasst (Ch. Stavrakos – Ch. Tsatsoulis).

Ikonographische Fragen bzw. Aspekte werfen schließlich zwei Siegel mit Darstellungen des Erzengels Michael auf. Soll es sich dabei um das Wunder von Chonai oder die Erscheinung des Erzengels bei Joshua vor Iericho handeln (V. Stepanenko)?
Sur quelques sceaux byzantins médiévaux trouvés en Palestine

J'ai eu l'occasion d'aller en Israël et obtenu l'autorisation de photographier les sceaux byzantins du cabinet Kadman du musée de Tel Aviv et ceux conservés chez les Franciscains de Jérusalem, dont une partie a été publiée par F. Manns il y a 40 ans. Je suis également en train d'achever, en collaboration avec le collectionneur, la publication des sceaux de la collection Edelstein. Ces sceaux ont la particularité d'avoir été trouvés localement, notamment ceux de la coll. Edelstein qui proviennent plus précisément de Césarée de Palestine. F. Manns, dans son édition des sceaux du Musée de la Flagellation, précise que le fonds conservé provient de deux sources, l'achat auprès des antiquaires de Jérusalem et l'acquisition d'une collection privée d'un avocat de Jérusalem, et pour l'auteur, les sceaux « à n'en pas douter » proviennent de Palestine. Malgré tout, les antiquaires ont pu acquérir des pièces venant de Beyrouth par exemple et, à mes yeux, un petit doute subsiste sur la localisation de leurs trouvailles.

La presque totalité des plombs, qui ont été trouvés sur le territoire de l'ancienne province de Palestine byzantine, ont été frappés antérieurement avant la conquête musulmane des années 635-645. Cependant, une petite minorité de sceaux sont nettement postérieurs.

Je voudrais m'attarder sur ceux qui peuvent être datés du XIᵉ siècle ou du tout début du XIIᵉ siècle. A cette époque, la Palestine est soumise au califat fatimide du Caire, qui contrôle notamment Jérusalem, jusqu'à sa prise par Atziz, un émir turc, vers 1071. Il faut donc expliquer la présence de sceaux byzantins contemporains. Les relations de l'Empire byzantin avec le califat fatimide sont bien connues. Après avoir été des adversaires jusqu'à la fin du règne de al-Hakim, les deux puissances ont entretenu des relations diplomatiques pacifiées, voire cordiales. Les Fatimides ont obtenu des livraisons de blé lorsqu'une famine menaçait l'Egypte, puis ils recherchèrent l'alliance des basileis contre un ennemi commun, les Turcs, des sunnites qui voulaient mettre fin au califat fatimide. Plus tard, les Byzants servirent d'intermédiaires entre les Francs, au moment où ils avaient entrepris leur grand pèlerinage armé, et les Fatimides, puis, après la prise de Jérusalem en 1099 et une défaite des Francs en 1102 à Ramla, Alexis Comnène, selon sa fille Anne, envoya une délégation au Caire pour racheter les captifs francs.

Parmi les sceaux notables des collections d’Israël, je présenterai ceux de :

Coll. Edelstein :
Nicolas ?, hórrearios
Alexandre Maniakès, vestarque et stratège
Bardas Karantènos, dishypatos et anthròpos du basileus

Cabinet Kadman (Tel Aviv)
Constantin, patrice et stratège des Kassènoi
Musée de la Flagellation
SBF 107 Jean Goudélès, vestarque
SBF 132 Constantin Spléniarès, proèdre et logothète du génikon
SBF 168 (Manns 13) Philarète Brachamios, protosébaste et domestique d'Orient
SBF 113 Thathoul Pakourianos, protonobélissime et archonte des archontes

Le sceau d’un responsable des greniers n’implique pas la présence de l’intéressé à Césarée, mais sa datation serait compatible avec la date de livraison de blé aux Fatimides. Il pourrait s’agir de blé public, ce qui justifierait l’action d’un hörreiarios. Cet hörreiarios n’était pas rattaché à un grenier précis, mais est seulement qualifié d’impérial, ce qui renforce le caractère officiel de sa fonction. Le blé fut-il livré au port de Césarée, du moins en partie ?

Le rôle d’un juge de l’hippodrome ou d’un stratège des Kassénoi (Kasès en Cappadoce) ne trouve pas d’explication évidente, mais leurs sceaux témoignent de relations plus soutenues que ce que les textes narratifs rapportent.

Les noms de Maniakès, de Goudélès et de Karantènos sont intéressants. Un Maniakès, Constantin, était présent au concile des Blachernes en 1094 et portait la dignité de sébaste, exceptionnellement élevée pour qui n’était pas membre de la famille impériale. C’est un signe de l’influence qu’exerçait encore la famille, cinquante ans après la mort de Georges Maniakès. Alexandre n’était que vestarque, dignité infiniment plus modeste et sans doute obtenue une ou deux décennies antérieurement. Les Maniakai avaient été en relation avec les émirs locaux, du temps où Georges avait conquis Edesse et occupé le poste de catépan de ce nouveau thème.

Bardas Karantènos, dishypatos, se présente comme le représentant personnel de l’empereur du moment, sans qu’il soit possible de déterminer de quel basileus il s’agit, Constantin X, Romain Diogène ou Michel VII. Le prénom Bardas suggère des alliances au sein des familles orientales de l’ancienne faction des Phocas, ce qui le rapprocherait des Diogénai, mais c’est une simple hypothèse. L’activité d’un Karantènos à Césarée est particulièrement intéressante. Il a envoyé un document ou il en était porteur en Palestine, sans doute en relation avec des négociations avec les Fatimides, au moment où la menace des Seldjoukides grandissait. Les Karantènoi connaissaient l’Orient, car l’un d’entre eux, Constantin, fut duc d’Antioche sous le règne de Romain III Argyre, son beau-frère. Son action fut appréciée car il corrigea l’effet désastreux de l’expédition manquée de l’empereur.

Le nom de Goudélès est celui d’une illustre lignée orientale. Le sceau d’un Jean protonobélissime, à l’effigie de saint Georges, est connu par une édition de Schlumberger, mais, le nôtre étant à l’effigie de saint Nicolas, ce doit être un homonyme. Il vivait dans le dernier quart du XIe s. Faute de la mention d’une fonction, nous ignorons pourquoi l’une de ses bulles a été retrouvée en Palestine.

La bulle d’un logothète du génikon, inconnu jusqu’ici, Constantin Splèniarès, suggère que des questions financières furent évoquées dans le document que scellait le plomb. Constantin, proèdre, est aussi connu par deux bulles inédites de Dumbarton Oaks, qui ne font pas état d’une fonction quelconque. La date du sceau, selon l’épigraphie et la dignité reçue par Constantin, est à placer au dernier tiers du XIe siècle. En 1088 Théodore Aktouarios était seulement magistre. Les Splèniarai étant d’une lignée sans doute plus prestigieuse, Constantin peut avoir obtenu antérieurement une dignité plus élevée, mais on doit être au tournant des années 1080. Bien entendu, nous sommes
réduits aux hypothèses pour la raison qui explique ces tractations financières, le plus vraisemblable étant la promesse ou le versement d’une somme effective pour trouver des alliés contre les Turcs.

La présence d’une bulle ayant appartenu à Philarète Brachamios est aisée à justifier, car cet officier fut en charge de la région d’Antioche à partir de 1078 et se révéla fort actif puisque c’est certainement le personnage dont on a conservé le plus grand nombre de sceaux. Le sceau date du début du règne d’Alexis Comnène, sans doute avant que Philarète ne perde Antioche. Philarète négociait-il avec un émir turc ou avec les Fatimides, si ceux-ci s’étaient maintenus dans certaines parties côtières de la Palestine ?

Marash avait été l’une des villes le plus longtemps tenue par Philarète. Elle fut confiée, à la suite de sa reconquête par les croisés, à un Arménien ou Géorgien, Thathoul, dont les sceaux nous apprennent que le second nom était Pakourianos. Cet archonte des archontes a laissé plusieurs bulles, issues de boullôtèria différents. Ce type correspond au type 3 de la publication de W. Seibt sur les Pakourianois, un sceau trouvé en Bulgarie et édité par I. Jordanov. Ce plomb, datable des années autour de 1100, est sans doute lié aux relations que Thathoul avaient nouées avec les chefs croisés.

Ces sceaux ne représentent qu’une partie de ceux qui datent des Xᵉ et XIᵉ siècles dans les collections mentionnées plus haut, mais ils permettent d’affirmer que les Byzantins ne cherchèrent pas seulement des secours en Occident, mais qu’ils menèrent aussi en Orient une politique active contre les Turcs, que les sources narratives passent en bonne part sous silence.
Das Verteidigungssystem an der nordöstlichen Balkangrenze
(Ende 10. – Ende 11. Jh.).
Neue Erkenntnisse aus der systematischen Auswertung des Siegelbefunds


Eher in Zusammenhang mit der Rückgewinnung bulgarischer Gebiete bis zum Haimos (1000/1001) ist das Siegel des Damianos Dobromiros ἀνθύπατος πατρίκιος καὶ δοῦξ Θράκης καὶ Μεσοποταμίας zu interpretieren – letzteres wurde von Werner Seibt am Fluss Hebros (Maritza), um


Im Zuge der Rückeroberung der Territorien nördlich des Haimos-Gebirges (Beginn 1001) unter der Führung von Theodorokanos Patrikios und Strategos von Philippopolis und Nikephoros Xiphias Patrikios und Strategos von Thrake (Kommandobereiche ausschließlich durch den bulgarischen Siegelbefund bekannt) konnten Preslav/Großpreslav und Dorostolon/Dristra zurückgewonnen werden. Daraufhin soll ersteres sofort seinen ursprünglichen Namen erhalten haben anstelle von Ioannupolis (unter Ioannes Tzimiskes), eine These die sich als communis opinio in der bisherigen Forschung durchgesetzt hat und eine chronologische Einstufung aller bisher greifbaren Siegeltypen mit dem Toponym Ioannupolis (gelegentlich kombiniert mit Thrake oder Dorostolon) noch vor 986 (terminus ante quem) zwingend zu Folge hatte.

Für die kurze Zeitspanne (fünfzehn Jahre!) von der ersten Rückgewinnung bulgarischer Territorien durch Ioannes Tzimiskes bis zur erneuten Rückeroberung durch Samuel (986) ist die Anzahl der bisher bekannten Strategen von Ioannupolis (insgesamt sieben) viel zu hoch. Zudem ist anzumerken, dass der sigillographisch bezeugte Nikephoros Xifias β. πρωτοσπαθάρχης και στρατηγός Θράκης καί Ιωαννουπόλεως einer der führenden Generäle Basileios’ II. beim Feldzug gegen die Bulgaren jenseits des Haimos war, der u. E. weiterhin Militärkommandant von Thrakien
blieb und zusätzlich jenes über das zurückgewonnene Ioannopolis (und Umgebung) erhielt. Wohl unmittelbar danach ist er zum β. πρωτοσπαθάριος και στρατηγός Ιωαννουπόλεως και Δοροστόλου ernannt worden.

Abgesehen von den oben angeführten Siegeltypen des Nikephoros Xiphias sind m. E. noch jene folgender Militärkommandanten der Einheit Θράκη καὶ Ιωαννουπόλεις in die Zeit Basileios’ ΠΙ umzudatieren (zuvor in die Zeit des Tsimiskes bzw. vor 986 chronologisch eingegrenzt):

1) Leon Sarakenopulos β. πρωτοσπαθάριος και στρατηγός Θράκης καὶ Ιωαννουπόλεως,
2) Theophanes β. πρωτοσπαθάριος και στρατηγός Θράκης καὶ Ιωαννουπόλεως,
3) Staurakios β. πρωτοσπαθάριος και στρατηγός Θράκης καὶ Ιωαννουπόλεως und
4) Adralestos β. πρωτοσπαθάριος και ἐκ προσώπου Θράκης καὶ Ιωαννουπόλεως. Demzufolge schließen wir, dass „Ioannopolis“ eine Zeit lang synchron neben Presthlava (auch Persklava/Presklava) als Bezeichnung ein und desselben Militärkommandos in Gebrauch war.

Meine Ausführungen schließt die Präsentation des Siegels von Nikephoros Kurtikios στρατιωτοφύλαξ καὶ στρατηγός Ἀχριδοῦ (1060/1090), weil es definitiv den bisher einzigen Beleg für die Existenz eines Strategen von Achridos (ἡ Ἀχριδός) – das Gebiet um die mittlere und untere Arda – liefert.
Khatchatur, Dux of Antiocheia, and the Family Theodorokanos – Is there a Community?

Khatchatur/Χατατούριος (this Armenian name means “present of the cross”), the last anchor of the dethroned emperor Romanos Diogenes, is well known as dux of Antiocheia from 1069 to 1072. In August 1069 he was sent by the emperor to Kilikia, where he should join a strong detachment from the imperial army to intercept a Turkish army returning home after a devastating invasion of Central Anatolia. Khatchatur camped with his troops in Mopsuestia, but the enemies could escape unharmed. The Byzantine sources introduce this general as a commendable and experienced personality: ἀνδρὶ γενναίῳ καὶ πολλὰ ἐπιδειξαμένῳ τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς προτερότατα πρῶτον.

In 1071 dux Khatchatur made a raid into the emirate of Aleppo, hoping to invest the uncle of the emir Mahmud, Aṭiya, as new emir, but failed.

When emperor Romanos Diogenes had returned from Seljuk captivity a coup d’état in Constantinople declared him dethroned, and the new rulers tried to get rid of him. They ordered Khatchatur to fight him. But the dux of Antiocheia went over to Romanos and became his most important assistant. Both spent the winter 1071/1072 with their troops in Kilikia, preparing for the war to come. But when the imperial troops under Andronikos Dukas arrived there in the spring of 1072, Khatchatur was taken prisoner. Andronikos treated him with care, but we are not informed about his future fortune. Till now we don’t have information about his family circle. Concerning his title as dux of Antiocheia I would guess that he was at least bestarches, probably magistros.

Let us now turn to the family Theodorokanos. In the army of Basil II a certain Theodorokanos became prominent, during the first invasion of Bulgaria, ca. 999, he was appointed commander (probably strategos) of Philippopouolis with the rank of patrikios. In the following year (1000) he headed (together with the protospatharios Nikephoros Xiphias) an army proceeding to the north and capturing Preslav, Preslavica and Pliska. But soon afterwards Xiphias succeeded Theodorokanos as strategos of Philippopouolis, because the latter was already an elderly man (διὰ γῆρας, according to Skylitzes).

We know two quite similar (but not identical) seals of a Theodorokanos as patrikios and dux of Adrianopolis, with a bust of St. George on the obverse; one was found in Preslav, the other one was offered in an auction. It could well be that we have to do with the same Theodorokanos as the previously mentioned general, since an Armenian named John, who commissioned an Armenian manuscript in Adrianople (now in Venice) in 1006/1007, calls himself protospatharios and proximos of the dux Theodorokanos.

The story becomes more complicated by two other seals types mentioning again a Theodorokanos (as single name!), first as protospatharios of the Chrysotriklinos and strategos of Artach, then as protospatharios of the Chrysotriklinos and archegetes of Anatole. At first glance
there could be some temptation to combine the two persons, as protospatharios is one step lower to patrikios, but the seals of the protospatharios are some years later than the one of the patrikios, as we can see by the ligature X-P, and also the ligature O-V comes already near to the horse-shoe-type. I would date the seals of the protospatharios to 1020/1040, so this man should be another person than the patrikios and dux of Adrianopolis.

In the following cases Theodorokanos appears as a family name. Quite early is the seal of a John Theodorokanos monachos, with a late invocative monogram with the tetragram on the obverse. Schlumberger dated it to the 9th century, Père Laurent to the first half of the 11th century; I would prefer late 10th or first quarter of the 11th century.

Skylitzes mentions a Georgios Theodorakanos, strategos of Samos, who defeated – together with Beriboes, the strategos of Chios, an Arab fleet invading the Cyclades in the time of Constantine VIII. There are seals of Georgios Theodorakanos as protospatharios and strategos of Sion in Erebarkeion (Erivark', southwest of lake Van) (1025/1055) and as protospatharios of the Chrysotriklinos (1030/1060).

Of greater prominence was a Basil Theodorokanos, one of the leading generals (with the rank of patrikios) under Georgios Maniakes during his successful invasion of Sicily; together with him he was deported to Constantinople and imprisoned in 1040, after Stephanos, the brother-in-law of the emperor, had brought them under suspicion of a rebellion. Probably he was freed quite soon, perhaps he was still in 1040 in northeastern Anatolia. When emperor Constantine IX Monomachos had realized that Maniakes, who was again supreme commander in Italy, had started an usurpation, he sent Basilios Theodorokanos as magistros and katepano of Italia to fight him; he arrived in Bari in February 1043, but was recalled already in June 1043 to defend Constantinople against a fleet from the Rus'. We know a seal type of this man as protospatharios and strategos with a bust of St. George on the obverse (1020/1040).

A seal, again with a bust of St. George on the obverse, mentions a Nikephoros patrikios and strategos; it dates from a period between 1025 and 1055. Another boulla stems from an Asotes Theodorokanos, perhaps with a bust of St. Demetrios (ca. 1030/1060).

Seals mentioning the name Constantine Theodorokanos seem to originate from at least two different persons. A type with the title patrikios and St. George on the obverse is to be dated between 1020 and 1040; it has still the older form of the ligature O-V. I. Jordanov published a seal in quite bad condition (with the legend on both sides), where he read Constantine Theodorokanos, anthypatos patrikios with the help of a parallel in the Hermitage. Probably the types of seals bearing the titles patrikios and patrikios anthypatos belong to the same person, the type with the higher rank immediately after the first one.

And we know a lot of seals of another Constantine Theodorokanos without a title, with a quite small diameter and a “Perlband”-border (ca. 1060/1090); at least nine were found in Bulgaria, e.g. in Silstra and Preslav, but there are more in different museums or were offered in auctions. Small differences point to three types at least. It is tempting – but not sure – to combine this man with the homonymous proedros, an adversary of the usurper Nikephoros Bryennios in 1078, who was taken prisoner and died shortly afterwards.

The very small seal of a Romanos Theodorokanos (without a title, with the legend on both sides) stems from the late 11th or beginning of the 12th century.
For the last quarter of the 11th or first third of the 12th century we can also mention the seal of a Tzotzikios (?) Theodorokanos, kouropalates and dux, with a standing figure of St. John Prodromos on the obverse. In the Synodikon of the Iviron monastery is mentioned an Arsenios Theodorokanos probably active in the time of Alexios I Komnenos. Quite important is the synchronous seal of a Taronites Theodorokanos nobellismos in the coll. Thierry, whose first name could have been Anthimos (with a standing figure of St. Nicholas on the obverse); the father of this man probably had married a Taronitissa. And it could well be, that the newly published seal of a Georgios protokouropalates, whose family name started with ΘΕΩΔ, stems also from a Theodorokanos, who served under Alexios Komnenos.

Very problematic is the seals type of a Theodorokanos patrikios and katepano of Edessa, the nucleus of this presentation and my starting point of this special research. A first exemplar was found in Gaziantep and edited by Cyril Mango and Marlia Mundell Mango. On the beginning of the conjectured obverse they wanted to read +Κ(ύρι)ε β(οή)ς(ε) δουκ(ός), which was certainly wrong. Finally I. Jordanov could publish in the second part of the Addenda to his Corpus a similar seal, recently found in Pliska. At the beginning of the conjectured obverse he proposed +Τοῦ[τ] ΚΑΤΕΠΑΝΟ ΕΔΕΣΣΗΣ. On the other side, which should be the real obverse, I restitute in the first (lost) line a word like σφραγίς, proposing [CΦΡΑΓ, - ΘΕΩΔΕΣΣΗΣ].

I would like to attribute this seal to the Khatchatur, who later became dux of Antiocheia.

There remains the problem of the narrow dating of the command in Edessa; even in the best list, established by J.-Cl. Cheynet, Theodorokanos was not taken into consideration. If my identification is valid, Khatchatur’s command in Edessa was some years before 1069.

For this period we know already some κατεπάνω of Edessa:

The seal of Leon Arbentenos/Arbantenos, bestarches and dux of Edessa in the Seyrig collection in Paris was convincingly attributed to the Aruandanos, mentioned for 1066/67) by Matthew of Edessa.

A seal in Dumbarton Oaks mentions Theodoros Pegonites as magistros and dux of Edessa; Matthew of Edessa testifies to a P’ilonit respectively P’ilawnit as dux of Edessa for the year 1065/66), who probably was this Pegonites. Shortly after that he was recalled. As the seal could be a little bit earlier, it is not absolutely impossible, that the owner of the seal was another person or the same one on an earlier stage of his career, but we prefer the identification.

The bulla of Michael Saronites magistros and dux of Edessa, with a standing figure of St. Michael on the obverse was dated to ca. 1065 by J.-Cl. Cheynet, but could be a little bit earlier.

A certain Dabatenos or Diabatenos, who was killed as katepano of Edessa assaulting the city of Amida in 1062/1063 according Matthew of Edessa.

At some time before 1062 Nikephoros Botaneiates, who later on became emperor, was magistros, bestes, bestarches and dux of Edessa and Antiocheia (?).
Ioannes Dukitzes/Dukas, who shortly afterwards became kaisar, was katepano of Edessa in April 1059, but was recalled to the capital at the end of this year, when his brother had become emperor (November 23, 1059).

Aaron, a son of Ivan Vladislav, who was in 1059 dux of Mesopotamia with the rank of proedros, had been at an earlier time magistros and dux of Edessa, as seals prove. This Aaron was also dux of Iberia and Greater Armenia, again with the rank of magistros, between 1054/55 and 1055/56 or even 1057; his command in Edessa could have been shortly before this period.

Taking also into account Theodorokanos’ relatively low rank of patrikios we would propose a date in the 50ies of the 11th century for his command in Edessa, perhaps even in the first half. We should have in mind, that AD 1050 a considerable part of the tagmata of the East was transferred to the Balkans to fight the Petchenegs; so the Syrian ducats lost partially their strategic importance.
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The Defeat of the Byzantines in the Battle of Dristra (August 1087).
A Sigillographic Contribution to the Prosopography of the Participants

In August 1087 the Byzantine army, led by the emperor Alexios Komnenos, was defeated by
the Pechenegs in the battle of Dristra. Both the events and the participants are described in detail
by Anna Komnene in her biographical novel “Alexiad”. There are mentioned 24 Byzantine persons.
In this survey we add the contribution of sigillography – the seals of these participants brought to
us through the ages. In some cases the data of the seals confirm the information from the written
sources, in other ones they add something, in the third ones they can even offer corrections.

We get started with the emperor Alexios Komnenos himself (1081-1118). Are there some of
his seals which could be connected with the military campaign? From the very same time there
were found 3 seals of Alexios Komnenos in Preslav, also in settlements from North-Eastern Bulgaria
– Vodno, Silstria district, Dulovo, Drandar etc. Perhaps the origin of the seal of Pacuiul lui Soare is
the same.

Of particular interest are 55 specimens found in a mound in the area of Dristra. They are a
mystery. As far as we looked over them they were struck by more than one bulloterion. It could
be suggested that they are part of the imperial mail. Perhaps in the time of the battle or after it
the messenger who carried the mail lost his own life. The other possibility is that the messenger
hided the letters away from the enemy. For example Anna Komnene describes how her father – the
emperor Alexios Komnenos - hided the banner of the Byzantines – the omophorion of the Virgin.

Members of the emperor’s family

I. Adrianos Komnenos (1060/1065 – 1105), emperor’s brother

He was awarded with the title of protosebastos (1081) and by the spring of 1087 he was megas
domestikos of the West. From 1081 till his death (on 19th of April 1105) he was a loyal ally of his
brother – the emperor Alexios Komnenos. He took part in the campaign of 1087. Before the decisive
battle of Dristra the emperor took under his personal order the center of the front which was formed
by his closer relatives, including his brother Adrianos. At that time he was commander of the Latins.
Anna gave him special attention describing one of the Byzantine attacks led by Adrianos himself.
He attacked the enemy with his vanguard. At the end he returned only with seven people.

From the territory of nowadays Bulgaria there are found three groups of seals with the name of Adrianos:
1. Protosebastos (1081 – 1105), according to the seal found in the fortress of Zlati voyvoda, Sliven district.

2. Protosebastos and megas domestikos of the West (1087 – 1105), according two seals – the first one found somewhere in Kazanlak district and the other one from Tsareva livada, Haskovo district.

3. As a “private person” according to the seal from Preslav.

It is hard to prove direct connection between the first two groups of seals and the campaign of 1087, although that kind of connection is possible. The specimen from Preslav has a direct link to the campaign because was found with other seals dated to 1087. A special logistic center was situated in Preslav, from where supplies and weapons for the army fighting under the walls of Dristra arrived.

A high ranking officer, perhaps an emperor’s relative, was the superior of that logistic center. We suggest that because the senders of the letters from Preslav are “private persons” – their seals from that time are “private” (only with their names, without any titles). That is probably a fashion trend or the emperor was really very close to them, so it was not necessary to approve their ranks.

II. George Palaeologos (1057 – 1119?) – brother-in-law of the emperor

He took part in the military campaign led by the emperor Alexios Komnenos against the Pechenegs in Northern Bulgaria. His name was mentioned amongst these young generals who advised the emperor to continue the campaign. Before the decisive battle of Dristra he recommended the emperor to withdraw in the fortress of Great Preslav. In the battle which ended very devastating for the Byzantines George Palaeologos barely escaped.

Until his death he stood loyal to the emperor and was an active participant in the major events. The time of his death is unclear but a period between 1119 and 1136 is acceptable.

With the name of George Palaeologos there are known three groups of seals:

1. Kouropalates and doux of Dyrrachion (1081).
2. Protonobellisimos (before 1094 according to a specimen found in the area of Fakiya, Burgas district).

A considerable amount of seals of George Palaeologos was recorded. Most of them are from the third group with the rank of sebastos – a title acquired at the earliest in 1094. These seals are not linked with the campaign. Probably he was protonobellisimos in 1087.

III. Michael Doukas - brother-in-law of the emperor

Eirene Doukaina, the wife of the emperor Alexios Komnenos, was Michael’s sister. After the Alexios’ accession to the throne Michael - as a person closely related to the emperial family - was honoured with the title of sebastos and occupied the high rank of protostrator. Anna says that he surpassed his contemporaries by height, but also by his possibilities to foresee the upcoming events, to take the necessary decisions and to turn them into action. His name is announced in the battle of Dristra. Michael Doukas was amongst the few left on a battlefield with the emperor after the defeat, together with Nikephoros Diogenes and the attending servants. The protostrator persuaded the emperor to withdraw from the battlefield saying “if you are saved, you can win again when you resume the war”. Michael Doukas passed away between 1108 and 1117.

Only a seal as sebastos is known with his name.
IV. Nikephoros Bryennios

He was a pretender to the throne in 1078. Against him there was sent the newly appointed Alexios Komnenos as the domestikos of the schools (in the beginning of May 1078). During the battle Nikephoros Bryennios was captured and sent to Constantinople. On the way he was blinded by order of the emperor Nikephoros III Botaneiates.

Alexios Komnenos had a high opinion of the military capacities of Nikephoros Bryennios and as emperor draw him into his entourage. Before the campaign of 1087 he dissuaded the emperor from fighting; Nikephoros expressed his opinion harshly and said the prophetic words “you must know, my Lord, that you will call on you faster horses if you pass over the Hemus mountains”. Nikephoros was still active in 1095.

Up to now there are known his seals as a protonobellisimos. It could be assumed that during the campaign of 1087 he was in this rank.

V. Nikephoros Melissenos (? – 1104). Son-in-law of the emperor Alexios Komnenos and pretender to the throne in 1081.

In 1087 he took part in the campaign against the “Skyths”. In the decisive battle he led the left wing of the Byzantine army and was captured, but “… the majority of the meeting did not agree of that (to kill them all), demands to sell them for a ransom”. When this opinion prevailed, the emperor was announced by a letter from Nikephoros Melissenos himself. Although he was in captivity he pushed many of the Skyths to this decision.

A seal of Nikephoros Melissenos as Caesar is kept in the seals collection at Dumbarton Oaks. Such a seal was affixed to the correspondence of Melissenos during the campaign of 1087. Probably the letter to the emperor in the time of Pechenegian captivity had such a seal.

VI-VII. Leo and Nikephoros Diogenes.

Leo and Nikephoros were sons of the emperor Romanos IV Diogenes from his marriage with Eudokia Makrembolitissa. There is a hypothesis that they were born between 1068 and 1071, when their father was already emperor. Anna mentioned: “they were called Porphyrogennetoi because they were born in Porphyry”. Immediately after the new emperor Michael VII (1071 – 1078) had ascended the throne he took off their red sandals, broke the golden wreaths and turned them from emperors into private persons. After Alexios was enthroned gave them attention not only for their sufferance but also because of their unusual strength and beauty. About Nikephoros Anna notes that he had a vigorous frame and a head in height above the others.

Leo and Nikephoros took part in the campaign against the Pechenegs in the summer of 1087. Before the Byzantine army crossed over the Hemus mountains there was a military council. The two brothers sided with the young commanders advising the emperor to continue the campaign.

Before the crucial battle with the Pechenegs near Dristra the emperor detached six people among them the two sons of Romanos Diogenes enthrusting them his own guard with the order to watch only on them; after the battle the emperor was left with only twenty brave horsemen exactly with Diogenes’ son Nikephoros. During their escape one Skythian pursued Nikephoros Diogenes wanting to hit him. The autocrator saw him and cried out “Look behind you, Nikephoros”. Diogenes turned as quick as possible and hit the pursuer in the face. Later the emperor explained that he never had seen such a rapidity and deftness.
During the excavations in Great Preslav was found a seal of a person with the same proper and family names. It is dated to the last quarter of the 11th c. The owner of the seal could be identical with the son of Romanos IV Diogenes – Nikephoros.

Concerning Leo Diogenes – as he lived, thus he died. In the battle occurred massive slaughter … many died from both sides. Thereafter Leo the son of Diogenes raced bravely against the Skythians and coming closely to the wagons fell down deadly.

The seals of Leo Diogenes are unknown.

ALIEN MILITARY COMMANDERS

VII. Argyros Karatzas 11th / 12th c.

His name is mentioned for the very first time in the summer of 1087. According to Anna Komnene before the decisive battle of Dristra as the military commanders of the right wing of the Byzantine army were chosen Kastamonites and Tatikios, and of the allied pagans – the Sauromates Ouzas and Karatzas. In 1092 Karatzas was as megas hetaireiarches in charge of the delicate mission concerning the upcoming plot of the emperor’s nephew John Komnenos doux of Dyrrachion.

From the territory of nowadays Bulgaria there are found two groups of seals with the name of Argyros Karatzas. The seals inform us about the proper name of this Skythian as well as his titles and ranks. The first group is attested by two bulls as kouropalates (before 1092). One piece was found in the area of Dobri dol, Plovdiv district and the other one is from Popovitsa, Plovdiv district. Argyros Karatzas is protokouropalates and doux of Philippopolis (1092 – 1095) on two seals from the vicinity of Pazardzhik and from the area of Dobri dol village.

What were his title and rank in 1087? He was one of the alien pagan chief commanders. We can suggest that he was kouropalates according to the seals of the first group. Most of the emperor’s military commanders in this campaign held that kind of title.

VIII. Basilios Kourtikios – the end of the 11th c.

He descended from an Armenian family. He is better known with the name Ioannikios. In the spring of 1087 Ioannikios was already in Thrace and together with Nikolaos Maurokatakalon defeated the Pechenegs led by Chelgu. During the summer of 1087 before the decisive battle with the Pechenegs near Dristra emperor Alexios I Komnenos entrusted his own security to six guards; amongst them was Ioannikios.

Two groups of seals with the name of Basilios Kourtikios have reached us. In the first group he is protokouropalates according to unpublished seals in D.O. (47.2.1110) and in the former Zakos collection. He appears as “private person” on the seals of the second group. We have four seals struck with the same bulloterion – from Malevo, Haskovo district, Silistra, North-Eastern Bulgaria (Dulovo or Alfatar) and Fakiya, Burgas district. In this case the seals of a person identical with the character from the “Alexiad” are “private”, but obviously he had a title and a rank too. They are from the time of the campaign.

IX. Constantine Houmbertopoulos – end of the 11th c.

He was a Norman by origin. It is suggested that he was a nephew of Robert Guiscard and a son of Humbert de Hauteville. During the reign of emperor Nikephoros III Botaneiates (1078 – 1081) he took a position in Byzantine hierarchy. Together with Tatikios he took part in the war with the
Pechenegs in 1086 and realized partial success. It is logical that he took part also in the campaign from 1087, nevertheless Anna did not mention him. In Preslav there was found one of his seals as a protonobellisimus and doux dated to the same time.

X. Nabbites – 80s of the 11th c.

The name comes from the Icelandic, meaning a bird of pray. He was a chieftain of the Varangians. In 1081 he accompanied the emperor in the campaign against the Normans of Robert Guiskard. On the 18th October 1081 they were attacked and destroyed by the Normans. We meet the name of Nabbites again among the participants of the campaign of 1087. He was one of the six warriors to whom the emperor entrusted his own life before the battle. His seals are still unknown.

BYZANTINE MILITARY COMMANDERS

XI. George Euphorbenos – end of the 11th c.

After he had arrived in Lardea the emperor appointed George Euphorbenos as military commander and sent him by the sea to Dristra. The next evidence is from the Danube river “...and when the Skythians noticed George Euphorbenos with a big army and fleet coming against them on the Istris ..., they heard also that the emperor was coming also with the biggest army, they found that for very dangerous, so decided to find a way out”. We lack information about the participation of Euphorbenos’ troops in the battle of Dristra or whether he stopped the aliens of the Pechenegs to cross over the river. It is sure that he was not injured because we meet his name again in 1095 during the invasion of the Kumans to Adrianoupolis. In Dumbarton Oaks is kept a seal of Georgios Euphorbenos as a kouropalates – a title that he probably owned during the mentioned events.

XII. Gregory Maurokatakalon – last quarter of the 11th c.

Before crossing the Hemus mountain in 1087 the emperor called a military meeting where two wings were formed: the veterans as Nikephoros Bryennios and Gregory Maurokatakalon, whom the emperor had ransomed from the Skythians as a prisoner for 40 000 nomismata, did not agree to fight in Paristrion. Before the decisive battle in August 1087 the emperor considered what to do: George Palaeologos and Gregory Maurokatakalon advised Alexios Komnenos to defer the battle. They thought it better that the emperor would leave full armed for great Presthlava and then “attack the Skythians every day”.

From the nowadays territories of Bulgaria there were found several groups of seals with the name of Gregory Maurokatakalon.

Patrikios and strategos – 50es -60es of the 11th c. (a seal from Preslav).

Anthypatos and katepano – 60es of the 11th c. (two seals from Preslav and two more from Silistra and Vetren, Silistra district).

Katepano – 60es of the 11th c. (two seals from Preslav and one of Silistra).

“Private person” – last quarter of the 11th c. (two seals – one from Melnitsa, Elchovo region, and one from Klokotnitsa, Haskovo district).

If we accept that the owner of all these seals and Gregory Mavrokatakalon from the “Alexiad” are the same person, his seals as strategos and katepano are from an earlier period. Taking part in various battles with the Pechenegs and gaining a lot of experience enabled him to give some advices to the emperor.
XIII. Constantine Antiochos – last quarter of the 11th c.

Twice the name of a certain Antiochos was mentioned in the “Alexiad”; most of the researchers accepted that this person was Constantine. Two seals of kouropalates Constantine Antiochos dated to the 80ies of the 11th c. were found in Preslav. It is quite possible that Constantine Antiochos took part in the war against the Pechenegs when he wrote a letter to Preslav.

XIV. Michael Monastras.

In the “Alexiad” the name of the “half-barbarian” Monastras is mentioned several time as one of the military commanders and brothers-in-arms of emperor Alexios Komnenos. We do not have any certain evidence that he took part in the campaign of 1087, but his seals which were found in North-Eastern Bulgaria and in Preslav bound him with these events. We have two groups of seals with the name of Michael Monastras/Manastras. On the first group he is a protovestiarios or protovestes (abbreviated only as A,R,), dated to the later 11th c. We have three seals struck with the same bulloterion found in North-Eastern Bulgaria. On the seals of the second group he is a “private person”. We have three specimens again struck with the same bulloterion. The origin of the seals is the same – one is found in Preslav.

XV. Niketas Kastamonites – end of the 11th c.

Niketas Kastamonites led (together with Tatikios) the right wing of the Byzantine army in the battle of Dristra in 1087. A seal with the names of Niketas Kastamonites was kept in the Archaeological museum in Varna, dated to the end of the 11th c. With the name of Niketas Kastamonites are known 3 groups of seals.

1. Vestarches (unpublished seal DO 47.2.1042).

Many circumstances gave us a reason to accept that these three groups of seals belonged to one and the same person (identical names, common iconography, chronological continuity), identical with the one in the written sources. His seal as a “private person” found in North-Eastern Bulgaria could be linked with the events of 1087.

XVI. Nikolaos Maurokatakalon – last quarter of the 11th c.

Before the decisive battle with the Pechenegs at Dristra, the emperor entrusted his protection to six men, among them Nikolaos Maurokatakalon, who had for long been experienced in warfare.

From nowadays Bulgaria there were found 3 seals of Nikolaos Mavrokatakalon as a “private person”, two of them originate from the fortress of Zlati voyvoda, Sliven district. Probably they are linked with the preparation of the campaign.

Conclusion

It seems that almost all of the participants in the military campaign of 1087 used seals as “private persons” nevertheless they had titles and ranks. Probably this was a kind of a modern trend. All these seals confirm the information from the written sources as silent witnesses of historical events and people's fate reaching us through the ages.
Sphragistic data on Thrace and Macedonia

Thrace was the first European theme, established about 680 for counteraction against the Bulgarians. In the period between 789-802 within the limits of Thrace a new theme – Macedonia – was created. Seals, including the Hermitage ones, belong to numerous officials of both themes: strategoi, judges, tourmarhes, etc. Both themes were closely connected with each other, which came into full play in the XI c.: the seals name different highest mainly civil officials who administered the union of Thrace and Macedonia. My report will be devoted to the seals unknown before. Among them are the seals of George, imperial protospatharios and strategos of Thrace and Macedonia (X c.); Nikephoros, patrikios and strategos of Macedonians (VIII/IX c.); Nicholas, imperial strator and tourmarches of Thrace and Macedonia (first half of the IX c.); Isaakios, kandidatos and protonotarios of Thrace (early IX c.); Christophoros, spatharios and episkeptites of Macedonia (XI c.), etc. These seals open new pages in the history of both themes.
A Rare Lead Seal of a Goldsmith (χρυσογλύπτης) from the Unpublished Zafeiris Syrras’ Collection (London)

The last twenty years in parallel with the increasing interest of researchers in Byzantine Sigillography the interest of private collectors for Byzantine lead seals has also increased. Hence new collections have appeared, which the owners made available for publication. These collections of Byzantine lead seals are either autonomous or they are parts of larger collections that comprise other items, usually coins.

The collection, however, of the Greek Zafeiris Syrras (London) is internationally one of the most important private collections of lead seals, not only in terms of the number of seals but also in terms of quality and historical importance of its articles. Zafeiris Syrras began collecting Byzantine seals in March 2003; since then he unceasingly continues acquiring Byzantine lead seals, and at this moment the collection numbers close to 1000 pieces. The collection is expected to grow, as the interest of the collector in Byzantine lead seals remains unequivocally high. The collection is considered amongst the three largest private collections of Byzantine seals worldwide. The lead seals of the collection are dated in the time period between the 8th and the 13th c., but the majority of them are from the 10th to 12th c.

One of the most important pieces of the collection names the rarely attested profession of the goldsmith (χρυσογλύπτης). Beside this unpublished specimen we found only a second seal with this profession – in the collection of Dumbarton Oaks. From other seals we are aware of: χρυσοτελής, ἀρχων τῶν χρυσοκλαβαρίων, ἀρχων τοῦ χρυσοχοείου, χρυσεψητής, χρυσ(o)επιλέκτης, ἀρχων/μειζότερος τοῦ χρυσοκλαβαρίου (χρυσοκλάβου, χρυσοκλαβαρίων), βασιλικός χρυσοτελής, βασιλικός κουράτωρ τῆς θείας χρυσοτελείας, χρυσοσερικοπράτης.

The paper is focused on a) the analysis of the above mentioned seal from the Collection of the Greek Zafeiris Syrras in London and b) the presentation of the activities of the χρυσογλύπται in Byzantium based on epigraphical and narrative sources and their on works of art.
Empire and Polis: The Evidence of Seals from Byzantine Cherson

This research is financially supported by the Russian Foundation for Humanities, project nr. 15-31-10106 “Byzantine Cherson VI - XIII cc. in the monuments of Sigillography”.

From the general complex of archaeological sources for research of administrative-political and trade-economic development of Byzantine Cherson problems, determining of its place and role in interest of the state and society monuments of sigillography are particularly of great interest.

They complement scanty information of medieval narrative sources and not numerous monuments of epigraphy not only substantially but that is also the most important, add impartial information about the proprietors.

Findings in Cherson of the whole complex of Byzantine seals from the 6th - 13th cc. and until now proceeding findings of new specimens allow not only to identify the certain model of administrative ruling of this military-administrative area of the empire but also to describe its specific.

The seals show that since the 8th c. Cherson is an archontia. Today we know about 140 seals of local archons since the first half of the 8th c. to the middle of the 9th c., having different titles (hypatos, imperial spatharios, imperial spatharokandidatos).

Approximately in the middle of the 9th century the Tauric theme Klimata (headed by the strategos, sent from the capital) was created. Unfortunately we know only four seals in a very poor state of preservation of the officials of this theme, which give only disputed information on this issue. However, before long it got both the new name (theme Cherson) and a new management administration which traditionally included like in the majority of themes – ek prosopou, kommerkiarioi and notarioi; the seals of them are well known, also among the Cherson's finds.

First, there are numerous seals of local kommerkiarioi (nearly 80 copies) from the beginning of the second half of the 9th c. - end of the 10th c., showing a variety of titles of their respective owners (imperial kandidatos, imperial koubikoularios, imperial spatharios, imperial spatharokandidatos and imperial protospatharios).

Also are known the seals of Sergios imperial spatharios and ek prosopou of Cherson (end of the 9th c. –early 10th c.), and Stephanos imperial protospatharios and protonotarios of Mangana and Cherson (second half of the 10th c.)

The seals of military commanders of Cherson (more than 150 pieces) date from the middle of the 9th c. - beginning of the second half of the 11th c. and they also represent the diversity of the titles of this officials (imperial spatharios, imperial spatharokandidatos, imperial protospatharios, imperial protospatharios epi tou Chrysotriklinou, patrikios).

At the same time in the 10th c. the empire carried out a wide practice of bringing into the management representatives of local aristocratic circles - original outranged officials, not included
in the official lists of the empire's vast bureaucratic authority. So new officials of authority appeared in local practice like *kyr* and *pater poleos* known only from their seals. Among them, the seals of *kyroi* of Cherson, *hypatoi* - Isaakios, Leon, Zoilos (end of the 8th c. –early 9th c.? and Michael, *imperial spatharios* and *epi ton oikeakon* (third quarter of the 9th c.); the seals of Nikephoros, *imperial kandidatos* and *ekdikos* (last third of the 9th c.) and Sergios, *pater poleos* of Cherson (first half of the 10th c.). Recently, this category of local officials joined *stratores* of Cherson (early 9th c.).

In the 11th c. Cherson is still considered a center of Byzantine domains, and by the middle of the century in the jurisdiction of local military commanders (*στρατηγοί*) considerable off-shore territory of Tauric from Cherson to Sougdaia was already included. The activity of Nomads on the northern borders of the empire forced imperial administration to create in Tauric in the later 11th c. a high military command (with the *katepano* as chief), known only by the seal of Nikephoros Alanos, vestarches and katepano of Cherson and Khazaria (end of the 11th c.).

The information of the seals from Cherson presents not only local public officials in the structure of imperial bureaucratic hierarchy but also gives the most valuable information about place and role of Cherson in mutual relations with the surrounding world.

The seals of Cherson's senders in many cases allow to confirm or complement testimonies of writing and other sources about the most different spheres of vital functions of the *polis*, its contacts with the sovereigns - Byzantine emperors and Constantinople's patriarchs; by a court aristocracy and central administration; by different provincial civil and military services, church dioceses and trade partners.

The sigillographical analysis shows that Cherson was not deprived of attention of different imperial and provincial departments, and, obviously, played a very noticeable role in protection of the empire's financial-economic interests and in the development of international trade in the Black Sea region.

The findings of the seals of Byzantine emperors (the seals of Anastasius I, Justinian I, Tiberius II Constantine, Maurice Tiberius, Phocas, Heraclius, Michael III, Constantine VII, Theophano, Basil II, Constantine IX, Michael VII), of Constantinople's Patriarchs (John VII, Nicholas I, Michael II and Manuel II) and of peripheral church dignitaries (bishops, archbishops and metropolitans of Bosporus, Sougdaia, Gothia, Anchialos, Amastris, Smyrna, Trebizond, Rus') or of functionaries of pious foundations like the Grand Orphanage of St. Peter and Paul in Constantinople are surely illustrating the special interest in Cherson as leader and defender of imperial interests.

The important strategic position of Cherson as an empire's outpost was the reason of permanent attention to the city from different ranks of the Byzantine army and fleet documented by seals (e. g. *tourmarchai*, *droungarioi* and *stategoi*). Among them the seals of strategoi of Hellas, Thessalonike, Sikelia, Armeniakon, Kephallenia, tourmarches of Gothia, komes of Opsikion, topoteretes and droungarios of the Ploimon and others.

At the same time Cherson is the active participant of financial-economic communications of Byzantium's development process in the Black Sea region. The finds of seals of representatives of fiscal service and customs demonstrate the natural habitat of contacts of local officials with their colleagues not only from the capital but also from centers of Southern Littoral of the Black Sea, of the Hellespontos and the Coast of Asia Minor, existing from the 7th c. up to the 11th century.
Among them the numerous seals of Genikoi Logothetai (over 100 specimens), the seals of komites of Hieron and Abydos, dioiketai of Amastris, Mytilene and Chaldia, kommerkiarioi of the Apotheke of Constantinople, Abydos, Honorias, Paphlagonia and the Littoral of Pontos, chartoularios and gennimatas of Chrysopolis, protonotarios of Paphlagonia and a number of others seals.

Thus the data of sigillography on this stage show wide enough, but it is necessary to suppose not exhaustive spectrum of connections of Byzantine Cherson - city-port and city-guard with its specific, and feature and enable in a great deal to examine anew its place and role in the interests of the Byzantine empire in the Northern Littoral of the Black Sea.
The Cycle of the Miracles of Archangel Michael in Byzantine Sigillography?

The adoration of Archangel Michael in Byzantium approached the level of glory held for the most highly respected saints. The image of Michael as a warrior has been found as early as the 6th century. Later, following political and economic changes in the empire, the popularity of the archangel (as archistrategos) extended to all Byzantine society. *The Miracles of Archangel Michael* was written by Pantoleon, the Chartophylax of the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, on the border of the 9th and 10th centuries.

*The Miracles* have been found in monuments dating from between 11th to 15th centuries in Byzantium and the states of the Byzantine world. In Byzantine sigillography there are no known representations of *The Miracles*. In this connection I want to draw your attention to two seals from the collections of the State Hermitage and The Sheremetiev’s Museum in Kiev.

First seal M – 3148 (XI c., unpublished).

On the right-hand side of the composition is an image of an angel with wings, standing in the profile and facing another person. This person is kneeling before him.

On the other side is an inscription, which is unfortunately badly preserved. My colleagues E. Stepanova and I. Jordanov only agree that the name of the seal's owner was Constantine.

In *The Miracles of Archangel Michael*, this iconographic image can be found in the following scenes: ‘The Miracle at Chonae’ and ‘The Appearance of Archangel Michael to Joshua before Jericho’. The representation on the Hermitage seal may be either one of these scenes.

The scene ‘The Miracle at Chonae’ was quite common in Byzantine art (S. Gabelich). In it pagans divert a river in order to flood a church dedicated to Archangel Michael. The monk or priest Archippos beseeches the archangel for help. Michael appears before him: with his long lance, he cleaves a hole in the earth to swallow up the water. Michael is represented in this scene as either a warrior or an angel (Sinai): in one case he is even shown in imperial garments (cf. the cross of St. Michael in DO). In the traditional rendition of this scene the archangel is represented on the right side and the priest on the left as on the Hermitage seal. However I do not see any lance in the archangel’s hand...

The second possible scene is ‘The Appearance of Archangel Michael to Joshua before Jericho’. The archangel appears before the walls of Jericho to Joshua and helps him to destroy them. Different interpretations of this scene have been found. For example in the frescoes of Cretan churches the archangel was painted as a horseman! Traditionally Michael is on the right-hand side in front of Joshua, who either kneels or prostrates himself before him on the left (although in the church of Archangel Michael in Archanes/Crete Joshua is on the right and Michael is on the left). However on the Hermitage seal the archangel is represented in profile. In consequence I cannot determine which scene from *The Miracles* is represented on the Hermitage seal.
The second seal is kept in the collection of The Sheremetiev’s Museum. It is possible that this seal once belonged to the Russian prince Oleg (Mikhail), the ruler of Tmutarakan. On one side of the seal is the image of Archangel Michael as a warrior: before him someone engages in *proskynesis*. According to the inscription on the other side of the seal Oleg was ‘the archon of Tmutarakan’ and the doux of ‘all Chazaria’. The seal can be dated to the 1080s-1090s, after the prince’s return to Tmutarakan from exile in Rhodes. Since he returned through Constantinople, it is possible that the matrix of his seal was completed in the Byzantine capital.

There are two possible interpretations of the scene on the seal. It may either be a scene of the prince worshipping his heavenly patron Archangel Michael or a representation of ‘The Appearance of Archangel Michael to Joshua before Jericho’. Both interpretations may be correct. In favour of the first variant are images from church frescos and mosaics in Cappadocia (Karanlik Kilise, XI c.), Kastoria (Panagia Mavriotissa, XI c.), Sicily (Martorana, XII c.) and the famous mosaic of Leo VI before Christ Pantokrator in the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople.

However the same iconographic representation has been found in versions of ‘The Appearance of Archangel Michael to Joshua before Jericho’ (S. Gabelich) in Byzantium (Chavushin, X c.) and Rus’ (Suzdal’, first third of the XIII c.). On the south of the Golden Gates in the Church of the Nativity in Suzdal’ all persons represented in *The Miracles of Archangel Michael* are shown in *proskynesis* (A. N. Ovchinnikov). The same is the case for the thirteenth-century Russian icon of ‘The Appearance of Archangel Michael to Joshua before Jericho’ in the Moscow Kremlin Church of the Dormition.

The last example is from Byzantine embroidery from Urbino (XV c.). In the inscription certain Michael is likened to Joshua: Iconographically this scene is similar to that in ‘The Appearance of Archangel Michael to Joshua before Jericho’.

In conclusion I repeat the following: 1. The scenes ‘The Appearance of Archangel Michael to Joshua before Jericho’ and ‘The Miracle at Chonae’ from *The Miracles of Archangel Michael* are unknown in Byzantine Sigillography. With the publication of new seals in the future it will be possible to come to a conclusion concerning the scenes on our seals. 2. It is necessary to draw attention to the rarity of a scene wherein the seal’s owner is engaged in *proskynesis*. 
The Theme of Drougoubiteia

The evidence of lead seals, in combination with the rich documentary sources of the monasteries of Mount Athos, promotes our knowledge of the administrative organization of the geographical region of Macedonia, especially during the 10th-11th centuries. Unlike the themes of Boleron, Strymon and Thessaloniki, however, the neighbouring theme of Drougoubiteia has not been systematically studied. The officers of the theme, the precise location of which has been the subject of various views, are mostly attested on seals published mainly during recent decades.

It is known that the Slavic tribe of Drougoubitai, which gave the theme its name, is attested for the first time in the Miracles of St Demetrius. According to this narrative, the Sermesianoi crossed the Danube and reached the Keramesios kampos (plain), near Thessaloniki. From there, their leader Kouver sent an embassy to the emperor Constantine IV (668-685), asking for permission to settle there with his people. He also asked for access to food supplies from the neighbouring Slavic tribe of Drougoutes, who were obviously under the imperial authority. Various opinions have been expressed about the exact location of the Drougoutian settlement, mentioning a region of Pelagonia, to the west of Thessaloniki. It seems, however, as is attested by Ioannes Kameniates (late 9th c.), that they inhabited the Kampania plain, or more accurately its central part, as has recently been argued.

The first attestation of a state officer connected with the Drougoutai is the seal of Peter, basilikos protospatharios and archon Drougoubiton, published by Alexandra Wassiliou-Seibt and dated to the first half of the 9th century. Peter was recognized and appointed as the head of that Slavic tribe by the Byzantine emperor in the framework of a policy of integration and control of the Slavic groups, since such archons of Slavic tribes, who were clearly Byzantine officials, are also mentioned in other seals dating from the beginning of the 8th to the 10th century.

A strategos of Drougoubiteia is attested for the first time in the Escurial Taktikon (971-973). The administrative unit of Drougoubiteia (combined with Strymon) is perhaps mentioned on the ca. contemporary seal of Symeon basilikos protospatharios, who performed his duties, probably as krites (Jordanov – Zhockedova 321, partially different reading).

The first certain krites of the theme mentioned in the sources is the judge of Strymon and Drougoubiteia Nikolaos attested on a seal attached to the document of a judicial decision dated in December 995 (Actes d’Iviron no. 9), although he subscribes it as krites of Strymon and Thessaloniki. Nikolaos also subscribes another document (November 996) as krites of Strymon, Thessaloniki and Drougoubiteia (Actes d’Iviron no. 10). The inconsistency of Nikolaos’ office between the seal and the documents led the editors of Actes d’Iviron to wonder whether Nikolaos might have been appointed krites of Strymon and Drougoubiteia, created his boulloterion, and later taken over responsibility for the theme of Thessaloniki as well. According to other opinions, however, if Nikolaos was krites of Strymon, Thessaloniki and Drougoubiteia, the omission of the theme of Drougoubiteia in his subscription of the first document cannot be easily explained. For this reason it has been recently claimed that the theme of Drougoubiteia was not so large and important and could, therefore, be easily omitted. But such an interpretation is not convincing.
In our opinion, it cannot be excluded that Nikolaos was *krites only of Strymon and Drougoubiteia* before December of 995, at which time he was *krites of Strymon and Thessaloniki*, according to his subscription, but was still using his old *boulloterion* because it was not yet recut in the meantime. Consequently, he did not mention the *theme of Drougoubiteia* in the document, probably because he no longer had jurisdiction there. Besides, the fact that in certain, although rare, cases, the full title of an administrative or judicial unit is omitted in documents or narrative sources, because an affair concerned only one of its regions or *themes*, cannot solve the problem or allow us to argue that this is why Nikolaos omitted the *theme of Drougoubiteia*, since the case concerned a land dispute in the *theme of Thessaloniki* but he subscribes as *krites* of the *Strymon theme* as well. It seems that the *theme of Strymon* was the common element between Nikolaos’ previous and new positions, which allowed or made it easier for him to use his old boulloterion, if that is the case. The following year, in 996, he was appointed as *krites* to the extended unit of *Strymon, Thessaloniki and Drougoubiteia*.

It has been assumed that the *theme of Drougoubiteia* lay to the north of the city of Serres, but at the same period the *theme of New Strymon* appears in the *Escurial Taktikon*, which was probably located north of the Roupel pass while the old theme of Strymon extended from Roupel to the Aegean coast, according to the recent study of Alexandra Wassiliou-Seibt.

Another opinion situates the *theme of Drougoubiteia* only to the west of Thessaloniki, in the central part of the Kampania plain, where the Slavic tribe of Drogoubitai was settled and the bishopric of Drougoubiteia located. The existence of such an episcopal periphery is attested from the 9th century, when Petros, bishop of Drougoubiteia, participated in the Synod of 879/880. A bishopric of Drougoubiteia under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Thessaloniki is mentioned in the *Notitiae Episcopatum 7* (early 10th c.), 9 and 10 (late 10th c.), 13 (12th c.) and in another catalogue of the bishoprics under the metropolis of Thessaloniki (late 11th c.) comprised in manuscripts from the 14th century published by J. Darrouzès, although these documents cannot be regarded as absolutely safe testimonies. But the bishopric of Drougoubiteia, the exact location and extent of which is the subject of different views, cannot define the boundaries of the *theme of Drougoubiteia*.

What is certain is that the *theme of Drougoubiteia* had common borders not only with that of *Thessaloniki*, as is also indicated by the above-mentioned subscription of Nikolaos as *krites of Strymon, Thessaloniki and Drougoubiteia*, but also with the *theme of Strymon*, according to the testimonies of the *kritai of Strymon and Drougoubiteia* Nikolaos and Symeon mentioned above, and one more seal published by I. Jordanov, on which Christophoros, *asecretis, krites of Drougoubiteia* and perhaps *of Strymon* is mentioned. The opinion that neighbouring but not contiguous *themes* could be united into a single administrative, fiscal and judicial unit, as in the case of *Drougoubiteia and Strymon*, cannot be accepted. Consequently, the *theme of Drougoubiteia* extended from northwest of Thessaloniki to the north of Thessaloniki, as N. Oikonomides had also suggested, and shared a border with the *theme of Strymon* as well, probably as far as the east bank of the Strymon, south of Lake Kerkini.

Despite the fact that the *theme of Drougoubiteia* bordered those of *Thessaloniki* and *Strymon*, there is no mention of this or of any financial or judicial officer serving there, in the documents of Mount Athos in the 11th century. This, in our view, is probably because there was no longer a single *theme of Strymon, Drougoubiteia and Thessaloniki*, but another, more easterly, one had been created comprising *Boleron, Strymon and Thessaloniki*, a unit that appears very often in the 11th century.
One would not expect, therefore, any mention of Drougoubiteia, since the land disputes referred to in the documents of the monasteries of Mount Athos concerned mainly the region of the themes of Thessaloniki and Strymon. Similarly, the allusions to Drougoubiteia in the late 10th century (996) were made because the disputes that concerned lands in the theme of Thessaloniki were examined by the krites Nikolaos of the unified theme of Strymon, Thessaloniki and Drougoubiteia, and not because some case concerned the region of Drougoubiteia.

At this point the existence of one more financial unit should be mentioned, that of the dioikesis of Smolenon, which was attached to the new dioikesis of Thessaloniki and Serres (Actes de Lavra no. 39 [1079]). This unique reference to the dioikesis of Smolenon is important, in our view, since we conclude that the dioikesis, and the theme of Smolenon as well, extended from the upper reaches of the Ardas River and the region of modern Smolyan, in Bulgaria, to the Nestos, otherwise such a connection with the neighbouring dioikesis of Serres, that is of Strymon, would not be possible. The case of the theme of Smolenon is, like the Drougoubiteia, another example of a theme that took its name from the core tribe of a Slavic settlement.

The evidence of seals attests one strategos of Drougoubiteia, 13 krites of Drougoubiteia, one of whom is mentioned on an unpublished seal from Austria, one archon of Drougoubiteia, who was probably in charge of a separate administration in the theme of Drougoubiteia, and two anagrapheis of the same theme. Two of Psellos’ letters are addressed to a krites of Drougoubiteia. After the 11th century there is no mention to the theme of Drougoubiteia, which was probably absorbed into the theme of Thessaloniki.

Finally, another interesting element to which little attention has been paid is the fact that we know the place where many of the seals of officers of Drougoubiteia were found, thanks to the efforts and the editions of I. Jordanov:

1. Three of the seals of Ἰσαάκιος, βασιλικὸς πρωτοσπαθάριος καὶ στρατηγὸς Δρουγουβιτείας were found in Preslav, and three in other unknown regions of Bulgaria (third quarter of the 10th c.).

2. The seal of ῾Ιρηγορᾶς Σαυλωάννης, πρωτοσπαθάριος, κριτής ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱπποδρόμου καὶ τῆς Δρουγουβιτείας (first half of the 11th c.) was found in the locality of Gradišteto, near Lyubimets in the district of Haskovo.

3. The seal of Χριστόφορος, ἀσηκρῆτις, κριτὴς Δρουγουβιτείας καὶ Στρυμόνος(;) comes from Silistra (first half or second quarter of the 11th c.).

4. Two seals from the same boulloterion of Λέων, ἀσηκρῆτις καὶ κριτὴς Δρουγουβιτείας (second quarter of the 11th c.) were found in Preslav.

5. The seal of Θεόδωτος, ἀσηκρῆτις καὶ κριτὴς Δρουγουβιτείας (middle of the 11th c.) was found near the village of Polski Gradetz.

6. The seal of ᾿Ιωάννης Κ…, πρωτοσπαθάριος, ἀσηκρῆτις, κριτής ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱπποδρόμου καὶ Δρουγουβιτείας (middle of the 11th c.) was found in the region of Elkhovo (Melnitsa).

7. One seal of Θεόδουλος, πρωτοσπαθάριος, ὕπατος, κριτής τοῦ βήλου καὶ Δρουγουβιτείας (second half of the 11th c.) comes from the region of Plovdiv or Pazardzhik, another from Aquae Calidae near Burgas, and two specimens from the same boulloterion from other, unknown, places.
8. The seal of an anonymous ἀσηκρῆτις καὶ κριτῆς Δρουγουβιτείας (11th c.), who could be perhaps identical with Θεόδουλος (no. 7), was found in the region of Gradishteto, near modern Simeonovgrad.

9. Of the ten seals of Μιχαὴλ Σκληρός, πρωτοπρόεδρος καὶ ἀναγγαφέως Δρουγουβιτείας (around 1080), which come from the same boulloterion, one was found in Preslav, one in Stara Zagora, one in the stronghold near the village of Kipilovo (district of Sliven), one in the stronghold near the village of Zlati Voyvoda, one in the stronghold near Simeonovgrad, one in Ahtopol (Agathoupolis), and four from uncertain places, perhaps some of them from Preslav. The find-spot of another specimen from a private collection in Varna that comes from a different boulloterion is not known.

10. The seal of Βασίλειος Τζιρίθων, ἀνθύπατος πατρίκιος, κριτῆς τοῦ βήλου καὶ Δρουγουβιτείας (1050-1070) was found in an unknown location in Bulgaria.

11. The seal of Ἰωάννης Ἐλεσβάαμ, ἀνθύπατος πατρίκιος καὶ κριτῆς Δρουγουβιτείας (1050-1070) was found in an unknown region of Bulgaria.

It is undoubtedly surprising that most of the above seals were found in areas of Thrace distant from the theme of Drougoubiteia where their owners performed their duties. But this does not mean that we should search for another location for the theme of Drougoubiteia, in the region of Thrace for example, since another branch of the Slavic tribe of Drogoubitai is also attested in the region of Philippoupolis.

The finding of seals of the strategos of Drougoubiteia Isaakios in Preslav, far away from the place of his jurisdiction, has been correctly interpreted as a result of his participation in military operations there. Besides, the strategos Isaakios was then appointed strategos of Thrace and Ioannoupolis and of Thrace and Macedonia as well. The seals of the other officers of the theme of Drougoubiteia found in various places in Thrace was the product of correspondence with officials, relatives or friends who lived or performed their duties there. For example, some of the seals of Michael Skleros could have been attached to letters sent to Constantine Skleros, who served as krites of Macedonia and Thrace during the same period (last quarter of the 11th c.). It should also be mentioned that Michael was later appointed exisotes of the West and krites of Thrace and Macedonia. The same career from the theme of Drougoubiteia to the theme of Macedonia and Thrace is also attested for the krites Ioannes Elesbaam. We may suppose that Michael and Ioannes had some contacts with officers of the theme where they would continue their career. Some seals could also have been transferred to regions very remote from Drougoubiteia for a variety of reasons. For example, the seal of Christophoros, asecretis, krites of Drougoubiteia and perhaps of Strymon, found in Silistra is seriously damaged and holed and reduced to just one third of its original size. It could, therefore, have been used as a button or something like that, as I. Jordanov observed, and may have arrived in Silistra with its owner. In any case, the evidence of seals for the officers of Drougoubiteia should be taken into consideration concerning the network of contacts and their distance in Byzantium, especially in the 11th century.
Ein bisher unbekanntes Siegel von Theodoros Styppeiotes als *Protonobellisimos* und Megas Sakellarios (frühe 50er-Jahre 12. Jh.)


Die bisherigen Informationen zu seinem *cursus honorum* können aufgrund eines jüngst entdeckten Siegels einer österreichischen Privatsammlung ergänzt werden, welches sowohl inhaltlich als auch ikonographisch anspruchsvoll ist.

In drei rhetorisch und metrisch einwandfreien byzantinischen Zwölfsilbern stellt sich der Siegler als *protonobellisimos* und *megas sakellarios* vor und bittet die segnende Hand Gottes, ihn zu schützen. Die Bleibulle ist in die frühen 50er-Jahre chronologisch eingzugrenzen.
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Introduction

Scholars have traditionally viewed the first half of the thirteenth century—the period of the so-called empire in exile after the “cataclysm” of the Fourth Crusade—as a time of transformation of Byzantine politics, society, and culture. It is important, however, to bear in mind that innovations emerged alongside the continuation of earlier practices attested in the Komnenian period as well as subtle realignments. The Nicaean state demonstrates the exceptional resilience of core elements of Byzantine society and culture. Members of the political elite migrated to western Asia Minor, which led to a rearrangement of networks of allegiance and kinship key to the success of imperial power in exile. The reestablishment of the core institutions of Constantinople—the imperial office and the patriarchate—went along with the continuation of older elements of imperial and ecclesiastical ideology. Texts and material culture enable us to study the distinguishing features of the political ideology of the states of Epiros and Nicaea, including key changes in Nicaea. The reception and adaptation of older literary and other texts (including ones from the twelfth century) is seen in the writings of Theodore II Laskaris, especially his poetic work and his letters. The unionist conversations with the Roman church gave rise to important new developments in Byzantine theology. The divergent thirteenth-century views of the judicial ordeal by red-hot iron, a phenomenon that has long puzzled modern scholars, serve to caution us by showing the difficulty of distinguishing true innovations from the continuation of pre-existing phenomena. This round table will address the question of the adaptability of the Nicaean Empire and the reconfiguration of previous elements for its own needs.
After Collapse: Aristocratic Networks and Imperial Power in the Empire of Nicaea

Introduction

The Fourth Crusade (1204) had an enormous impact in the entire Eastern Mediterranean. Political and economic relations were newly defined and spheres of power were divided between the Western crusaders and the Venetians. All that happened after the capture of the capital of the Byzantine Empire, Constantinople. Its collapse was the end of destabilising processes and a period of revolts that had shaken the state. And as Joyce Marcus observed “urban based states typically exerted control over vast territories early in their life-spans, but they are fragmented as provincial centers brake away.” A significant turning point is the fact that especially in the 12th century the revolts took a much more local character. Contrary to what happened in the previous centuries, where insurgents wanted to become emperors, the later rebels did not aim anymore at coming to the power in the centre. In his book *Historical Dynamics*, Peter Turchin explained this phenomenon in the following way: „In mature empires, in which central regions have lost much of their collective solidarity, frontier regions may acquire their own identity, separate from both the parent empire and the enemy on the other side of the border."

Here the model of Marcus, where “a secondary center would eclipse its former overlord to become the capital of a new and more powerful state” does not find application. Instead, the insurgents in those centuries preferred to become rulers over small territorial states at the periphery of the Byzantine Empire. Alone in the 12th century ca. 70 such revolts have been registered, making visible a great degree of instability.

In this paper, I will set the rise of a Byzantine empire in exile in the wider context of state collapse, regeneration and re-structuring of power networks in the 12th and 13th century. I will then highlight the special role of the founder the most successful Byzantine state in exile after 1204, Emperor Theodoros I Laskaris of Nicaea. In that way also the role of the aristocracy will be enlightened.

1. Collapse and regeneration: some historical remarks

In order to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances which lead to the Fourth Crusade and the rise to power of the first Laskarid ruler, Theodore I Laskaris, I have followed the example of Peter Turchin in his book on “Historical Dynamics”, where in so-called “instability indices” he measured the years of socio-political instability or the numbers of “instability events” per decade through the centuries for several polities (but not for Byzantium). My colleague Johannes Preiser-Kapeller calculated an “index of internal instability” in Byzantium and Nicaea for the decades between 1100 and 1300 CE; in contrast to Turchin, Preiser-Kapeller introduced some kind of threshold in order to include only over-regional and instability phenomena of wider significance in our list.
(Preiser-Kapeller, Complex historical dynamics, 69-127). The visualisation of his survey very much illustrates the exceptional turbulences which upset the Byzantine Empire after the death of Emperor Manuel I Komnenos in 1180 till the Fourth Crusade 1204 and its aftermath; ties of allegiance were broken, new networks emerged on regional and local levels in the imperial centre as well as in various provinces, of which some separated from the Empire. Within this framework took place the establishment of Lascariid power in Bithynia and Western Asia Minor by members of the aristocracy. Theodore I Laskaris (1204–1221) and his successor John III Dukas Vatatzes (1221–1254) were able to create a more solid imperial government incorporating other aristocratic clans; however, the power was centralised around the Emperor and his household. This seemingly well organised system was put into trial and failed when Emperor Theodore II Laskaris (1254–1258) tried to exclude in great degree the aristocratic clans from his regime and to rely on homines novi.

2. The Nicaean experience of regeneration

The Nicaean Empire was the result of a state collapse in the form by which the state fragments into smaller political entities. On the other hand, we must not believe that collapse is always total or complete. As Shmuel Eisenstadt asserts “Ancient states and civilizations do not collapse at all, if by collapse is meant the complete end of those political systems and their accompanying civilizational frameworks. Thus, the investigation of collapse in ancient states and civilizations really entails identifying the various kinds of social reorganization in these types of societies and so viewing collapse as part of the continuous process of boundary reconstruction” (Eisenstadt, Beyond collapse, 236-243).

That states do not collapse completely can be proven by procedures of regeneration which find place after collapse. The Byzantine state was re-established taking back its former capital Constantinople. However, it took almost 60 years for that to happen. The regeneration began within “second generation” states which were formed at the periphery of the collapsed empire.

The case of Nicaea but also that of Epirus is quite close to what Joyce Marcus has described as “dynamic model”, by which “regeneration is powered by the rise of ambitious elites in provincial contexts forging alliances and re-creating large scale political entities.” (s. the bibliography). The State of Nicaea was founded 1204 in Bithynia by a member of the imperial family, Theodore I Laskaris, after he had succeeded in gaining the support of local and Constantinopolitan aristocrats (he forged therefore necessary alliances). The interesting point is nevertheless that Laskaris has probably arrived at the area of Bithynia before the capture of Constantinople (autumn 1203). He fled from the city together with his family and went to Nicaea (today Iznik) in order to organise the fight against the Latins. The citizens of Nicaea denied him to enter the city, but they allowed his wife and children to stay there. What is certain is that Theodore wanted to be accepted as military chief of north-western Asia Minor and he based his activities around the city of Prousa. It seems that he had at that point the support of the Byzantine troops located at that area but we lack on information on exact numbers and names. Later, he could rely also on troops from other revolt leaders in the area of Thrace (Alexios Aspietes).

The separate polity he was trying to create was very similar to all those which appeared with increasing intensity at the 12th century, since in the capital there was until April 1204 still a Byzantine emperor (Alexios IV), which means that he was actually acting as “insurgent”. The legitimisation of his actions was not only that he acted in the name of the former emperor Alexios III, but also that the capital was captured finally by the crusaders. Otherwise he would have been only one among
other revolt leaders. Two very important elements should be noticed: Here the model, where “a secondary center would eclipse its former overlord to become the capital of a new and more powerful state” (Schwartz, From Collapse to Regeneration, 8) finds in a way application. The second aspect which has to be pointed out is that aim of this polity was to recover Constantinople, not to replace the Byzantine Empire. That means the tendency of revolt leaders of the 12th century to restrict themselves to a small territory and not to aim to take the central power was transformed through the collapse of the central authority. As one of the reasons for this change can be seen the will of the new exile states to legitimise the necessity of their existence and also their struggle against their opponents. In order to do so Laskaris used the Byzantine imperial ideology for his own purposes. It has been argued that “a crucial factor in regeneration is the survival of institutions or ideas from the era before collapse, supplying a base for the eventual recreation of complex societies….that ideologies and values of earlier complex societies provided reference points for second-generation states” (Schwartz, From Collapse to Regeneration, 10).

Similar aims and ideological tendencies had also the other Greek state at the Western parts of the former Byzantine Empire: Epirus. It was founded after April 1204 by a member of the imperial family. He was a cousin of the former emperor Alexios III and he went to Epirus to form an autonomous state. He may have gone there because his family probably possessed lands or because it was an area hostile to Alexios III.

3. Brokerage, aristocracy and networks of power in late medieval history

In 1204 an external factor lead to the modification of the existing economic and political networks in the Eastern Mediterranean. Not all networks broke down. While the core was crushed, the networks in the Byzantine periphery remained at a greater degree intact. The rulers of the Byzantine states in exile based their power on the cooperation of those local aristocrats and took advantage of their networks.

In order to analyse from a different perspective the imperial and aristocratic power in Nicaea we will apply the methodology and tools of Social Network Analysis (SNA). This found in the last years a fertile ground for development also in Byzantine Studies. A classic point of reference for socio-historical network research with regard to the rise of individuals or groups to power has become J. F. Padgett and Ch. K. Ansell's paper „Robust Action and the Rise of the Medici, 1400–1434“. Padgett and Ansell analysed the political, economic and social interactions between 92 Elite families in early 15th century Florence; they constructed network models on this basis and determined the key figures of degree, closeness, betweenness, etc. for the various powerful clans, especially of course for the most important family of Medici. The results of their work sound similar to our findings about the rise of the Emperor of Nicaea: “Medicean political control was produced by means of network disjunctures within the elite, which the Medici alone spanned. Cosimo de Medici’s multivocal identity as sphinx harnessed the power available in these networks holes and resolved the contradiction between judge and boss inherent in all organisations” (Padgett–Ansell, Robust Action, 1259).

“A social network consists of a finite set or sets of actors and the relation or relations defined on them. The presence of relational information is a critical and defining feature of a social network” (Wasserman–Faust, Social network analysis, 20). What social network analysis actually does is to map relationships between individuals in social networks.

After 1204 many members of aristocratic families of Constantinople moved to the periphery. Theodore I Laskaris based his power on 66 aristocratic families (of local and Constantinopolitan
origin). In an ego-network of Laskaris which we have constructed on the data included in the study of V. T. Puech in the aristocracy in the 13th century (PUECH, L’ aristocratie), we see that we can also make a distinction between “profane” and ecclesiastical aristocracy, while some of these individuals had a mixed position (fig.1). It became clear that Theodore I succeeded to establish himself in centre of a network of aristocratic clans and individuals of heterogeneous backgrounds, thus benefiting from brokerage among different pressure groups; by including more and more territories in Western Asia Minor in his realms and by fending off crusaders as well as Seljuks he satisfied the want of local elites for a protection of their possessions and of the aristocratic clans which had taken refuge from Constantinople for the allotment of new properties as compensation for their estates lost to the Crusaders. As balancer of interests and benefactor of those worthy of benefactions he fulfilled ideals of Byzantine imperial ideology as well as structural position of a broker within a newly emerging network with many opportunities to establish oneself in “structural holes”.

If we compare the network of Theodore I with the one of Michael Angelos (fig. 2), the founder of the (ultimately inferior) rival state of Epirus, we realise that Angelos’ supporters were of smaller number and were principally members of the clergy; in this case, less opportunities for brokerage emerged, limiting the space for the establishment of “imperial” power.

In both cases we have to keep in mind that our network reconstructions are made on the base of our actually limited sources; on the other hand we must not forget that the support of those aristocratic families took place gradually or it followed after intermarriage or after the subordination of some of them.

Finally, it is very important to keep in mind the geographical position of the Empire of Nicaea: its centre was in Bithynia in North-western Asia Minor. In the 13th century, Bithynia became not only a seedbed for the revival of Byzantine imperial power; towards the end of this century, as the resources of the Byzantine Empire (reinstated in Constantinople since 1261) were almost exclusively devoted to the defence against new crusading attempts from the West, the Emirate of Osman and his successors emerged in the former core region of Nicaea.
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Fig. 1 The network of Theodore I. Laskaris (supportive aristocratic families) (graph created by the author with the help of Johannes Preiser-Kapeller)

Fig. 2 The network of Michael Dukas Angelos (supportive aristocratic families) (graph created by the author with the help of Johannes Preiser-Kapeller)
Nicaea: The New “Ark” of Basileia

The conquest of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade on April 13, 1204 brought about the dismemberment of the Byzantine Empire. According to the agreement, known as the Partitio Romanae, drawn up between the leaders of the Fourth Crusade and the Venetians, Byzantine territories were divided among them. Baldwin of Flanders was elected Emperor of Constantinople and was crowned “Emperor of Romania” in the Church of Saint Sophia on the 16th of May. Boniface of Montferrat became King of Thessaloniki, while the Venetians claimed Epiros and the Ionian islands; the remaining provinces were allotted to the rest of the Crusaders as fiefs and principalities. Baldwin’s troops invaded Asia Minor and conquered many territories, while Boniface set out from Thessaloniki to conquer Central Greece and Peloponnesus.

The capture of Constantinople was a consequence of the mutual hatred and suspicion between the Latins and the Byzantines and the economic interests of the Westerners in the East, but it was mainly due to the deep political and moral crisis that Byzantium underwent in the last quarter of the twelfth century. The deposition and violent change of emperors led to the destabilization of the Empire. Many provincial governors in Asia Minor and Greece became independent from the weak central authority. It was in 1185 when the rebellion of the Vlachs and the Bulgarians under the leadership of the two brothers Peter and Asen led to the creation of the Second Bulgarian State.

Poor provincial administration, oppressive taxation, the abuses of tax commissioners, and the lack of army and navy increased the indignation of the provincial populations, who had been alienated from the capital and its aristocracy. Refugees from Constantinople, who made their way to Asia Minor and the west provinces, were not received with sympathy by the locals. Yet, from the remnants of the Byzantine Empire three independent Greek States were established by relatives of the imperial family: the Empire of Trebizond on the Black Sea, founded shortly before the fall of Constantinople, the Empire of Nicaea in Bithynia, and the State of Epiros in continental Greece. They soon became centers of resistance against the Latins, their main goal being the recovery of Constantinople.

The Empire of Nicaea was founded by Theodore Laskaris, the son-in law of the Emperor Alexius III, who had been honored with the title of Despot. He fled from Constantinople and established himself at first in Prousa (Bursa) and finally in Nicaea. He was defeated by the Franks, who conquered many districts in Asia Minor, but were withdrawn urgently, because of the Bulgarian threat in Thrace. A rising of the Greek aristocracy in Adrianople gave the opportunity to the Bulgarian King Kalojan to invade Thrace and help the Greeks against the Franks, who were obliged to withdraw their forces from Asia Minor. The Franks suffered a great disaster at Adrianople on April 14, 1205. The ferocity of Kalojan’s campaigns against Thrace and Macedonia (former theme in Thrace) made the Greeks of Thrace ask for help from Nicaea. Kalojan was murdered outside Thessaloniki in 1207. His death was a great relief for the Greeks and the Franks. The same year Boniface of Monferrat was killed in Thrace.
The withdrawal of the Latin forces from Asia Minor and their defeat at the battle of Adrianople gave the opportunity to Theodore Laskaris to suppress his Greek rivals in Asia Minor and come to terms with the Sultanate of Iconium. In 1206 he was proclaimed and in 1208 was crowned emperor of the Romans in Nicaea by the new Patriarch Michael III Autoreianos, “βασιλεύς Ῥωμαίων υφ όλων των εών αναγορεύεται πόλεων”. However, there were some discrepancies: in his speech (σλέντιοι) he is called “ο κρατων των ανατολικών χωρών”. Michael Choniates, addressed his letter to Theodore from his exile on the island of Kea, τω βασιλεί της Ανατολής τω Λάσκαρι. Later on, in 1227 George Bardanes called him ο της Ασίας άρχεας. The Patriarch Theodore II Eirenikos (1214-1216) was called Πατριάρχης Οικουμενικός εν Νικαία; in 1214 he reprimanded the metropolitan of Ephesos and exarch of Asia Nicholas Mesarites, because the latter in his negotiations with the papal legate Cardinal Pelagius of Albano in Constantinople did not react to his calling him πατριάρχην των Ἰραικών and πατριάρχην Νικαίας (αρχιεπίσκοπον των Ἰραικών, το Νικαίας αποξέσας). The official title though was Θεόδωρος ελέω Θεου αρχαεπίσκοπος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Νέας Ρώμης και οικουμενικός Πατριάρχης. Cf. also the intitulatio of Manuel Sarantenos (Reg. Nr. 1224).

Many refugees, mostly high political and ecclesiastical officials, found refuge in Nicaea, which became "η ακρόπολις των ρωμαιικών πραγμάτων", and the emperor was hailed as “πατήρ όλων των Ρωμαίων», «πιστός βασιλεύς και αυτοκράτωρ Ρωμαίων». However, the new center of the empire was considered as temporary. Without Constantinople we were ἀπόλιδες, the polymath historian George Pachymeres wrote after the recovery of Constantinople by Michael VIII Palaeologus in 1261.

Thus Nicaea, a town only sixty miles away from Constantinople, became the seat of the political and ecclesiastical authorities of the Emperor and the Patriarch. Theodore signed as the Emperor of the Romans; he minted his own coinage and was hailed by Greek rhetoric as the saviour and deliverer of the Greeks. His imperial majesty, he boasted, like the Ark of Noah preserved the seeds of the imperial power. His realm became the shelter of Greek refugees, and Asia (Nicaea) the new Ark of Noah that saved what had remained from the Roman realm (διέσωσε τα της ρωμαϊκής πολιτείας υπολείμματα), according to Nicholas Mesarites; it became the ecumenical harbour (οικουμενικός λιμήν), for the rescue of the “blessed people” (Michael Choniates).

By his investment of the imperial title, Theodore claimed to be the sole heir of Byzantine emperors and the continuator of the Roman imperial idea. He surpassed all his Greek rivals in Asia Minor and he became a symbol of unity, the person who could bring “one fold under one shepherd”. “God gave us the Empire as the monarchical institution, in the likeness of his own government, thus setting aside for all time the disorder that results from polyarchy”; the Patriarch wrote to him in 1208. His main task, according to Nicetas Choniates, was to unite the Greeks of Asia Minor like a New David or Moses so that “their native land, their first dwelling, the City, the joy of the whole world…” could be restored. By this recovery the emperor of Nicaea would become a New Moses, the new founder of the City of Constantine. Theodore’s great victory over the Seljuks at the battle of Antioch-on-the Maiander in spring of 1211 made him worthy of comparison with Alexander the Great. The invasions of Asia Minor by the Latin troops were put to an end only in 1214, when a treaty was signed between the Latin Emperor Henry and Theodore Laskaris at Nymphaeum. The treaty was of great importance, because it specified territories that were ceded to each part and the state of Nicaea was de jure recognized. After the death of Henry in 1216, Theodore was able to profit by his diplomatic skill. By his third marriage to Henry’s niece and daughter of the Latin Empress Yolanda of Courtenay, he made an overture to the Franks with the regency as a target.
After Yolanda’s death in 1219 he proposed the betrothal of one of his daughters to his brother-in-law Emperor Robert, but he met great opposition both from the Franks and the Patriarch. The same year, Sava, the brother of the king of Serbia Stephen the Prvovencanij, was consecrated archbishop of the autocephalous church of Serbia by the Patriarch. By this ordination the Patriarch and the emperor of Nicaea were recognized as the heirs of Byzantine political and ecclesiastical authorities. In 1220 Theodore tried to convene an oecumenical synod in Nicaea for a discussion over the union of the Churches, but his plan was repudiated.

Theodore Laskaris died in 1222 and was succeeded by his son-in-law John III Vatatzes (1222-1254). During his long reign Vatatzes made profit of the political circumstances and increased his territories both in Asia Minor and Europe through his diplomatic and military efforts. After the death of Ivan Asen in 1241, John Vatatzes recaptured many towns and strongholds from the Bulgarians in Thrace and Macedonia. In 1242 John Doukas, the emperor of Thessaloniki, was forced to lay aside the imperial insignia and in 1246, with the removal of his brother Demetrios, Thessaloniki became part of the empire of Nicaea. With Vatatzes’ administrative talents, the empire of Nicaea became a strong and well-organized state, a factor of stability in Asia Minor. Nicaea became a cultural center, it was regarded as new Athens; scholars used the word “Hellenes” and “Hellenikon” or “Hellas” for Nicaeans and their empire especially during the brief kingdom of his son, Theodore II Lascaris (1224-1261). He supervised the progress of students, founded libraries, and promoted the production and copying of manuscripts etc. Nicaea was seen as “σχολείον πάσης Ελλάδος” and the abundance of scholars made a city equal to ancient Athens, according to Gregory the Cypriot in his autobiography.

I have not traced in sources whether Nicaea was ever called βασιλεύουσα. On the contrary, Thessaloniki was called βασιλεύουσα and the emperor of Thessaloniki, Theodore Doukas, was ο αυτοτελώς ανάσσων, wrote George Bardanes to the Patriarch in 1227. On the other hand the archbishop of Achrida Demetrios Chomatenos made a contemptuous remark that there cannot be any comparison between Constantinople (η του Βύζαντος, ο ἐνδόξος Βύζας) and Nicaea (η Βιθυνών, ο ευτελής Βιθυνός), which “boasts of having the tops of the Empire and Church “εναβρύνεται, της βασιλείας δηλαδή και της ιεραρχίας τας ακρότητας φέρουσα». We must keep in mind, though, that Nicaea had been the city where two Ecumenical Councils, the First and the Seventh, had been convened. Those who had found refuge in Nicaea clung to the hope of their return to their homeland, Constantinople, as the historian George Pachymeres wrote in the Preface of his Histories: “Τεώρημα Κωνσταντινουπόλιτης μέν το ανέκαθεν, εν Νικαιά δε γεννηθείς καὶ τραφείς, εν Κωνσταντίνων δέ καταστάς αὕτως, ὅτε Θεοῦ νεώματι ὑπὸ Ρωμαίους αὐτὴ εγένετο, ἐτης γεγονός εἰκοσιν ενός δέοντος τηνίκάδε. τάδε ξυνέγραψεν.” George Akropolites was addressed ευγενής (noble) by his pupil Theodore II Laskaris because of his birthplace, the city of Constantin. At the age of sixteen he was sent by his parents to Nicaea for further studies “αυτός προς των γονέων ἐκ τῆς Κωνσταντίνου απεστάλην τῷ βασιλεί, εκκαδεκέτης ὀν.”

Nicaea had not only been the shelter of refugees from Constantinople and other territories, which were under Latin rule. Dignitaries and prelates of high education had been invited by the Emperor Theodore I Lascaris and joined the Government and the Church in Nicaea, e.g. the grand logothete Nicetas Choniates, Nicholas Mesarites, the rhetor and επὶ του κανικλείου Theodore Eirenikos, who became chartophylax of the Ecumenical Patriarchate and before his election to the
Patriarchal throne (1214-1216) he held the high office of the hypatos ton philosophon; some did not accept the invitation (i.e. Michael Choniates, Euthymios Tornikes et al.).

A unique and very precious source for the education under Theodore I Laskaris and John III Vatatzes is the double autobiography of the famous scholar Nikephoros Blemmydes, who was born in Constantinople in 1197; he fled with his family in Bithynia, he studied in Prousa and Nicaea, and became the teacher of many intellectuals and of the prince Theodore II Lascaris. The Historical work of George Akropolites, who had been the pupil of Theodore Hexapterygos and Nikephoros Blemmydes and later on the teacher of Theodore II Lascaris together with Blemmydes, reveals not only the historical events but also the friendship and mutual respect between the teacher and his student. A most impressive is the Εγκώμιον of Theodore Doukas Lascaris, the son of the highest emperor John Doukas εις τον μέγαν κυρόν Γεώργιον τον Ακροπολίτην». In 1252 Theodore in his Εγκώμιον εις την μεγαλόπολιν Νίκαιαν, compares Nicaea with ancient Athens in the study of philosophy, rhetoric and paideia, with the only difference that in Nicaea all are in the service and glory of God and the emperor.

Concerning the education in Nicaea, George Akropolites reveals the great interest of the emperor John Vatatzes in him and the other sons of aristocratic families. By that time teaching of the αρχοντόπουλα took place most probably in the palace. This was not something new. It was rather a traditional practice. I will present on this occasion the case of Gregory, bishop of Assos in Asia Minor. According to his Vitae, he was born with the name George in Acorna on the island of Lesbos. Initially he was taught the “holy Scriptures” (τα θεία και ιερά γράμματα) by a teacher (παιδευτήν, γραμματιστήν), who was paid most probably by his parents. Then, at the age of fourteen, together with other children that came from rich families (των κρειττόνων της νῆσου, των πρωτευόντων) he went to Constantinople for three years, in the palace (εν τοις βασιλείοις), at the time of the Porphyrogennitos Manuel (τα σκήπτρα Ρωμαίων έχοντο τότε Μανουήλ του πορφυρογεννήτου), i.e. Manuel I Komnenos (1143-1180). There he was totally devoted to the εγκύκλιον παίδευσιν, without being distracted by his classmates to any kind of entertainment. His teacher was the αγιώτατος, μέγας Αγάθων. His board and other expenses were covered by the palace, “επείπερ πάντες οι Λεσβοῢδες παιδες τοις βασιλείοις από των βασιλικῶν σιτηρεσίων πάσας εἶχον τὰς διατροφὰς καὶ εξόδους». It was usual for children of good families who were supposed to pursue a career in Government or the Church after the preliminary education (προπαιδεία, γράμματα, πεζά γράμματα, ερά γράμματα) in their native town, to continue their studies in Constantinople and other centers. After three years he followed his teacher Agathon to Asia Minor, probably on mountain Ide. When he was twenty years old, he went to Jerusalem and after he lived in the Jordan desert as a hermit for fifteen years, he took his vows as a monk, and the name Gregorius. That must have been before the Holy Land was conquered by the Sultan Saladin in 1187. He was then ordained bishop of Assos in Troad by the metropolitan of Ephesos. Unfortunately his career was not smooth. Malicious slander, originating even from within the clergy, forced him to march to Constantinople twice in order to prove his innocence. At last he returned with his student Leontius to his motherland, Lesbos. The case of this little-known historical figure sheds light on educational practices and traditions that predate the Latin occupation and continued to exist in the empire of Nicaea.
Job at the Time of Exile

The Old Testament book of Job belongs to the category of texts that often are identified as “wisdom literature.” It was a popular book in Byzantium, especially for establishing the relationship between mankind and god. It was commented by the Church fathers and was at various periods illustrated with numerous images of Job’s predicaments. It is a complex text but full of well-known “life-questions” that human beings and societies in general ask but do not have answers for. God’s power, judgment and control of situations are very much part of the rhetorical arguments in this text and determine the medieval worldview. Job’s “punishment” and suffering is well known. A popular image in the illustrated manuscripts especially of the 13th century depicts Job’s torture by the plague that Satan had inflicted upon him, reducing him to an outcast on a pile of dung outside the city suffering for many days. The paper will discuss the Byzantine perceptions of their situation during the period of exile in relation to this popular narrative and the illustrated manuscripts of this period.
Nicæa as the new New Rome

Shortly before the year 1254, the young prince Theodore II Laskaris (b. 1222) delivered an encomium in praise of the city of Nicæa, in the presence of his father, emperor John III Doukas Vatatzes (r. 1222-1254), the greatest builder in the history of the Laskarid realm. Speaking in a flowery and embellished style, the prince opened his speech with a description of the city’s fortifications, the “ornament of Nicæa”.¹

Men of Nicæa, your most illustrious city, from the very sight of it alone, gives great pleasure to the rational mind—by the firm wall which encircles the grounds within, with its remarkable size and symmetry, by its situation, its battlements and towers and the height of both of them, the most magnificent and choice material of its structure, and the arrangement and skillful method of its construction—…For it is then that a city is above other cities, and a queen above queens, and a ruler above rulers, a superior above superiors—appropriately distinguished in rank one over the other—when it excels them in the use of reason.”²

Praising the walls that had sheltered the Byzantine rulers throughout decades of exile, Theodore II, born in Nicæa, emphasized the defining feature of the Bithynian capital.³ Nicæa would undergo many transformations during the years of Laskarid rule, but the repairs and renovations to its formidable walls proved instrumental in defining the city’s role as the new capital in exile. Close examination of the Laskarid fortifications and their inscriptions illustrates how the Laskarid rulers fashioned themselves as the preservers and extenders of Byzantine power.

Framed by thick, high fortifications with numerous towers, the walls of Nicæa were surrounded by a moat and possessed four monumental gateways a system of defense that effectively protected the city from infiltration.⁴ Unlike the walls of Constantinople, overrun by crusading knights in 1204, Nicæa’s walls had never been breached by armed attack. Theodore II emphasizes this contrast in his

---

² “Ἄνδρες ὡς Νικαιαὶ, ἢ περιφανεστάτη πόλις ὑμῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς καὶ μόνης τῆς ὄρεως ἐμποιεῖ πολύ τῇ λογικῇ ψυχῇ τὸ τερψιθυμοῦν, ἐκ τῆς περὶ κύκλωσε τοῦ ἔνδον χώρου καλοτεχνεία, ἐκ τοῦ αξιολόγου μεγέθυνας ταύτης καὶ ἱσορρόποιον, ἐκ τῆς θέσεως, ἐκ τῶν θριγγωμάτων, τῶν πυργώματων, τῶν ἀμφιτέρων ὑψίματος, τῆς περιφανεστάτης ὑλῆς καὶ ἱσαρίετον τῆς οἰκοδομῆς, τῆς κατασκευῆς καὶ ἐνέτηγον μεθόδου τῆς αὐτῆς σπαρτάσεως ἐκ τῶν ἔνδοθεν καὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν, τῶν ἴδιων, τῶν ὑποπόδων, τῶν ἐπουσιωδῶν, τῶν ἐπισωματῶν, τῶν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου καλοκαγάθως συρρέοντων καθεκάσθαι τῶν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ ἔξω ἔμοι, ὡς σεμνοὶ ἄνδρες, τὴν κοσμίοτητα καὶ κατ᾽ ἱδίον λογική παιδείαν ἄνυκριτῶς. Ἱσεῖ καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ πολίς πόλεως, καὶ βασιλείς βασιλιάδων, καὶ βασιλέων βασιλέων, καὶ ἐπισχέσεως ἑαυτοῦ ἐπισχέσεως καὶ ἱσαρίετον τῆς ὑλῆς ἐπισχέσεως καὶ ἱσαρίετον τῆς λογικῆς. “Ibid., 132-133.
³ Theodore II, when visiting Pergamon (modern Bergama), laments its ruined classical remains. He makes no mention of the vast fortification walls surrounding the upper acropolis built by his father there a generation earlier. For full translation of his remarks, see A. Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium* (Cambridge, 2008), 337; *Theodori Duca Lascaris Epistulae CCXVII*, ed. N. Festa (Florence, 1898), Letter 80, 107-108.
⁵ The city gates still retain their ancient names that indicate the terminal points of the roads passing through them, i.e. Istanbul Gate, Lake Gate and Lefke Gate.
encomium, characterizing Constantinople as a city that was “taken” and one that had “yielded” whereas Nicaea was able to consolidate “the lost and broken portions of the empire.”

Clive Foss has suggested that the walls of Nicæa would have held a symbolic resonance for refugees entering the city in 1204-1205 after their expulsion from Constantinople. This discussion focuses on the repairs and enlargements of the city walls of Nicæa by Theodore I Laskaris and John III Doukas Vatatzes, whose primary concerns were Nicæa's defensibility. The additions they made provided Nicæa with more than a strengthened circuit of city walls: they informed an imperial perspective that contributed to Nicæa's image as the new Byzantine capital of a new realm.

The City Walls and their Laskarid Inscriptions

The walls visible today encircling Nicæa are the result of numerous repairs and rebuilding due to attacks and earthquakes. During the attack on the city by the knights of the First Crusade in 1097, the incumbent Seljuq Turks rebuilt sections of the walls, though this did not prevent the crusaders from winning the city eventually. When Theodore I Laskaris arrived in Nicæa in 1204-1205, the most recent repairs to the city walls would have occurred a generation earlier. Based on written evidence, it appears that the new Laskarid ruler delayed repairs or improvements to the capital's walls until after his coronation as emperor in 1208, when he had rights over the city as the new emperor of a new capital. Three inscriptions, two of which are lost, record Theodore I's repairs to Nicæa's city walls and confirm this dating. The third inscription is unique, presenting a text that stands in a metaphorical relationship to the tower upon which it is affixed. This we will focus on in an effort to clarify the Laskarid emperor's work at Nicæa, but also to understand Theodore I's role in defining Nicæa as the new center of Byzantium in exile.

The three inscriptions located at Nicæa were recorded in the journal of Rev. Dr. John Covel, who traveled to Nicæa between 1669 and 1677. One assumes that Covel transcribed each of the inscriptions as they then appeared to him; the images from his journal are reproduced below with transliterations and translations. The first inscription, recorded in the 1670s, was located on a section of the walls repaired by Theodore I:

---

5 “...And because you have received the imperial government, oppressed by its opponents, and like an unbreakable rock, guarding it and frightening away the assaults of the enemy, you blunt their spears; shattering their strength, guarding your own people, contending with the enemy, you securely consolidate beside you the lost and broken portions of the empire.” See Foss, Nicæa, 149.


7 A. M. Schneider and W. Karnapp, Die Stadtmauer von Iznik (Nicæa) (Berlin, 1938); Foss, Nicæa, 5.

8 Foss, Nicæa, 93.

9 Foss believes that some areas of the Lake walls and towers were rebuilt at the end of the eleventh century under the Komnenoi. See Foss and Winfield, Byzantine Fortifications, 102.

10 For usurpers of the Byzantine throne, conquering the city of Nicæa appears to have been a key step in consolidating Byzantine imperial and military power for several centuries prior to 1204, particularly since the city was the last urban bulwark before attempting to win Constantinople, for not only was Nicæa located on a major north/south highway but it was also the capital of the Byzantine theme of Opsikion, and a marshaling area for the army.

11 J. Raby, “A Seventeenth-Century Description,” 149-188.
The citadel of Nicaea, having been utterly destroyed, was renewed by the Emperor Lord
Theodore Komnenos Laskaris in the year of the world, 1208.

Fashioned from bricks set on edge, the inscription was written in majuscule Greek letters. The
difficulty of the brick and mortar as a medium for Greek writing accounts for oddly shaped letters (such
as “A”) and collapse of the “M,” “N,” and “H” letter forms into one another (as in “KOMNHNOU”).
Foss suggests that this inscription, which does not survive, was located somewhere between tower
49 and the Istanbul Gate. According to Covel: “From that gate [i.e. the south gate] to the North.
Upon one tower thereabouts aloft near the foot of * the place of * the battlements….we found this
inscription rudely wrought * in a freeze * with bricks set edge wise…”.
The most likely spot for the
inscription's original location is along the northeastern stretch of the city walls, somewhere between
tower 48 and tower 64 (between the Lefke and İstanbul Gates), an area extensively repaired by
Theodore I. Discussion of the second inscription I have elided for now.

The Tower of Babel in Nicaea’s Walls

The third inscription at Nicaea is still located on tower 106, which together with tower 19 are
the great western and eastern corner towers that bracket the long expanse of walls defining the
southern face of the city:

---

12 Inscriptions made from bricks set edge-wise appear on a number of Byzantine fortifications, including at Constantinople and Thessaloniki.
13 Foss and Winfield, Byantines Fortifications, 103.
15 Foss and Winfield, Byzantine Fortifications, 110-111.
This Tower of Babel was made and indeed the enemy is confused. Theodore Laskaris made the wonder (Ἰης?)...16

Alfons-Maria Schneider, whose study of Nicaea’s walls is fundamental to this analysis, reconstituted the missing text, which forms the basis for my translation. Like the second inscription, this text was also carved into marble and immured in the inner tower façade. The plaque was set above a band of brick in a part of the lower wall that is otherwise constituted by large marble spolia. A double arcade frames each of the four lines of text. In all likelihood, the marble was salvaged from a columnar sarcophagus and trimmed down for reuse. Such sarcophagi, decorated with figures placed under arcades, are found locally in the Iznik Archaeology Museum. The figures that would have once stood beneath the arches may have been chiseled off to create a flat surface capable of receiving the inscription, as at Hagia Sophia in the city center. Looking at the tower from ground level, the carved plaque is distinguished by shape and color from the smooth surface of the wall. The band of bricks directly beneath the inscription underlines the text, permanently emphasizing the message above.

The part of the inscription that is missing, noted in brackets above, has not been recovered. I have identified the name “Πῦργος Χαλάνης” as a euphemism referring to the Tower of Babel.17 In the book of Genesis, the Tower of Babel (“Πῦργος Χαλάνης” in the inscription) was the setting for the dispersal of the Babylonians, a people who once had been united by a single tongue, but were then cursed by God with a multiplicity of languages for their role in enslaving the Jews in the seventh-century BC. The legend holds that the Babylonians, unable to understand each other, were scattered across the world, taking their multiple languages with them. A second detail in the inscription confirms a specific reference to the Tower of Babel and the city of Babylon: the

---

17 Schneider and Karnapp, *Die Stadtmauer*, 52.
word “ΣΥΓΧΥΣΙΣ” possesses the same root as the name given for Babylon in the Greek Septuagint, “ΣΥΠΕΙΓΟΥΣΙΣ,” or “confusion.” A direct reference to the Tower of Babel on a Laskarid fortification, particularly when the other inscriptions are generic in content, generates questions: What meaning was the inscription intended to convey? What was Theodore I’s interest in associating the rebuilding of Nicæa’s city walls with the Tower of Babel?

The meaning of the inscription unfolds on literal and metaphorical levels. On its most basic, literal level, the inscription serves to identify the patron of the tower as Theodore I and to associate him with the rebuilding of the city walls. By naming it “This Tower of Babel,” the Babylonian and Laskarid fortifications become conflated. This conflation extends to the experience of exile currently occurring for the Constantinopolitan refugees, and their sense of connection to the Jews of the Hebrew Old Testament, sent into exile from Jerusalem. By extension, the mythical city of Babylon is remembered as a place of past exile and associated with the Nicæa as a place of current exile.

As Michael Angold has pointed out, Niketas Choniates likened the waters of Nicæa’s nearby lake to the “waters of Babylon” with which the Byzantines would atone for the sins that brought them into exile. The physical meaning is explicit: the Nicæan tower is named the Tower of Babel, “a wonder, built by Theodore I Laskaris, to confuse and confound the enemy.” The might of the citadel/tower is also harnessed, for its self-evident purpose was to confound and scatter the enemy in the way that the Babylonians themselves had been confounded and scattered when cursed with a multiplicity of languages. An irony is embedded in this statement, particularly since it was precisely this tower that had been weakened by Bardas Skleros, a usurper, in 978 and then finally collapsed during the attack on the city by the knights of the First Crusade in 1097; thus, the tower became known as the Gonatas or “kneeling” tower. Theodore I may have had that ignominious defeat in mind as he rebuilt the tower, fully intending his to stand and endure where its predecessor had failed—to cause an enemy attack to break without the tower itself breaking. The levels of meaning are interwoven and complex, highlighting Babylon and Nicæa as cities of exile for God’s chosen people, who, in this case, would be its inhabitants: we remember that the inscription is on the interior of the tower wall.

Babylon was the fortified city where the Jews had been taken by King Nebuchadnezzar II (r. 604-562 BC) following his destruction of the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem. Surrounded by thick, high walls, that city became a place of exile for the Jews. Nebuchadnezzar II is also credited with having finished (due to the efforts of his newly acquired Jewish slaves) the great ziggurat in Babylon, also known as the Tower of Babel, or more accurately, the Great Ziggurat of Etemenanki. Thus, Nebuchadnezzar II is both the ruler of Babylon and the builder of the Tower of Babel, and not a figure a Byzantine Emperor would want to be associated with.

By making reference to the Jewish exile from Jerusalem (i.e. Sion), was Theodore I positioning himself as the Babylonian King? From this perspective it might seem that Theodore I was indeed fashioning himself as Nebuchadnezzar II, but this is not the case. Niketas Choniates was the first to articulate the view of Theodore I not as Nebuchadnezzar, but as a second Zorobabel, the exiliarch
who led the Jews back to Jerusalem from Babylon and then built the Second Temple. The notion that Nicaea was considered a Byzantine Babylon and that Constantinople was the lost Sion, at least at this early phase, indicates that the Constantinopolitans, and specifically Theodore I, understood their present position as one of exile and displacement. This cord of tension of both being in exile and yet being in the capital is seen here for the first time—written on Theodore I’s newly renovated tower.

The inverse of this perspective would be the association of Constantinople with Sion, a topic that appears in an exilic letter by Michael Choniates, Niketa’s brother, and bishop of Athens:

When the New Sion (Constantinople), abandoned like the Old (Jerusalem), had been captured and pillaged, those of its population who escaped by being overlooked or by emptying their pockets, moved to Nicaea in Bithynia and there changed their abode, rejoicing yesterday with their rejoicing fellow-citizens, today lamenting with them as they lament, and just as they were leaders of the City in prosperity, so in unhappy absence from home they are comforters of their fellow-citizens.

The metaphor suggested by Theodore I in the inscription at Nicæan is completed here in Michael Choniates’s letter, where he discusses how the new Sion (Constantinople) had been abandoned like the old Sion (Jerusalem). Theodore I claims Nicaea then not as a tertiary Sion, but as a tower of Babel in the Babylonian citadel that receives and protects Byzantium’s exiles. Michael Choniates, himself exiled from his episcopal see at Athens, asserts that Nicaea is a place of lamentation, and established the perspective that the city was a citadel of exiles reminiscing about their lost homes in Constantinople. It is this perspective that initiates Nicaea’s transformation into a Byzantine capital.

John III possessed a unique talent for evoking different moments in the Byzantine past through his patronage. An excerpt from a lengthy inscription from the walls around the acropolis at Smyrna (modern İzmir) mentions “John, the ruler of Younger Rome.” Coinciding with the year of his coronation, this inscription records the restoration of the citadel atop Smyrna, overlooking the enormous harbor, and is likened to reversing time: here an old woman grows younger, stronger and more fresh. John III’s desire to renew the walls was prompted by witnessing their decrepit state. Notable for our purposes is John III’s epithet, “the ruler of the Younger Rome (Ῥώμης κοίρανος ὁπλοτέρης),” which refers to Constantinople, not literally, but figuratively. Thus, enough had been replaced in exile by John III’s reign that he ruled over “Constantinople” in an abstract sense. It is possible that the lack of specificity was intentional, referring instead to the empire in exile, which carried the imperial tradition.

---

21 See Niketas Choniatae, orationes et epistelæ (Berlin, 1972), 236.
23 John III was particularly active in this region: besides restoring the walls at Smyrna, he built walls around the upper acropolis at Nymphaion, and at many other sites, including Magnesia in whose environs he built the double-monastery of Sosandra. For further bibliography see Inschriften Greichischer Städte aus Kleinasien, ed. G. Petzl (Bonn, 1987), 323-325, esp. for last two lines of text; for edition of text used here, see Epigram 281, lines 1-19 (missing lines 20-21), in Anthologia Graecae Appendix Epigrammatum demonstrativa, Epigrammatum anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et appendice nova, Vol. 3, ed. E. Coughy (Paris, 1890). Translation mine.
John III obliquely refers to the lost capital of Constantinople in a letter written to Pope Gregorius in 1237, translated by Anthony Kaldellis, in which the emperor responds (with a tone of mocking incredulity) to the pope’s request to validate the rule of the crusaders over Constantinople:

How is it that you approve unjust and grasping attitude and hands, and regards as a matter of law, that theiving and murderous takeover by which the Latins installed themselves in the city of Constantine?...Even though we have been forced to change our location, regarding our rights to that authority we remain unmoved and unchanging, by the grace of God. For he who is emperor rules over a nation (ethnos) and a people (laos) and a multitude, not over rocks and wooden beams, which make the walls and towers.24

Here, we observe that John III believed that the empire over which he ruled, comprised of an “ethnos and laos,” was continuous with that which had ruled from Constantinople. This implies that Constantinople, comprised of “rocks and wooden beams, which make the walls and towers” cannot itself grant authority to rule the empire. The emperor’s statement might initially appear to diminish the importance of the physical city of Constantinople; if it does this, it also shows that the Byzantine empire was seen to have been replaced in Nicea, and that the Bithynian city became Constantinople’s whole and complete substitute. That Constantinople was the referent for Nicea in the process of replacement is not surprising, but it is an interesting distinction for John III to draw that residence in Constantinople could not emperors make.

The walls of Constantinople were the last sight seen by the refugees as they exited their imperial capital, and it is those walls that would have been remembered upon first seeing the city walls of Nicaea. A few generations later, following the reconquest of Constantinople in 1261, Theodore Metochites (1270-1332) gave his “Nicene Oration” before the Emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos (r. 1282-1328) in Nicea, and praising the city in which he lived as a child,25 comments on the unassailable quality of the walls, their beauty, and their functionality, while noting that they would offer as great a degree of aesthetic pleasure and comfort to those living within them as they would provide a barrier and threat to enemies outside. He, like Theodore II, notes the second ring of walls, showing that this Laskarid addition had become fully assimilated into the city’s urban identity.

Nicea’s walls would have appealed to the refugees’ longing to see Constantinople again. They would have entered their new home through a gate labeled with the name of the home they had left. By 1208, when Theodore I was crowned and the new Orthodox Patriarch appointed, the irony of being in the capital and yet in exile stimulated a constant negotiation between the exiled inhabitants and their new urban setting. The symbolic conflation of Theodore I’s tower 106 with the mythic Tower of Babel indicates an acknowledgement and acceptance of the present state of exile. John III’s second curtain wall, their towers, and the surrounding moat became a key feature in encomia on the city’s appearance in later years, and boosted its resemblance to Constantinople. Each act of patronage nuances the cityscape of Nicea, affirming its substitution for Constantinople.

24 Kaldellis, Hellenism in Byzantium, 237.
25 Foss, Nicea, 128.
Continuity and Change in the Poetry of Theodore II Laskaris

This contribution focuses on the poetic works of the Emperor Theodore II Laskaris (1254-58), in part neglected, in part unknown to modern scholarship. They can be divided into liturgical poems and more personal religious “hymns”. Three genuine kanons, accessible in old editions, belong in the first category. Further short hymns in the form of stichera, theotokia, and prosomoia of the ainoi, ascribed in some manuscripts to him, need a critical edition to certify their authenticity; thus they will not be considered here. A series of hitherto unpublished poems of praise and supplication, explicitly acknowledged as having been composed after his accession to the throne, belong in the second category. My aim here is to show how in his few poetic works – while following literary tradition and specific models in the composition of his poems – Laskaris managed to put his personal stamp on the liturgical and religious poetry of his time and to earn a prominent position among contemporary poets.

I. Liturgical poems

I.1. On the strength of his supplicatory kanon to the Mother of God alone, known as the Megas (Great) Parakletikos Kanon – the only one of his hymns still sung to this day in Orthodox churches –, Laskaris can be counted among the seven Byzantine emperors traditionally attested as hymnographers. The kanon (inc. Τῶν λυπηρῶν ἐπαγωγαί), written in the fourth plagal mode, can thus be found in the liturgical books of the Horologion and the Parakletike (or Oktoechos), from where it has also been reprinted in Patrologia Graeca 140. Laskaris composed it following the model of an earlier supplicatory kanon to the Mother of God, also still sung to this day in the first half of August (before the Feast of the Assumption). This earlier hymn, known as the Mikros (Small) Parakletikos Kanon, is ascribed to a monk named Theosteriktos or Theophanes (perhaps ninth century) according to the Horologion. Several parallelisms in terms of content and language, rhythm and music attest to their relationship. Despite, or indeed because of these similarities, where Laskaris makes different choices his intentional contribution to the development of thematic hymnography is displayed all the more clearly. To mention but a few observations, which revise the opinions hitherto expressed by scholars about the Megas Parakletikos:

First of all, there is a significant difference in the representation of the Theotokos in the address of the supplication for health of body and soul. The poet of the Mikros Parakletikos pleads with the Mother of God as the most influential intercessor, whose power stems from her relation to Christ after the Incarnation. The poet recurrently mentions or implies this relationship throughout the hymn, thus making Christ himself present; Christ is even directly addressed once (ode VII 1). By contrast, the Megas Parakletikos is addressed only to the Theotokos throughout and quite independently of her Son; in the praise and thanksgiving, she appears as someone who exerts power in her own right. It is only in the very last strophe that Laskaris explicitly states that the Theotokos is almighty because she draws her power from her status as the Mother of God, thus implying her role as mediatrix.
Another substantial difference between the two kanons lies in the construction and character of the supplication. The *Mikros Parakletikos* addresses the supplication to the Theotokos initially in the first-person singular, and from the fourteenth strophe onwards alternately using the first- and third-persons plural. By contrast, the *Megas Parakletikos* is conceived as a monologue. Composed in the first-person singular, it discloses the tendency of our poet to structure the thematic elements of a prayer (i.e. confession with lament, supplication, thanksgiving with praise and adoration) and to conclude with an epilogue. Thus by using the rhetorical devices of the monologue, the *Megas Parakletikos* sounds more personal and intimate. However, the human distress and suffering – typical of supplications – are too generalizing to be understood as autobiographical testimony on the part of Laskaris. But as common circumstances of human life, they could also apply to the emperor’s own situation. Clear autobiographical elements are found only in his more personal religious poems.

Lastly, it is worth noting that, though both kanons consist of 32 strophes (*troparia*) each, those in the *Megas Parakletikos* are significantly longer; a fact which may explain its traditional characterization.

I.2. Laskaris wrote two kanons with salutations to the Virgin Mary, in the style of the Akathistos hymn, available only in outdated editions: one (inc. Χαίροις ἱλαστήριον) was edited by Sophronios Eustratiades in 1931 and another (inc. Χαράν ἣ κυήσασα) by Nikodemos Hagiorites in 1883. Intended to be sung in the first and the fourth mode respectively, they are preserved in old *Theotokaria*, but they are no longer in liturgical use. It is noteworthy that a significant part of Χαίροις ἱλαστήριον constitutes a rewriting of the salutations included in Laskaris’s *Oration on the feast of Akathistos*, adapted to fit the metrical patterns of the hymn. It is also significant that Laskaris has attempted to rival the number of salutations in the *Akathistos Hymn* (144); both kanons have 145 salutations on average. This fact cannot be coincidental, considering Laskaris’s fondness for mathematics and number symbolism, as demonstrated, for example, in his work *On the natural society* (Περί Φυσικής Κοινωνίας). In this regard, the round figure (10) of salutations to the Theotokos in his above mentioned *Parakletikos kanon* is also indicative.

A comparative study of the two kanons is illuminating as regards Laskaris’ compositional technique, as he seems to follow a certain plan for their thematic construction. And the two works differ from each other regarding the combination of the elements of praise and supplication. While the kanon Χαράν ἣ κυήσασα has only salutations with praise throughout, Χαίροις ἱλαστήριον has salutations with praise in the first four strophes and only an address of supplication in the last strophe of each ode instead of salutations.

I.3. A closer study of the metrical construction discloses certain tendencies Laskaris has concerning metrical and musical models (*heirmoi*). In all three kanons, Laskaris omits the second ode; thus each of the remaining eight odes consists in turn of four strophes (or five in Χαίροις ἱλαστήριον) and of a heirmos. He does not compose the *heirmoi* himself, but he borrows them from earlier kanons, with a distinct preference for John of Damascus. Moreover, he does not use all the *heirmoi* from the same kanon, but prefers a combination, selecting them from a variety of John’s kanons. In each of the three kanons there is only one heirmos derived from Andrew of Crete, Kosmas Melodos or the patriarch Germanos I. Moreover a metrical analysis shows that Laskaris does not slavishly copy the *heirmoi*. Instead he makes small modifications, invariably in respect of accent regulation rather than isosyllaby. However, once he has decided on the modified pattern, he strives to keep it consistently throughout.
I.4. Regarding the formal traits of the kanons, Laskaris avoids acrostics and makes limited use of the ephymnion (refrain). The available editions, though not critical, reveal a tendency to use it in the fourth ode. In the Parakletikos kanon there is an ephymnion only in the first two strophes of the fourth ode. In the kanon Χαίροις ἱλαστήριον, the ephymnion also appears in two strophes of the fourth ode. On the other hand, the kanon Χαράν ἢ κυήσασα has ephymnia in all strophes of the fourth and ninth odes and in part of the second and fifth odes (in the second and fourth strophes only).

II. Religious “hymns”

A series of seventeen poems of praise with supplication to the Holy Trinity, Holy Cross, Mother of God, angels and various holy figures form part of Theodore Laskaris’ poetic oeuvre. They are all transmitted under the common title προσφωνητήριοι ὕμνοι (hymns of address). Since they are not composed in a metrical pattern (heirmos) and mode (ēchos) and for lack of explicit evidence of a liturgical purpose, they are classified here under religious poetry. The poet’s references to his imperial office and the empire further support this classification.

In the course of preparing a first critical edition (ongoing), valuable insights were gained into the source of the inspiration and the objective of their composition:

Laskaris drew his inspiration from the poetry of Theodore Prodromos. There is no explicit evidence for the connection, but the characterization of the poems as prosthonetērioi in the superscription already hints at it. This attributive is a rare variant of the common rhetorical term prosthonetikoi, which according to LBG appears only in the title of some poems addressed to holy figures by Theodore Prodromos (προσφωνητήριοι στίχοι).

Furthermore, the designation of the poems as ὕμνοι, where Laskaris is using the term in a rhetorical sense, points to their encomiastic character rather than any liturgical purpose. This observation is supported by their content, and corroborated by the poet himself in one poem addressed to the John the Baptist:

ὁντως ἡ μαρτυρία ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ τοῦ κυρίου σου· ὕμνοι παντὸς ἐγκωμίου ῥητορικοῦ, φιλοσόφου στροφῆς τε καὶ ἀποδείξεως πάντων πέλων ἃρα ὑπέρτερος.

[Translation: the testimony of your Lord is sufficient indeed; for you are greater than every hymn of rhetorical praise, and philosopher’s proof or turns of thought]

The arrangement of the poetic addresses is not arbitrary either. On the contrary, it reflects the idea of a celestial hierarchy. The influence of Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite on several of Theodore’s works has already been noted. Moreover, the arrangement reflects the order of invocations in the offices.

Almost all the encomiastic addresses – with the exception of two – end with a prayer for the salvation of the soul and (sometimes) the health of body; four of them end with exactly the same expression about the Day of Judgment and the rest use nearly the same wording. These similarities together with the common superscription and their arrangement indicate that these 17 pieces constitute an entity.

Last but not least, it is worth noting the literary qualities of the poems such as well-chosen diction, nice rhythm, figurative language and a variety of rhetorical devices. However, the most fascinating aspect is the concept behind his compositions, which illuminates the subtlety of his poetic art and his commitment to theological teaching. The praise of his natural talent in composing hymns from the historian George Pachymeres (a somewhat younger contemporary) is fully justified.
« Ne pas déplacer les bornes antiques » (Pr 22,28)
Continuité et renouveau dans les débats théologiques sous l’Empire de Nicée

Les historiens médiévistes ont tendance à opposer d’ordinaire l’essor de la théologie en Occident au xiii\textsuperscript{e} siècle et, par contraste, la stabilité qui prévalait en la matière dans un monde byzantin marqué par le régime de la tradition. En réalité les choses semblent avoir été plus complexes. Cette contribution a pour but, précisément, d’analyser dans quelle mesure la IV\textsuperscript{e} Croisade a eu pour effet, entre autres conséquences, d’amener des changements notables dans les débats théologiques qui avaient lieu dans l’espace byzantin sous l’empire de Nicée, et cela tant sur la thématique que sur la méthode utilisée.

La lutte séculaire de l’Église contre les sectes, notamment les Bogomiles, se poursuit dans l’empire de Nicée, surtout avec le travail énergique du patriarche œcuménique Germain II (1223-1240) qui se déplace inlassablement, prêchant le retour à la pauvreté évangélique et répondant avec succès dans ses homélies aux critiques contre l’Église formulées par les Bogomiles.

Le débat récurrent à Byzance sur l’intérêt de l’ancienne philosophie grecque et en particulier du platonisme pour la réflexion chrétienne se poursuit après la condamnation de Jean Italos au xi\textsuperscript{e} siècle et les écrits de Nicolas de Méthone contre le néo-platonisme au xii\textsuperscript{e} siècle. Le moine savant Nicéphore Blemmydès représente une position médiane, assumant la figure d’un grand humaniste épris autant de théologie que de sciences logico-formelles et physiques. Dans son court traité De theologia adressé à son ancien élève l’empereur Théodore II Laskaris (1254-1258), il souligne qu’il ne faut « pas déplacer les bornes antiques » (Pr 22,28), autrement dit ne pas s’enquérir de questions théologiques insensées, que la Tradition des Pères n’a pas explorées. Théodore II Laskaris, dans le 3\textsuperscript{e} traité de son recueil Sur la théologie, avait traité de théologie trinitaire de manière très innovante pour son temps, s’appuyant sur de subtils développements unissant philosophie néo-platonicienne, géométrie et mathématiques. Et Blemmydès en fut sans doute effrayé.

Il est certain que les enjeux liés à la recomposition du paysage politique de la région ont amené à susciter de nouveaux débats ou à en approfondir d’anciens de façon tout à fait nouvelle. Entre l’empire de Nicée et l’empire éphémère de Thessalonique s’engagea une confrontation de légitimités qui donna lieu à un débat serré entre le patriarche Germain II et le savant archevêque de Bulgarie Démétrios Chomatènos sur le sens de l’utilisation du myron pour l’onction des empereurs.

C’est sans doute à l’occasion de l’occupation latine de Constantinople et d’une partie des provinces de l’Empire que s’amorcèrent des débats plus riches que par le passé : il ne s’agit plus simplement de discréditer les pratiques latines, mais d’analyser leurs doctrines qui sont bien davantage étudiées qu’aux xi\textsuperscript{e} et xii\textsuperscript{e} siècle. On trouve là l’amorce d’un renouveau de la réflexion théologique byzantine : celle-ci commence à sortir d’une théologie de répétition. Mis à part les questions du purgatoire et des azymes, deux thèmes récurrents sont abordés à frais nouveaux : l’ecclésiologie et la théologie trinitaire.
En ecclésiologie, les prétentions de la papauté (en premier lieu Innocent III, après la prise de Constantinople par les Croisés en 1204) d'étendre sa juridiction sur tous les patriarchats de l'Orient chrétien amènent les théologiens grecs à réfléchir sur le sens de la primauté romaine dans la communion des Églises. En ce sens, les lettres des patriarches œcuméniques Jean X Kamatéros et Germain II adressées respectivement aux papes Innocent III et Grégoire IX soulignent que la papauté ne peut se comprendre que dans le système de la pentarchie, c'est-à-dire de la communion de cinq Églises patriarcales qui n'ont pas entre elles des relations de maternité-filiation, mais des liens étroits de sororalité. Pour la première fois ont lieu des rencontres officielles approfondies entre des délégations latines et grecques en 1234 à Nicée puis en 1250 à Nymphée. Les échanges qui ont eu lieu, sans donner de grands résultats, ont sans doute constitué un défi pour les théologiens grecs peu versés dans un usage intensif des syllogismes. Pourtant on constate chez Blemmydès une rare maîtrise des différents types de syllogismes, surtout utilisés pour réfuter la position des Latins sur les points de désaccord.

En théologie trinitaire, le débat sur le Filioque, qui se limitait jusque là, du côté grec, à un refus catégorique fondé sur la reprise des arguments du patriarche Photius, est renouvelé par l'exégèse patristique proposée par le moine théologien Nicéphore Blemmydès. Il ne se borne pas à refuser le Filioque latin mais met aussi en évidence le fait que, pour de nombreux Pères, l'Esprit Saint est dit procéder à partir du Père par le Fils (Per Filium). La procession de l'Esprit per Filium n'est pas seulement inscrite dans l'économie du salut, mais elle signifie pour Blemmydès une « manifestation éternelle » de l'Esprit comme énergie trinitaire. Cette réflexion créatrice sera poursuivie et complétée un peu après le concile de Lyon (1274) par le patriarche anti-unioniste Grégoire II de Chypre dans ses écrits pneumatologiques et notamment dans le Tomos du Ier Concile des Blachernes (1285), puis, un siècle plus tard, dans l'élaboration de la doctrine palamite lors de la crise hésychaste. Nous voyons dans ces développements ultérieurs un signe indiscutable de la fécondité de la théologie nicéenne. Sur un fond général de continuité et de conservatisme clos, une vague irrésistible de rénovation et de reformulation a commencé à affecter la théologie byzantine.
Barbarian or Hellenic? Ordeal by Fire Viewed from Nicaea*

Much ink has been spilled on the question of the origin of the judicial ordeal by red-hot iron in Byzantium, also known as ordeal by fire. Some scholars have preferred to see the practice as the survival of an ancient Hellenic custom famously referred to in Sophocles’ Antigone. This alluring hypothesis, which faces the persistent silence of the documentary and narrative evidence until the first half of the thirteenth century, gains some support from a Byzantine scholion to the Sophoclean play found already in codex dated to the tenth century. The scholion states that “the Romans do this until today, erring in Hellenic manner in many other ways too.” Most scholars have espoused the view of an importation from the Latin West around the time of the Fourth Crusade, in a period when ordeals by fire and water were on their way out in medieval Europe. The theory feeds on similarities with the practice in the West. Furthermore, Byzantine contemporaries qualified the trials by ordeal in Nicaea and Epirus (the two main successor states after 1204) as “foreign” and “barbarian.” The negative view is featured prominently in judicial decisions by the archbishop of Ohrid Demetrios Chomatenos (in office 1216-1236) and the metropolitan of Naupaktos John Apokaukos (in office 1199/1200-1232) as well as in the description of the trial held in Philippi in 1253 of Michael Palaiologos, the future emperor, in George Acropolites’ History.

My purpose here is to approach the question from a new angle by drawing attention to a hitherto unnoticed thirteenth-century attempt at the legitimation of the ordeals

as a practice based on religious and philosophical tradition. The author of this attempt was Theodore II Laskaris, a highly accomplished philosopher and man of letters, who was born in Nicaea in 1221 or 1222, served as co-emperor since at least 1241, and was the sole ruler of the Byzantine state in Anatolian exile between 1254 and 1258. Theodore’s reasoning about the ordeals takes us beyond arguments made in the law courts and into the world of belief and the occult. He never tackled the question of the illegality of the ordeals. The law, in any case, was not on his side. The legal expert Demetrios Chomatenos availed himself of the silence of ecclesiastical and civil laws to argue that the ordeals lacked validity as evidence presented at court. Theodore’s acceptance of trial by ordeal rested, rather, on a belief in the miraculous properties of fire and involved esoteric knowledge grounded in his native tradition. He was certainly well positioned to comment on the ordeals, not only because they took place in his times and with his explicit approval. His wide-ranging philosophical and literary interests gave him the ability to search for the foundations of the practice and arrive at new formulations. His mentions of the ordeals can be lost on us easily, for he did not employ the vocabulary of contemporary documents and narrative sources. He spoke of a “discerning fire” (πῦρ διακρίσεως) and a “divine fire” (θεῖον πῦρ) rather than using familiar terms, such as “red-hot iron” (μύδρος, σίδηρος πυρακτωθείς or πεπυρακτωμένος) or “holy fire” (άγιον πῦρ). The clearest reference to ordeals is found in a letter to his ex-teacher and current spiritual father Nikephoros Blemmydes.

* A fully developed and documented version on this paper is to appear in A. Simpson and P. Papadopoulou (eds.), The Empire of Nicaea Revisited (Brepols, under preparation).
The letter forms part of a cluster of three epistles to Blemmydes written before 1254 (probably in the course of 1253), in which the author complains of being slandered and declares his innocence. The governor of Thessaloniki Theodore Komnenos Philes, appointed to this position after 1248, claimed that the co-emperor had an amorous liaison (eros). Theodore read the defamatory verses with the allegations and reacted in a characteristically impulsive way, accusing Philes of murder and vowing to punish him. The paneugenestatos (“most noble”) Theodore Komnenos Philes was a well-connected figure within the Anatolian Byzantine aristocracy. He was a well-off landowner and the son-in-law of Irene Komnene Vranaina, a benefactor of the Lemviotissa monastery. The allegations against the co-emperor reached Blemmydes, a stern moralist and the abbot of monastery near Ephesos, who reprimanded Theodore. “Forgive us, examine, and forgive us,” Theodore begged Blemmydes in one of the letters. In another one he vowed that he was ready to go through an ordeal by fire in order to prove his innocence:

If you wish the discerning fire (πῦρ διακρίσεως) to carry out the examination, as if it were some sort of cleansing, I do accept. For it demonstrates the truth of a wrongdoing and the lack of wrongdoing. We will take no account of the pain with the examination. For our good tutor and spiritual father knows exactly how to examine, and most of all how to examine his truthful son.

The similarities between this description and the ordeal cases that reached the courts in the state of Epiros are remarkable: the charge is that of sexual misconduct; the defendant consents to go through this procedure in order to clear his name. The ecclesiastical context manifest in the ritual act of ordeal (e.g., prayers and a church setting) corresponds with the status of Blemmydes as an abbot and Theodore’s spiritual father. Theodore’s declaration should probably be seen as posturing rather than a real commitment, for it is difficult to imagine the co-emperor holding blazing coals in his hands in a public trial or a private ceremony. By virtue of his position, he had an upper hand and succeeded in convincing Blemmydes in the falseness of the allegations.

The name for the ordeal that Theodore used in the letter to Blemmydes is “discerning fire” (πῦρ διακρίσεως). The word διάκρισις is allusive, meaning “discernment,” but also “superior judgement,” “discrimination” and “differentiation,” as in the separation of the virtuous from the sinful souls at the end of times. The fire of Last Judgement is to “test every person’s work” (Paul, Corinthians 1, 3:13). Theodore calls it the “divine fire” (θεῖον πῦρ) and the “judging, discerning and burning fire” (κριτικὸν καὶ διακριτικὸν καὶ καυστικὸν πῦρ). In a literary piece on friendship and envy, a work to which we shall return, he wrote that the person who amassed wickedness in his life would earn a deserved punishment in the fire of the Last Judgement. Its flames, he wrote elsewhere, would consume tyrants and people who did not accept the word of God and the gospels. In addition to the fire of Gehenna, Theodore was well aware of other scriptural bases of the ordeals, such as the miracle of the three children in the fiery furnace related by the Book of Daniel, which was celebrated in an annual church feast in Byzantium on December 17 (the Sunday before Christmas). He commented on how the fire preserved the children, but consumed the godless, and wondered at how the furnace was sometimes destructive and sometimes not.

More than scriptural rhetoric was needed, however, for the emergence of a ritual of proleptic enactment of God’s final judgement, in which an individual agreed to come into contact with fire in the hope that he would remain unharmed. Remarkably, a religious culture accepting the supernatural
properties of fire can be traced in Byzantium in different milieus—monastic and secular, popular and elite. Spyros Troianos has pointed to examples of the extrajudicial use of fire for an inquest into God’s judgement, mostly within monastic circles during the early centuries of Byzantine history. For example, the Spirit of Meadow of John Moschos relates that the patriarch of Antioch Euthymios and a stylite monk who was a monophysite agreed to enter a fiery furnace in order to discover God’s judgement on their doctrinal disagreement. Saying a prayer, the patriarch threw his episcopal robe into the burning coals. When the stylite saw that the robe miraculously remained intact, he readily abandoned his heretical beliefs.

The twelfth-century historian Anna Komnene bears witness to the belief that fire could miraculously preserve a righteous person in the elaborate and dramatic description of the execution of the unrepentant Bogomil Basil, whom her father Alexios I condemned to death by being burnt alive at the Hippodrome. The heretic is said to have thought that he would emerge unscathed by the fire. The historian contrasts his arrogance with the rapidity of his undoing. When Basil was still away from the pyre, he averred that the angels would save him and spoke with the words of David: “It will not come near you. Only with your eyes will you perceive” (Psalm 90.7-8). But once he caught sight of the fire, he stood frozen and unmoved. The crowds at the Hippodrome, including the Bogomils, were speaking of an impending miracle. The executioners themselves feared lest “the daemons around Basil” work some miracle, but gained confidence after throwing his robe into the fire and seeing that it burned down. Anna digresses to explain the commonly held belief, which he presents matter-of-factly as her own. She remarks that “the elements are stirred against the wicked, but spare, to speak the truth, those who are dear to God, just as once they paused and yielded to those young men in Babylon, and a fire surrounded them like a gold-like chamber.” The historian clothes the belief in philosophical language, which is the approach Theodore would adopt.

Byzantine popular culture also accepted the belief in fire’s supernatural quality. The fire-walking ritual of the anastenaria (nestinarstvo) performed annually on 21 May, which survived until the early twentieth century in eastern Thrace, is usually thought to have derived from pre-Christian cult practices. A reference to this custom has been detected in a thirteenth-century historical text, the Synopsis Chronike attributed to Theodore Skoutariotes. Another annual ritual called kledon which took place on 23 June involved divination and fire-jumping. The twelfth-century patriarch Michael of Anchialos considered the practice scandalous enough to ban it by decree, a one-time measure whose effectiveness cannot be known.

Theodore did not elaborate on the scriptural basis of the ordeals and was even less prepared to comment on beliefs of dubious orthodoxy about fire in popular culture and ritual. He preferred, rather, to situate the practice within the sphere of secular, or outer, learning and ancient knowledge. He did so on two occasions, the first of which was his work on friendship and envy composed before his accession to the throne in November 1254. A saying about the rose and the dung beetle that he seems to have borrowed from the Pseudo-Aristotelian Mirabiles auscultationes provided him with an allegory of friendship and envy. The fragrant rose, Theodore wrote, prayed to God to expel the malodorous insect which had for long fastened itself onto her. God asked to sun to shine on the rose and apply its fiery heat as a test. Theodore adds revealingly: “For somebody also knows on the basis of outer learning how to investigate, in some cases, the distinction through fire.” At the end the rose of friendship blossomed and the dung beetle of envy perished.
In his philosophical treatise *Representation of the World, or Life* Theodore assigned an ancient pedigree to the ordeal by fire. The *Representation of the World, or Life* is a work addressed to his high minister and childhood friend George Mouzalon as part of a four-volume compendium. It probably dates to the period after Theodore's accession to the throne in November 1254. The author presents his vision of a world full of inconstancy, lays out his views of the imperfection of humankind, makes political comments, and voices his amazements at God who holds together a wondrously diverse universe. At the beginning of the treatise, Theodore remarks that he was about to undertake an examination which Plato had once named “divine fire” (θεῖον πῦρ), because it tested concealed things. The phrase “divine fire” which refers elsewhere to the fire of the Last Judgement signifies here the testing ordeals by red-hot iron known as “holy fire” (ἁγιον πῦρ) among thirteenth-century contemporaries. Both ordeal by fire and his own philosophical work served to unveil the divine truth.

Why was it necessary for Theodore to refer to Plato when speaking of the ordeals? The most plausible explanation is that he sought to impart legitimacy to the practice by associating with a great philosophical authority. But there was an added reason. For Theodore philosophy included not only the theoretical and practical disciplines listed in the *divisiones philosophiae* since the times of the late antique schools. It encompassed also what he called the “secrets of philosophy” (τὰ ἄρρητα τῆς φιλοσοφίας), namely, occult sciences. Theodore claimed to have studied the secrets of philosophy thoroughly, approved of some divinatory practices and had a particular admiration for astrology, while at the same time he dismissed magic and spells. In a discourse against the Latins Theodore took price in the heritage of Hellenic philosophy, which included (beyond Plato, Aristotle and others) also the oracles, auguries, and palmistry of Calchas, John Laurentius Lydus's *On Celestial Signs*, Pythagoras's magic and “special art of occult philosophy,” and the works by Apollonios of Tyana (a magician, astrologer, and prophet) and by the fifth-century physiognomist Adamantios. In viewing the occult as an integral part for philosophy, Theodore was follower of the great Michael Psellos.

The fascination with ordeals by an emperor and philosopher—a man with an empirical mindset highly interested in the principles nature—may appear puzzling at first. Theodore was not a rationalist, but nor were his contemporaries. He seems, in fact, to have had practical considerations in mind. The ordeal by fire affirmed the mystery of God's will, in which Theodore sought the basis of his rule. Ideas of sacral rulership served his agenda of the centralization of royal authority in the face of political adversaries and an entrenched aristocracy. Theodore never reveals whether he was aware of contemporary criticisms of the ordeals as a non-Roman and unlawful practice, but it is very probable that he knew about the contrary opinion, which was (or at least came to be) the opinion championed by his rival Michael Palaiologos. His search for justification of the ordeals can therefore be interpreted as a riposte against a chorus of critical voices.

The thirteenth-century debate, of which a distant echo is heard in Theodore's writings, does not help to resolve the modern dilemma regarding the western vis-à-vis native origin of ordeal by fire in Byzantium. What is clear is that Byzantines themselves faced this dilemma well before modern scholars posed it. The thirteenth-century opponents of ordeals considered them foreign and barbarian, thus delegitimizing them. They seem to have been aware of the western custom. By contrast, a prominent proponent and a Nicaean emperor saw them as embedded in tradition. The sources have, in fact, set a trap for us into which it is all too easy to fall. For the reasons for the appearance of the ordeals by fire in Byzantium do not lend themselves to a simple dichotomy. In order to attain a fuller understanding of the ordeals, we need to move beyond the question of origins and
indeed beyond the sphere of belief. We need to consider their function in conflict resolution and the need they fulfilled for settling disputes both within and outside the court system. It is important to bear in mind in the process that there was a fertile ground for the ordeals in Byzantium well before 1204 thanks to ideas and practices, some based on the scriptures, others bordering on heterodoxy. It is this receptive climate which enabled their apologist, Theodore Laskaris, to claim that they were part of his own culture.
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Introduction

The issues of “Sinaitic” iconography touch upon the broader issue of the iconography of the “Holy Lands”. Their importance in the genesis of iconography has been stressed by A. Grabar and K. Weitzmann. The latter in fact posed the question of the influence of the holy lands on this “local” iconography, and explored the issue of the addition of topographic details to related representations.

Mount Sinai, which was certainly part of the “Holy Lands” from the 4th century, was the place where the Law was handed down as well as the place where God spoke to the Prophet Moses through the Burning Bush. An Old Testament holy place, it was also transformed into a pilgrimage site of the Virgin Mary. The monastery’s celebration identity gradually became enriched by honoring Saint Catherine. At the same time, there emerged other important saints from within the Sinaitic brotherhood, foremost among them Saint John Climacus.

Some significant parameters of Sinaitic iconography come into the broader discussion which follows, and individual aspects of this theologically, historically, and culturally multi-dimensional subject are illuminated, with abundant iconological and iconographic implications.

The presentations of Maria Panayotidi and Marina Myriantheos offer particular illumination of the personality of John of the Ladder, whose presence on Mount Sinai was decisive not only as an intellectual and spiritual leader, a learned user of the iconological vocabulary, but also as a manager of the practical arrangements of daily life.

Nikolaos Fyssas, Dionysis Mourelatos, Miodrag Markovic, Miloš Živković and Ioannis Sisiou comment on groups of Mount Sinai icons with local iconographic elements and highlight facets of the history of worship in the region. Aspects of the Sinaitic landscape are investigated through the communications of Anastasia Drandaki and Maria Constantoudaki-Kitromilides. Finally, Elena Boeck will explore relations between the Mount Sinai monastery and Russian centers as reflected in Russian icons in the Sinaitic collection.
The representation of the Transfiguration in the apse of the Catholicon in the Holy Monastery at Sinai and its sinaitic origin.

Abstract: This paper discusses the mosaic composition in the katholikon of the Holy Monastery of Mount Sinai, the creation of which is dated to 565-566, immediately following the death of Justinian. Support is provided for the prevailing view that the mosaic was the work of a Constantinopolitan workshop, and furthermore that this iconographic theme was created on Sinai, inspired by the Monastery's intellectual hegumen John Climacus, who would also have served as deacon. This information is revealed only through the iconography of the mosaic.
σε στάση έντονου θαυμασμού. Ο Ιωάννης και ο Ιάκωβος γονατισμένοι αντίστροφα γυρίζουν την κεφαλή προς το Χριστό, ενώ ο Πέτρος ξαπλωμένος σχεδόν στο κέντρο, κάτω από τα πόδια Του, στρέφεται ως να αφυπνίζεται, σύμφωνα με το ευαγγελικό χωρίο (Λουκάς Θ΄:32), καθώς γίνεται κοινωνία της θείας Θέασης. Οι μορφές, αν και αποδίδονται με αδρά χαρακτηριστικά, έχουν, με εξαίρεση το Χριστό, βλέμμα οξύ και έντονες εκφράσεις που συμπληρώνονται από τις αντίστοιχες κινήσεις. Ο έντονα ασύμμετρος τρόπος που αποδίδονται τα χαρακτηριστικά του προσώπου και οι αναλογίες των μερών του σώματος, καθώς και οι ανόργανες αρθρώσεις τονίζουν την υπερβατική διάσταση, παρά τα εμφανή στοιχεία της σωματικής απόδοσης και του όγκου και παρά τις έντονες κινήσεις και τις στάσεις σε contrapposto.

Το τοπίο απουσιάζει τελείως στη σύνθεση. Το όρος Θαβώρ αποδίδεται με ζώνες και αποχρώσεις του πράσινου που απολήγουν σε κίτρινο, κάτω από το σιωπηλό χρυσό κάμπο, που τονίζει το χαρακτήρα του Οράματος.

Μια σειρά από δισκάρια με τις απεικονίσεις των Δώδεκα Αποστόλων σε προτομή μέσα σε διακοσμημένη με φυλλοφόρα θέματα ταινία, περιτρέχει την ημικυκλική παρυφή του τεταρτοσφαιρίου. Η θέση του Πέτρου, του Ιάκωβου και του Ιωάννη, που εικονίζονται στη Μεταμόρφωση, έχουν πάρει ο Παύλος, ο Θαδδαίος και ο Ματθίας. Η ίδια ταινία, διαφορετικά διακοσμημένη, ορίζει το κάτω μέρος της κόγχης με στηθάρια που περιβάλλουν τις μορφές σε προτομή δεκαέξι προφητών, των τεσσάρων μεγάλων, ανά δύο στα άκρα, και των δώδεκα μικρών στο μέσον. Τέσσερα ακόμα δισκάρια συμπληρώνουν τη σύνθεση.

Η αναφορά της της 14ης ινδικτιώνας θα μπορούσε να προσδιορίζει, μετά το έτος βανάτου της Θεοδώρας (548), τα έτη 550/51, 565/66, 580/81, 595/96, 610/611, 625/26 ως την έλευση των Αράβων.
Στο κέντρο του θριαμβευτικού τόξου εικονίζεται σε ένσταυρο δισκάριο ο Αμνός ανάμεσα σε δύο αγγέλους, που πετούν, κρατώντας σκήπτρο και σφαίρα, όπως οι αρχαίες Νίκες στα αυτοκρατορικά τόξα θριάμβου, μόνο που τα σύμβολα αυτά φέρουν μικρούς σταυρούς μαζί με τον Αμνό στο κέντρο, προδρομική παράσταση της Δέησης.

Στον ανατολικό τοίχο, πάνω από το θριαμβευτικό τόξο, δεξιά και αριστερά ενός δίλοβου διακοσμημένου με ψηφιδωτά παραθύρου, βρίσκονται δύο παραστάσεις από το βίο του Μωυσή, που προέρχονται από την Παλαιά Διαθήκη και σχετίζονται με τον Βίο του Μωυσή, που έλαβε χώρα στον ιερό τόξο.

Η παράσταση της Μεταμόρφωσης, Θεοφάνεια κατά την Καινή Διαθήκη, η οποία εξαίρετη κατεξοχήν τις δύο φύσεις του Χριστού, ολοκληρώνεται με την υπανικτική της την έλευση του Μεσσία, καθώς και την Ενσάρκωση που εικονίζεται θριαμβευτικά στο μέτωπο του τόξου. Μέσω αυτής της πραγμάτωσης της θείας Οικονομίας, η ανθρωπότητα έγινε ικανή να γίνει κοινωνός του θείου οράματος, κατά την Καινή Διαθήκη.
Οι παραστάσεις, εξάλλου, του ηγουμένου Λογγίνου και του διακόνου Ιωάννη στις γωνίες, δείχνουν μέσα σε αυτό το σύνολο ότι πρόκειται για τους υπεύθυνους συντελεστές του έργου, που ζούσαν την εποχή της κατασκευής του ψηφιδωτού. Ο διακόνος Ιωάννης, χαμηλόβαθμος στην ειραρχία της ιεροσύνης δεν θα είχε άλλο λόγο να απεικονισθεί παρά ως εμπνευστής της εικονογραφικής σύνθεσης, εφόσον κληρικοί αυτής της τάξης δεν εμφανίζονταν συχνά σε επιγραφές ως δωρητές ή συντελεστές μεγάλων έργων. Ανάλογα περίπτωση αποτελεί και το ψηφιδωτό του διακόνου στο νοτιοδυτικό πεσσό του ιερού βήματος στον Άγιο Δημήτριο Θεσσαλονίκης, στα χρόνια μετά το 640. Η εξαυγεινισμένη φυσιογνωμία του Ιωάννη δείχνει και την πνευματική του συμβολή, σε αντίθεση με τη μορφή του ηγουμένου Λογγίνου, ο οποίος πιθανότερα θα ήταν ο υπεύθυνος διαχειριστής, συνεπικουρούμενος από τον μνημονευόμενο Θεόδωρο, για την πραγματοποίηση του έργου.

Πρόκειται πραγματικά για μια σύνθεση που περιέχει αλλεπάλληλα νόημα με περιεχόμενο εσχατολογικό, δογματικό, λειτουργικό, με τοπογραφικούς υπαινιγμούς και αναφορές στην αυτοκρατορική ιδεολογία. Η εικονογραφική αποτύπωση των εικονογραφικών διαφοροποιήσεων των μορφών στα δισκάρια, και των ιδιαίτερων προσωπογραφικών χαρακτηριστικών των υπεύθυνων διαχειριστών, είναι στοιχεία ελληνιστικά, που αποτυπώνονται στο ψηφιδωτό, δείχνοντας τους τρόπους της διείσδυσής τους στη μεσαιωνική τεχνοτροπική έκφραση του Βυζαντίου. Εφόσον το καθολικό φαίνεται ότι κτίστηκε μεταξύ των ετών 548 και 559/60, είναι πολύ πιθανό ότι το έτος 565/66 που συμπίπτει με τη 14η ινδικτιώνα να είναι το έτος εκτέλεσης των ψηφιδωτών που θα έγιναν, όπως είναι αναμενόμενο, μετά την κατασκευή του κτίσματος, όσο ζούσε ο Ιουστινιανός, όπως φανερώνει και η αποτύπωση των προσωπογραφικών του χαρακτηριστικών στην παράσταση του Δαβίδ. Παρά την αυστηρότητα που χαρακτηρίζει τη σύνθεση, υπάρχει πλούτο καλλιτεχνικών τρόπων, αντίστοιχος με τον πλούτο των εννοιών που εκφράζονται. Στην παράσταση της Μεταμόρφωσης, ο χρυσός κάμπος είναι τελείως σιωπηλός, χωρίς να δηλώνεται το όρος Θαβώρ. Μόνο οι τρείς ταινίες σε αποχρώσεις του πράσινου προς το κίτρινο, όπως αναφέρθηκε, δηλώνουν το έδαφος. Αντίθετα όμως το σιναϊτικό τοπίο δηλώνεται καθαρά στις παλαιοδιαθηκικές Θεοφάνειες που αντιπαρατίθενται πιο πάνω.

Στο σύνολό του πρόκειται για ένα έργο άριστης τεχνικής εκτέλεσης. Παρά την αυστηρότητα που χαρακτηρίζει τη σύνθεση, υπάρχει πλούτος καλλιτεχνικών τρόπων, αντίστοιχος με τον πλούτο των εννοιών που εκφράζονται. Στην παράσταση της Μεταμόρφωσης, ο χρυσός κάμπος είναι τελείως σιωπηλός, χωρίς να δηλώνεται το όρος Θαβώρ. Μόνο οι τρείς ταινίες σε αποχρώσεις του πράσινου προς το κίτρινο, όπως αναφέρθηκε, δηλώνουν το έδαφος. Αντίθετα όμως το σιναϊτικό τοπίο δηλώνεται καθαρά στις παλαιοδιαθηκικές Θεοφάνειες που αντιπαρατίθενται πιο πάνω.
της ύστερης αρχαιότητας παράλληλα με τα στοιχεία που προέρχονται από τις νέες αναζητήσεις για την υπερβατική έκφραση. Παρουσιάζεται δηλαδή με δυναμισμό ένας δυϊσμός, με εμφανέστερα από πριν τα στοιχεία της αφαίρεσης, που θα εξακολουθήσει ως την περίοδο της Εικονομαχίας και θα χρησιμοποιεί ως πρότυπο για τις μεταεικονομαχικές παραστάσεις του 9ου και 10ου αιώνα.

Παρά την ενότητα που παρουσιάζεται το σύνολο, οι ποιοτικές διαφορές που υπάρχουν στην απόδοση των μορφών δείχνουν ότι εργάτηκαν περισσότερα χέρια. Οι μορφές της παράστασης της Μεταμόρφωσης και εκείνη του Ιωάννη του Προδρόμου θα πρέπει να οφείλεται στο πιο προικισμένο χέρι, του «αρχιμαστορά», ενώ άλλες, όπως των αγγέλων, έγιναν φαίνεται από άλλους τεχνίτες και μαθητές.

Όπως είναι ευνόητο, μια τέτοια σύνθεση με τα πολλαπλά νοήματα που ταιριάζουν και στην τοπογραφική θέση του ναού οφείλεται στη έμπνευση κάποιου διανοουμένου, ενδεχομένως του διακόνου Ιωάννη, όπως αναφέρθηκε. Διαφορετικά δεν θα υπήρχε λόγος ένας διάκονος να απεικονιστεί στην ταινία που περιτρέχει το μέτωπο του τεταρτοσφαιρίου. Σύμφωνα με αυτά, γίνεται πολύ ελκυστικό να οφείλεται η υπόθεση που από παλαιά έχει διατυπωθεί, χωρίς ωστόσο να έχει γίνει αποδεκτή ο εικονιζόμενος Ιωάννης είναι ο σιναστής, ενώ άλλες, όπως των αγγέλων, έγιναν φαίνεται από άλλους τεχνίτες και μαθητές.

Είναι αξιοσημείωτο ότι τα προσωπογραφικά χαρακτηριστικά του διακόνου Ιωάννη, με το οξύ βλέμμα, την ευθύγραμμη μύτη, το θελητικό στόμα και την οξύλκητη γενειάδα χαρακτηρίζουν και τις μετέπειτα παραστάσεις του Ιωάννη της Κλίμακος. Αν η άποψη αυτή είναι σωστή, θα πρέπει να γίνει δεκτή για τη γέννηση του Ιωάννη της Κλίμακος. Η μοναδική επιλογή και διασύνδεση γεγονότων της Παλαιάς και της Καινής Διαθήκης στην παράσταση της αψίδας του καθολικού, που δημιουργεί μια κλίμακα αξιών με μορφές ανακούφισης, ενδεικτικά δεν θα μπορούσε να απεικονιστεί στην ταινία που περιτρέχει το μέτωπο του τεταρτοσφαιρίου. Σύμφωνα με αυτά, γίνεται πολύ ελκυστικό να οφείλεται η υπόθεση που από παλαιά έχει διατυπωθεί, χωρίς ωστόσο να έχει γίνει αποδεκτή ο εικονιζόμενος Ιωάννης είναι ο σιναστής, ενώ άλλες, όπως των αγγέλων, έγιναν φαίνεται από άλλους τεχνίτες και μαθητές.
Είναι πολύ πιθανόν επομένως η σύνθεση της Μεταμόρφωσης στο τετατοσφαίριο της αψίδας του καθολικού της Ιεράς Μονής της Παναγίας στο Σινά, δίπλα στην Καιόμενη και μη Φλεγόμενη Βάτο, στη θέση που ο Μωυσής Την ατένισε, να δημιουργήθηκε στο Σινά με την καθοδήγηση ενός εμπνευσμένου λόγιου σιναϊτή μοναχού από ένα κωνσταντινουπολίτικο εργαστήρι.

Συνοψίζοντας a) εφόσον η παράσταση του Σινά είναι η παλαιότερη γνωστή σύνθεση του γεγονότος με έντονους τοπογραφικούς υπαινιγμούς στο σιναϊτικό τοπίο β) εφόσον υπάρχει αδιάλειπτη διασύνδεση στην υμνολογία ανάμεσα στο όρος Θαβώρ και Χωρήβ και γ) εφόσον πιθανότατα ο εμπνευσμένος της σιναϊτικής παράστασης είναι ο εμπνευσμένος σιναϊτικής λόγιος μοναχός, θα ήταν ενδιαφέρον να ερευνηθεί εάν η παράσταση αυτή αποτέλεσε την απαρχή της θεοφάνειας του τύπου αυτού της Μεταμόρφωσης στη βυζαντινή εικονογραφία.

Επομένως στην παράσταση της Μεταμόρφωσης του καθολικού της Ι. Μονής του Σινά συντίθενται με επιτυχία η Παλαιά και η Καινή Διαθήκη σε μια κοινή Θέαση, με παλαιοδιαθηκηκά πρόσωπα που συνδέονται τοπογραφικά με τον τόπο αυτό, εφόσον εξάλλου και οι δυο θεοφάνειες της Παλαιάς Διαθήκης στο όρος Σινά, αποτελούν προεικονίσεις της Θεοφάνειας της Μεταμόρφωσης στο όρος Θαβώρ.
The iconography of the Ladder of Divine Ascent of Saint John (Sinaites) examined through his work as founder

Abstract: Saint John Climacus (525-600) had witnessed, initially as a monk, the evolution of the small skete of the hermits of the Bush below Jebel Musa into the great Justinian Monastery. Apart from his writings, known as the Climax, which guided monks towards the divine ascent to Heaven, he was simultaneously the founder of the stepped pathway (Climax) linking the Monastery to the Holy Summit, and this is a major correlation.

Saint John Sinaites, also known as John “of the Ladder” from the title of his acclaimed book on asceticism and theology “Climax” (the Ladder) that he authored based on the biblical vision of Jacob, lived during the 6th century (most probably between 526 and 600) as an ascetic in the Sinai desert, and for some time served as abbot of the Sinai Monastery. He is distinguished as a leading teacher of Christian spiritual life, and an emblematic figure of the monastic tradition of both East and West.

Saint John started his monastic life as a hermit in Sinai at the age of sixteen under the spiritual guidance of abbot Martyrios, having already acquired a higher education in the outside world. After the death of his supervising elder, he lived in seclusion and prayer for about forty years in a nearby location named “Tholas”, where he attained a high level of sainthood, and rose as the quintessential leader of Sinaite monasticism of his time. In his old age he was asked to take on the position of abbot of Sinai Monastery, where he remained for only a short period of time setting the solid foundations of the brotherhood’s spiritual life, as he preferred to return to his hermitage in Tholas, where he finally passed away.

His work “Climax” (the Ladder) was written towards the end of his life, in response to the request of the abbot of Raitho Monastery to provide spiritual advice. The work sums up the spiritual wisdom, experience and feats of ascetic struggle of a whole lifetime. The Ladder is made up of thirty speeches, in which John analyses in a superb manner the virtues and passions that one encounters in the struggle for spiritual enlightenment, listing them in an ascending order from the more pragmatic to the more spiritual ones, and concludes with the speech “On love, hope and faith”. The Ladder became one of the most beloved and widely read books on monastic life, read by monks of all periods. This is evident from the multitude of manuscript copies, as well as the early translation of the work from Greek to other languages (Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian and Slavonic), and, later on, to many languages of the modern world.

The height of the Saint’s path coincides with a pivotal transition period for the Sinaite desert. The construction of the Monastery’s building complex by Justinian set the foundations for the development of a strong ‘lavra’ and cenobite monastic tradition in Sinai, while hermit and recluse life also thrived in the same area. Saint John set his indelible seal on the whole of this monastic activity, not only through the spiritual accomplishment of the Ladder and his saintly life, but possibly also through hi organizing efforts, many of which survive and are evident today.
Modern research has identified John “Climacus” with the spiritual patron of composition of the, religiously significant, mosaic of Transfiguration (c. 565) in the apse of the Sinai Monastery’s main Church (“Katholikon”), depicting a young John, probably the Saint, during his years as a deacon.

On the other hand our research has also attributed to him the construction of the stepped pathway that links Sinai Monastery with the Holy Summit of the Ten Commandments, as the name John is found in the inscription of the path’s archway; at the same time there is a very clear association between the arduous construction of the stone steps of the pathway, and the long time required to progress on the spiritual steps of the “Divine Ladder”. Other construction works as well, such as the building of the Holy Bush chapel to the east of the Katholikon apse, are possibly linked with John’s activity in the Monastery. In view of these observations the iconography of the Divine Ascent through middle byzantine depictions in illuminated manuscripts and portable icons should be reexamined.

John also had experienced the monastic life of Egypt, during a short – as its turns out, according to the Ladder - stay in the prominent monastic centers of the area. This visit has been considered as a deliberate effort or even a mission, aimed at providing the necessary impetus to organize cenobite life in the newly established Sinai Monastery. Because of this spiritual journey to Egypt, the Saint was recently linked with the, otherwise unknown figure of an elder John, located in Nafrati according to the text of the Account of Ammonius on the first slaughter “of the forty holy Fathers in Sinai”, translating in Greek an original text in the “Egyptian” language. Perhaps it is not by chance that a 6th century funerary inscription containing psalms (Gr. Vamvakas, 1984), fashioned precisely in reverence to these martyrs, and now kept in the Monastery Katholikon (I. Ševčenko, 1966) twice bears the monogram “Elder Ioannis”. Thus, it might be Saint John himself that attended to the collection of the oral traditions, and the promotion of the reverence of these local saints. Along the same lines, researchers have recently proposed that Saint John might also be associated with the oldest surviving text recounting the Martyrdom of Saint Catherine.
Sinai icons, worship and local devotion in the Liturgical Year

Abstract: The paper focuses on the relation between:
a) The various festal identities of Sinai Monastery and the alteration of the perception of these identities through the ages;
b) The relevant liturgical rubrics inserted in the Monastery’s Typika, or surviving in other sources;
c) The role that may have played certain sinaitic icons as parts of the festal ceremonies.

Katά τη διάρκεια των αιώνων η Μονή Σινά και το Καθολικό της γνώρισαν σημαντικές μεταβολές ως προς την ονομασία/αφιέρωσή τους, διαδικασία που συνδέοταν αφενός με την ζώσα τοπική παράδοση, όπως αυτή εκφράζοταν από την μοναστική αδελφότητα, αφετέρου δε με τις αλλαγές στην πραγματικότητα και τις προτεραιότητες του προσκυνήματος, δηλαδή με την πρόσληψη του Σινά από τους προσκυνητές του.
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Οι ονομασίες-αφιερώσεις αυτές και οι συνακόλουθες μεγάλες και μικρές πανηγύρες της Μονής, του Καθολικού της και των παρεκκλησίων της, καθώς και οι επιμέρους παραδόσεις τιμής τοπικών αγίων και γεγονότων, διαμόρφωσαν σταδιακά την ιδιαίτερη εορτολογική ταυτότητα της Μονής, εμπλουτίζοντας την πορεία του λειτουργικού της έτους. Η ποικιλομορφία αυτή αποτυπώθηκε ανά τους αιώνες στον μεγάλο αριθμό των παρεκκλησίων εντός και εκτός Μονής, συχνά με μεταβολές προς την αφιέρωσή τους, καθώς επίσης στα λειτουργικά χειρόγραφα που περιέχουν τις αντίστοιχες εορταστικές ακολουθίες, αλλά και στο πλήθος των εικόνων του σιναϊτικού εικονοφυλακίου, δεδομένου ότι κατά την κωδικοποιημένη δογματική παράδοση η τιμή προς τον Χριστό και τους αγίους υλοποιείται «ἐν λόγοις …, ἐν συγγραφαίς, ἐν νυμμάσι, ἐν θυσίαις, ἐν ναοῖς, ἐν εἰκονίσμασι...» (Συνοδικόν Ὄρθοδοξίας). Η χρήση εικόνων κατά τις μεγαλύτερες ή μικρότερες εορτές του έτους και παράθεσή τους για προσκύνηση, τακτική που αποτελεί μέχρι και σήμερα κοινό τόπο στη λατρεία των Ὄρθοδοξών, είναι προφανές ότι συνδέεται με πολλές από τις φορτιστές εικόνες του Σινά.

Ο Σιναϊτικός Κώδικας 1097, δηλαδή το Τυπικό που συντάχθηκε το 1214 επί αρχιεπισκόπου Συμεών, όπως έχει επισημανθεί από την έρευνα αποτελεί βασικό τεκμήριο για τη σιναϊτική ιστορία, αποτυπώνοντας σημαντικά ιδιαίτερα στοιχεία της τότε σιναϊτικής παράδοσης και λειτουργικής πρακτικής, την οποία αυτό προσπάθησε να κωδικοποιήσει και εμπλουτίσει. Το Τυπικό προβάλλει ως κύριες τοπικές πανηγύρες πρώτα την εορτή του προφήτη Μωυσή, δεύτερη την εορτή του Α.Μ. και τρίτη την καθολική της τότε σιναϊτικής παράρτησης και λειτουργικής επιστολής, της οποίας το μεγαλύτερο καθεστώς ακολουθεί δεδομένη ότι κατά την κωδικοποιημένη δογματική παράδοση η τιμή που περιέχουν τις αντίστοιχες εορταστικές ακολουθίες, αλλά και στο πλήθος των εικόνων του Σινά, αναφέρεται κατά κύριο λόγο με τις εικόνες του προφήτη Μωυσή, της Ανάμνησης του Απόστολου Παύλου και του Αγίου Ιωάννη της Κλημάκος στα Φούκαρα. Εντυπωσιάζει η απουσία σπάνιων αναφορών σε εικονίδια –επί παραδείγματι τον Καθολικού της Μονής (ή του ναού της Αγίας Κορυφής), κάτι που μπορούσε να καταλήξει σε τύπον σιναϊτικής ιστορίας, όπως έχει επισημανθεί από την έρευνα αποτελεί βασικό τεκμήριο για τη σιναϊτική ιστορία, όπως έχει επισημανθεί από την έρευνα αποτελεί βασικό τεκμήριο για τη σιναϊτική ιστορία, όπως έχει επισημανθεί από την έρευνα αποτελεί βασικό τεκμήριο για τη σιναϊτική ιστορία.
έχει λησμονηθεί, η αναφερόμενη εικόνα, γνωστή από μεταγενέστερη επιγραφή της ως έργο του Μιχαήλ Δαμασκηνού, συνεχίζει να βρίσκεται στην ιδία προβληματισμένη θέση στο καθημερινό στασίδιο του αρχειοπισκόπου, τιμώμενη με καθημερινή φωταψία και προβαλλόμενη από πολύτιμο βυζαντινό μανουάλι που είναι τοποθετημένο μπροστά της. Το κατά πόσο η μεταβυζαντινή εικόνα αντικατέστησε στη θέση αυτή κάποια παλαιότερη –υπενθυμίζεται η παρουσία στο σιναϊτικό εικονοφυλάκιο σχετικά εικόνας, γνωστή από μεταγενέστερη επιγραφή της Υπαπαντής των βυζαντινών χρόνων- δεν μπορεί φυσικά να τεκμηριωθεί, αλλά αποτελεί μια εύλογη υπόθεση εργασίας. Σε ό,τι αφορά την εορτή της Υπαπαντής, το Τυπικό του 1214 παρουσιάζει πληρότητα τυπικών διατάξεων με τέλεση αγρυπνίας, κάτι που όμως δεν αποτελεί ένδειξη ιδιαίτερης προβολής, καθώς αυτά προβλέπονται για όλες τις Δεσποτικές και Θεωμητορικές εορτές. Σε μία σπάνια, ωστόσο, αναλυτική περιγραφή λιτής και σε άλλο εορτολογικό πλαίσιο, το ίδιο Τυπικό περιγράφει την διάβαση της πομπής από το παρεκκλήσιο της Αγίας Βάτου, προβλέποντας στην περίπτωση αυτή την ψαλμώδεις υμνολογία της Υπαπαντής. Ο συνδυασμός των ανωτέρω (τυπικών διατάξεων, χωροτάξεων, εικόνων) φαίνεται να επιβεβαιώνει την αρχαιότητα της σχετικής λειτουργικής παράδοσης τουλάχιστον στον 13ο αιώνα.

Σημειώστε ότι η επιλογή σαράντα εικόνων σαράντα εικόνων κατά τη διάρκεια εορτών από την Βιβλιοθήκη Σιναίτικης πιθανότατα διασώζουν και σημαντικές πληροφορίες σχετικά με τη νυστατικής Βιβλιοθήκης πιθανότατα διασώζουν και σημαντικές πληροφορίες σχετικά με την επιλογή τυπικών διαταξικών εικόνων κατά τη διάρκεια κάποιων από τις εορτές. Επί παραδείγματι, αραβική σημείωση στον Νέο Αραβικό Κώδικα 83 (απροσδιόριστης προς το παρόν χρονολόγησης) αναφέρει για τη μνήμη του προφήτη Ηλίου: «εικόνα μεγάλη στο παρεκκλήσιο του Θεολόγου, άμφιο, βιβλίο της εορτής χρώματος μαύρου μικρό». Από τη σημείωση δεν καθίσταται σαφές αν η εικόνα φυλασσόταν στο εντός της Μονής συγκεκριμένο παρεκκλήσιο, ή αν εκεί προβλέποταν να τελεστεί η εορτή, ή και τα δύο. Το κατά πόσο η αναφορά σε εικόνη μεγάλου μεγέθους θα ήταν πιθανό να παρατείνει στη γνωστή εικόνα του ξωγράφου Στεφάνου, των αρχών του 13ον αιώνα, και το αν οι διγλώσσες επιγραφές της θα μπορούσαν να συσχετιστούν με το αραβόφωνο περιβάλλον για το οποίο γράφθηκε ο αραβικός αυτός κώδικας και σε σκοπό απενδυθών την σημείωση, θεωρούμε ότι θα μπορούσε να αποτελέσει μία εύλογη υπόθεση εργασίας και να μας οδηγήσει στην αναζήτηση αντίστοιχων πληροφοριών που σήμερα λανθάνουν.
Η εικονογραφία της Θεοτόκου σε εικόνες της Μονής Σινά (12ος-15ος αι.). Έκφραση ιδιωτικής ευλάβειας ή μαρτυρία προσκυνήματος;
The iconography of the Virgin in the Sinaitic icon collection (12th c.-15th c.).
A local expression of devotion or a manifestation of pilgrimage?

Abstract: This paper will focus on the cult of Virgin Mary at the Monastery of Sinai, based on a group of ten icons of Virgin Mary depicted along with different saints. This group of icons is dated to the end of the 13th century. These icons indicate the high respect of Virgin Mary at least within the monastic community of the monastery of Sinai even at the end of the 13th century.

Η εικονογραφία του Σινά συνδέεται από πολύ νωρίς με την Παναγία καθώς η Παναγία συνδέεται υμνολογικά και θεολογικά με την Βάτο στο Σινά, την φλεγόμενη και μη καιόμενη Βάτο. Θεωρείται ότι η Βάτος αποτελεί την προεικόνιση της Παναγίας στην Παλαιά Διαθήκη. Η ιδρυση της Μονής της Θέση που σύμφωνα με την παράδοση εμφανίστηκε στον Προφήτη Μωυσή ο Θεός με την μορφή της Φλεγόμενης και μη Καιόμενης Βάτου οπωσδήποτε παίζει σημαντικό ρόλο για την κατοπινή ανάπτυξη της εικονογραφίας σε σχέση με το Σινά. Πιο σημαντικός βέβαια θεωρείται ως ιερός τόπος η Αγία Κορυφή, όπου σύμφωνα με την Παράδοση ο Προφήτης Μωυσής παρέλαβε το Νόμο. Επίσης η Παράδοση αποδίδει τη θαυματουργή ανεύρεση των λειψάνων της αγίας Αικατερίνης στην κορυφή της όρους της Αγίας Αικατερίνης και τη μεταφορά τους στη Μονή Σινά. Όλα τα παραπάνω αποκαλύπτουν τη σημασία που έχουν και οι τρεις αγίες μορφές για το Σινά, η Παναγία, ο Προφήτης Μωυσής και η Αγία Αικατερίνη.

Αν και το ψηφιδωτό του Καθολικού της Μονής με τη σκηνή της Μεταμόρφωσης, αναδεικνύει μία Θεοφάνεια σε κεντρικό θέμα αλλά και δύο από τη πιο σημαντικές σκηνές από τον Προφήτη Μωυσή και τη Παραλαβή του Νόμου. Οπωσδήποτε αυτό μας δείχνει τη σημασία που θα είχε στην αρχική αφιέρωση της Μονής η μορφή του Προφήτη Μωυσής.

Η σημασία της λατρείας της Παναγίας αναβαθμίζεται σταδιακά και ιδιαίτερα με τη πάροδο των αιώνων και ιδιαίτερα με την Εικονομαχία. Στην Κωνσταντινούπολη οι «Θαυματουργές» εικόνες της Παναγίας παίζουν ένα όλο και σημαντικότερο ρόλο στην κοινωνική ζωή της Πόλης. Οπωσδήποτε από τον 11ο αιώνα και εξής λιτανείες των Θαυματουργών εικόνων της Θεοτόκου έχουν αναδείξει τη Θεοτόκο ως προστάτιδα της πόλης. Χαρακτηριστικό φυσικά είναι το γνωστό ψηφιδωτό από την Αγία Σοφία της Κωνσταντινούπολης, όπου απεκοινώνονται οι αυτοκράτορες Κωνσταντίνος και Ιουστινιανός να προσφέρουν στη Θεοτόκο την Πόλη και το Ναό αντίστοιχα.

Στο Σινά η γνωστή παράσταση απεκοινώνεται στο πάνω μέρος του κεντρικού φύλλου του εξαπόλυτου του 11ου αιώνα την Παναγία ανάμεσα σε τέσσερις απεικονίσεις Θαυματουργών εικόνων της Θεοτόκου στην Κωνσταντινούπολη, οι εικόνες της Παναγίας Οδηγήτριας, Βλαχερνίτισσας, Χυμενης και Αγιοσορίτισσας περιβάλλουν μία κεντρική μορφή της Παναγίας Βρεφοκρατούσας, η...
οποία έχει συνδεθεί από τον ομιλούντα με υπόμνηση της λατρείας της Παναγίας στο ναό της Αγίας Σοφίας της Κωνσταντινούπολης. Η τιμή των εικόνων της Παναγίας γνωρίζει ιδιαίτερη ανάπτυξη την ίδια περίοδο, δηλαδή από τον 11ο αιώνα και εξής.

Στη Μονή Σινά υπάρχουν αρκετές εικόνες της Παναγίας διαφορετικών εικονογραφικών τύπων και προέλευσης. Εδώ, ωστόσο, λόγω κυρίως του χρόνου θα εστιάσουμε σε μία ομάδα δέκα εικόνων γύρω από τις οποίες θα αναπτυχθεί όλη η συζήτηση, που αφορά στο ερώτημα αν οι φορητές αυτές εικόνες θα μπορούσαν να αποτελούν αντικείμενα προσκυνήματος ή εκδήλωση της ιδιωτικής ευλάβειας των μοναχών.

Πρόκειται για μικρές εικόνες περίπου 18 Χ 23 εκατοστών και έχουν πανομοιότυπη εικονογράφηση. Απεικονίζονται, δηλαδή, η Παναγία Βρεφοκρατούσα τον τύπο της «Βάτου» και μία άγια μορφή ακόμη. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, απεικονίζεται η Προφήτης Μωυσής, μορφή στενά συνδεδεμένη με το Σινά. Η αγία Αικατερίνη, όπως είναι αναγνωρισμένη, ο άγιος Γεώργιος (δύο φορές), του οποίου υπήρχε παρεκκλήσι στο Σινά. Ο άγιος Ιωάκημ, ο Προφήτης Αβραάμ, άγιος Σάββας, άγιος Σώμιον και άγιος Θεόδωρος.

Είναι ενδιαφέρον, ωστόσο, να εξετάσουμε περισσότερο το ρόλο και τη σημασία των εικόνων αυτών. Αν και θα ήταν ελκυστικό να θεωρήσουμε ότι μπορεί να υπήρχε παραγωγή εικόνων, με σκοπό να δίνονται ως αναμνηστικά στους προσκυνητές της Μονής, ούτε υπάρχει κάποιο παράλληλο σε γραπτή πηγή ή σε άλλο προσκύνημα και επιπλέον όλες οι εικόνες βρέθηκαν στο Σκευοφυλάκιο της Μονής. Λόγω των μικρών διαστάσεων θα ήταν πιθανό να υποθέσουμε ότι η παραγωγή αυτών των εικόνων προοριζόταν για τις ανάγκες ιδιωτικής ευλάβειας των μοναχών. Από μία σειρά παρατηρήσεων σε ιδρυτικά τυπικά μονών γνωρίζουμε ότι σε ορισμένες μονές απαγορεύεται η κατοχή αγαθών και ανάμεσα τους φυσικά και εικόνων αλλά και η λατρεία στα κελλιά των μοναχών. Ωστόσο, αυτή η απαγόρευση υποδηλώνει ότι ήταν μία συνήθης πρακτική.

Τα παρόμοια τεχνικά, τεχνοτροπικά και εικονογραφικά στοιχεία αυτής της ομάδας εικόνων υποδεικνύουν ότι έχουν παραγενθεί στην Μονή Σινά, πιθανότατα ως αντικείμενα παραγγελίας από τους σημαντικότερους μοναχούς της Μονής για χώρους ευλάβειας εντός ή πλησίον της μονής.

Αποτελούν έργα προφανώς του ίδιου καλλιτέχνη, αν και δε μπορούμε, ωστόσο, να είμαστε βέβαιοι για την προέλευσή του. Χρονολογούνται στα τέλη του 13ού αιώνα, εποχή πυκνών σχέσεων της μονής με τους Σταυροφόρους.

Επιπλέον, αν εστιάσουμε στην εικονογράφησή τους, είναι ενδιαφέρον να παρατηρήσουμε ότι πρόκειται για εικόνες όπου η Παναγία είναι η κεντρική μορφή, και απεικονίζεται όρθια με μετωπική στην ίδια περίοδο της «Βάτου» και ακριβώς στον τύπο της Παλαιά Διαθήκη είτε είτε δεν περιέχει τη λατρεία στο Σινά.

Όλες οι άγιες μορφές επίσης προέρχονται είτε από την Παλαιά Διαθήκη είτε είναι συνεχιστές της παλαιοχριστιανικής περιόδου. Οι συνολικοί αυτών πρέπει να χρονολογείται προς τα τέλη του 13ού αιώνα, ήταν άλλες συνήθης πρακτική.
Ανάλογα ερωτήματα αναδύονται φυσικά για την εικονογραφία της Παναγίας και την επικράτηση του τύπου της «Βάτου» αυτή περίπου την περίοδο, όπως προκύπτει και από άλλες εικόνες που φυλάσσονται στο Σινά. Το ιδιαίτερο αυτό στοιχείο, η δημιουργία δηλαδή ενός εικονογραφικού τύπου, το πλήθος των εικόνων της Θεοτόκου αλλά και η ιεραρχία μεταξύ των αγίων μορφών που προκύπτει από αυτό το σύνολο των εικόνων, αναδεικνύει τη σημασία της λατρείας της Παναγίας και την κεντρικό ρόλο που συνεχίζει να παίζει αυτή την περίοδο στη Μονή Σινά. Προκύπτει με σαφήνεια ότι η τιμή της Παναγίας δεν έχει υποβαθμιστεί υπέρ της τιμής της αγίας Αικατερίνης ή άλλων αγίων μορφών, τουλάχιστον εντός της μοναστικής κοινότητας.
Miloš Živković
Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Institute for Byzantine Studies, Belgrade, Serbia;
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Between Invention and Convention:
Icons of the Sinai and Raithu Fathers at Saint Catherine’s Monastery on Mount Sinai

Abstract: The communication is devoted to the icons of Sinai and Raithou martyrs from the Monastery of St. Catherine at Sinai. Along with the problem of the cult of the saints in question, special attention is devoted to monastic “portraits” on the icons, that is, to their possible iconographic templates.

Two icons depicting the holy fathers slain at Sinai and Raithu and dated to the 12th or early 13th century are kept at Saint Catherine’s Monastery on Mount Sinai. They are located at the monastery catholicon, in the side chapel dedicated to these martyrs of the faith, above the reliquary containing their relics.

The central position in the upper register of the icon depicting the Sinai fathers is occupied by an image of Deisis – representing Christ in Majesty being approached by Virgin Mary and John the Baptist in a supplicating position. The composition of Deisis includes another two figures on either side of the central image: representations of the apostolic coryphei Peter and Paul, as well as the famed hegoumenos John Climacus at the rear of the procession on the right and St. Paul of Latros on the opposite side. Below this “extended Deisis” are the frontal standing figures of the forty monks of Sinai arranged into four rows and holding martyrs’ crosses or (less commonly) rotuli in their hands.

The uppermost section of the second icon contains a representation of Virgin Mary with Christ at the center, which is approached by the archangels Michael and Gabriel; it is flanked by the figures of John Climacus and John of Damascus. As in the first icon, the figures of the monks-martyrs are arranged into four rows of ten hieratic images each.

* *

What attracted our attention are some very interesting iconographic characteristics of these icons. However, it is necessary to provide a brief overview of the cult and iconography of the holy fathers of Sinai and Raithu, as these hagiological and art-historical problems have yet to be adequately elucidated.

The story of the slaughter of the Sinai and Raithu martyrs has reached us via two early Christian writings. The first is the Report (Δήγηγησις) by the Egyptian monk Ammonius (BHG 1300), which describes the slaughter of monks from both groups. Ammonius’s narrative was probably written in the late 4th or early 5th century, but there are some rather sound reasons to suggest that its final version was compiled as late as the second half of the 6th century or late 6th century. The other extant description of this event was written by Nilus of Sinai (BHG 1301-1307) and is also difficult to date; hence, its creation is placed in the period between the late 4th and the 6th century. Finally, the third, much younger and shortest written testimony has been preserved in the so-called “Imperial” Menologion for January from the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore (No. 521), which was composed in the 11th century. The note on the slaughter of the Sinai monks in this manuscript (BHG 1307D) is mostly based on the corresponding chapter in Pseudo-Nilus’s text.
The existence of relics of the holy fathers of Sinai and Raithu in the monastery is also directly evidenced by a piece of information contained in the Synaxarion of the Typikon of the Great Church, which reserves 14 January for the commemoration of their martyrdom. According to a note in this text, the cult of the Sinai martyrs outgrew local boundaries in the second half of the 6th century and made its way to the imperial capital owing to the Byzantine emperor himself. Namely, Emperor Justin II (565-578) had their relics translated to his endowment church – St. Paul's Church (or more accurately, St. Peter and Paul's) which was built as a part of the orphanage (orphanotropheion) located at the acropolis of Constantinople.

On the other hand, the fostering of the Sinai and Raithu martyrs' cult at St. Catherine's Monastery is even today evidenced by the easternmost side chapel on the south flank of the cathedral church and connected by a door to the central Chapel of the Burning Bush, which was added on the east side of the altar apse. However, it is not entirely certain that this chapel has always been dedicated to the worship of the martyrs of Sinai and Raithu, since some sources seem to suggest that the cult of the Sinai and Raithu martyrs was initially tied to two separate chapels in the catholicon. And yet, pilgrim testimonies dating from the 16th centuries indicate quite clearly that it was during this century at the earliest that the cult of the Sinai and Raithu holy fathers became associated with the chapel on the south side of the altar; it was then that the chapel was renamed in their honor instead of its previous dedication to John the Baptist.

The power and endurance of the cult of the holy fathers of Sinai and Raithu is also evidenced by their representations in works of art. It is very important to note that the veneration of these martyrs has not left a deep mark in art of the Byzantine world. Except the icon discussed in this paper, almost all other visual representations are found in menologia illustrated in manuscripts or painted on the walls of East Christian churches. The richly illuminated Menologion of Basil II (Vat. gr. 1613) contains three miniatures depicting their martyrdom. The slaughter of the Raithu fathers is also depicted in the aforementioned Baltimore menologion, as well as in the Sinai Manuscript No. 512. The joint martyrdom of both groups is depicted in the Menologion of Marciana (gr. Z 585) and the Menologion of Demetrios Palaiologos, Despot of the Morea, which is kept at the Bodleian Library in Oxford (14th century). Finally, the Serbian medieval churches painted in the 14th century provide another two examples: the calendar illustrations from the monasteries of Staro Nagoričino and Dečani.

Menological illustrations of the martyrs from the Sinai Peninsula continued to appear even in the post-Byzantine period. The Sinai fathers are depicted at St. Nicholas' Church of the Philantropion Monastery near Ioannina (1560), while the menologion in the dining hall of the Great Lavra Monastery on Mount Athos depicts both martyr groups (16th century); their representations are also found at the Romanian monasteries of Sucevița and Voroneț (16th century).

Finally, it should be noted that the cult of the martyrs of Sinai and Raithu has also left a mark in the distinctive Russian artistic tradition. For instance, they are depicted in the well-known Stroganov Artist's Handbook (late 16th – early 17th century) and on the calendar icon from the Moscow Theological Academy (16th century). Particularly noteworthy is a 17th-century icon painted by Master Pervusha, a member of the so-called Stroganov icon-painting school. In fact, besides the icon from St. Catherine's Monastery, this is the only known icon representing the monks of Sinai and Raithu.
Let us return to the Sinai icons. Before we turn to the main subject of our paper – the representations of the monks slain at Sinai and Raithu – let us briefly consider the iconographic characteristics of the images in the uppermost sections of the two icons.

The representation of “extended Deisis” – as the succinct iconographic formula for expressing the idea of salvation and saintly representation – is very fitting to the top section of an icon depicting a group of martyrs. However, the choice of saints approaching Christ and the figures of Virgin Mary and John the Baptist requires an explanation. The figures of the first apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, are often positioned on either side of the central image in this type of composition. However, the reason for the presence of the figures of St. Peter and Paul on the Sinai icon could have been the fact that the martyrs’ relics were located at the Constantinople church dedicated to this apostolic pair. The presence of the figure of St. John Climacus – the most famous hegumen of Sinai – is understandable.

While the choice of the aforementioned figures is not surprising at all, it is exactly the opposite with the figure on the opposite side of the “extended Deisis”: that of St. Paul of Latros. This notable ascetic (†955) was the founder of the Monastery of the Mother of God tou Stylou (του Στύλου) on Mount Latros, the monastic community in Caria near the ancient Greek city of Miletus. Except the figure on the Sinai icon, no more than a few medieval representations of St. Paul of Latros have survived: those on the 11th-century frescos painted on the walls of the catholicon at Paul’s monastery and in several Byzantine (Protaton) and Serbian monuments (Virgin Hodegetria at the Patriarchate of Peć; Dečani, Lesnovo, Treskavac) dating from the 14th century.

In view of the scarcity of his representations in art, we have to ask: why was Paul of Latros chosen to be depicted on the icon with the forty fathers of Sinai? Although this question has not been given adequate attention, some possible answers have been suggested. In their book on the Sinai icons, Georgios and Maria Sotiriou view the presence of the figure of the Latros ascetic as a sign that suggests certain ties between Sinai and this monastic center in Asia Minor. Alexei M. Lidov has gone a step further: the Russian scholar has noted the very interesting fact that the hagiography of Paul of Latros mentions that he had particularly venerated St. Catherine. Unfortunately we cannot consider this problem in more detail in this paper, but we can offer some very indicative information that could help its future resolution. It is important to note another fact that has not been noticed before: St. Paul’s hagiography mentions another persecution and slaughter of the monks of Sinai and Raithu. The eighth chapter tells the story of as many as three hundred monks of Sinai and Raithu, who fled before the Saracens and found their first refuge on Latros.

However, the link between the two Sinai icons with Latros was perhaps not merely symbolic, that is, through the figure of St. Paul. Namely, the link to this monastic center in Asia Minor is also indicated by certain characteristics of style. Georgios and Maria Sotiriou have noted that the icon depicting the Sinai fathers stylistically resembles the Dodekaorton from the Sinai collection. The authors associate this epistyle (preserved in fragments) with the frescoes in the Kelivarion Monastery on Latros, which were dated to the 13th century at the time of writing. In view of these similarities in style, could we entertain the thought that the icon of Sinai was painted by an artist who had arrived on Mount Sinai from Asia Minor (i.e. from the Empire of Nicaea, if the dating to the 13th century is correct)? Although this question requires a more detailed and comparative stylistic analysis, we
would like to mention the recent research conducted by Maria Panayotidi, which suggests that some Nicene masters were indeed responsible for the creation of the most representative paintings on Mount Sinai in the 13th century. In addition to this possibility, are there grounds to consider the possibility that the icon was brought to Sinai from Latros? We can do no more here than to merely indicate this possibility to be confirmed or refuted in future studies.

Before we can focus on the figures of the Sinai and Raithu holy fathers, we will briefly discuss the figures in the top register of the second icon. As we have already noted, the central position of the top section of the icon depicting the Raithu fathers is occupied by the frontal standing figure of Blachernitissa (Our Lady of Blachernae) with Christ, with the stooping figures of the two most prominent archangels beside it. The placement of this representation at the top of the icon is of course understandable: in the 12th and 13th century, the monastery was still dedicated to the Mother of God. The presence of the image of John Climacus on the left is also self-explanatory, as are his depiction on the first icon and that of his peer, St. John of Damascus, on the right. There can be no doubt that the famous theologian was depicted on the icon as a great venerator of the Mother of God and the author of many hymnographic compositions dedicated to her.

* * *

Finally, we can turn our attention to the depictions of the holy fathers of Sinai and Raithu.

We will begin our discussion with a characteristic that has already been noted. Alexei M. Lidov has noticed that all images of the monks on the icons have distinctive, very well executed and believable portrait features although the painter probably had no model to rely on, i.e. no iconographic template for painting all eighty faces of the Sinai and Raithu fathers. He has concluded that “by the sheer power of his imagination and familiarity with iconography, the artist of Sinai created eighty unique portraits of the holy martyrs”.

We fully agree with this observation. It will suffice to compare the monks’ portraits on the Sinai icons with those in the aforementioned menologia – it is very obvious that the artist took great care to create fully individualized physiognomies and not to repeat any of the eighty faces.

In comparison with some other interesting group depictions in East Christian iconography, the Sinai icons display a high level of originality in regard to the distinctiveness of the depicted physiognomies. The successful characterization of the martyrs’ portraits on the Sinai icons is rivaled only by the most accomplished depictions of another group of notable martyrs, which is equal in number to the Sinai and Raithu groups: the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste. This is evidenced, for example, by their frontal group portrait in the menologion from the University Library of Messina (11th century), an exceptionally well-executed 13th-century icon kept at the Svaneti Museum in Mestia (Georgia) and the famous and also artistically accomplished 14th-century icon from the Dumbarton Oaks collection. In addition to the similarities in number and (to some extent) the believability of the portraits, the representations of the Sebaste martyrs are relevant for the Sinai icons due to another formal reason. Namely, some representations of these saints can help us explain the appearance of frontal portraits of martyrs. Besides the scene of martyrdom, the Holy Forty of Sabaste have been depicted in Byzantine art as a group of hieratic images. Unfortunately, only fragments of both examples that provide evidence of this have survived to this day. These examples are two standing figures made in ivory (11th century) and a few preserved frescos in the side aisles of the Church of the Acheiropoietos in Thessalonica (13th century).
How was the richness of the “portrait” features of the two icons from St. Catherine’s Monastery actually achieved? To at least partially answer this question, we must return to Alexei Lidov’s remark, who in addition to “imagination” mentions a certain “familiarity with iconography” of the painter. We believe that this remark could be further elaborated. First of all, careful observation of the monks’ faces on both icons leads to the conclusion that suitable templates had been used in their designing. Some of them correspond to a great extent (and sometimes fully) to the images of notable holy monks of the Orthodox East, whose “portrait characteristics” were fully formulated and standardized by the time of the icon’s creation and even as early as the post-iconoclastic period. Although this cannot be said of all representations, it does apply to a number of images of the monks of Sinai and Raithu. Due to the limited time we have on our disposal, we will focus on a few characteristic examples – the images for which we are almost certain that they were painted after the model of the “portraits” of famous martyrs venerated in the Orthodox Church.

For example, one of the depictions on the icon of the Sinai fathers obviously resembles the physiognomy of one of the first desert hermits in Palestine – Euthymius the Great. The figure in question is the third on the right in the top row. This notable holy hermit was usually depicted as a balding old man with a very long and pointed beard, which is mentioned already in his hagiography by Cyril of Scythopolis. The “portrait” characteristics of one of the greats of Early Christian Egyptian ascesis – Anthony the Great – also seems to have been considered. His figure with a distinctive hood on his head and a mid-length beard corresponds to the fourth monk on the left in the same row. If we continue the geographic classification of famous hermits whose physiognomies are easily recognized in the group representation of the Sinai monks, the next would be one of the most remarkable figures of the distinctive Syrian ascetic tradition: the famous hymnographer and theologian Ephrem the Syrian. His appearance with its characteristic “shallow” hood and a very short, sparse beard seems to have been used as the model for the monk depicted second from the left in the third row from the top.

While painting the icons of the Sinai and Raithu fathers, the author have tried to include faces of different ages. Besides the seasoned elderly hermits, the depictions include middle-aged men and even a few young beardless ones. The figures of the latter in some cases strongly resemble the physiognomy of the very distinctive “Holy Fool” of Constantinople – St. John Kalivitis.

Furthermore, it seems that the painter had no qualms about adapting some of the monks’ faces to resemble the appearance of notable bishops, as suggested by the fifth figure on the left in the third row. This is a hermit with an unusually wide forehead and narrow face, as well as very prominent cheekbones. These features closely resemble the well-known representations of St. John Chrysostomos.

It has already been noted (A. M. Lidov) that the painter tried to achieve the individuality of some monks’ portraits by emphasizing their different geographic and ethnic origin. Two monks are depicted with white headscarves adorned with black ribbons – an element of the typical Eastern costume. In Byzantine iconography, it was usually St. John of Damascus who was depicted with this kind of headdress (interestingly, his turban on the icon of the Raithu monks is slightly different), the holy physicians of Arabia Cosmas and Damian (as evidenced by their excellent portraits at the Dečani Monastery) and even Jews (as evidenced by the frescos from the Passion of Christ cycle at St. Nicholas’ Church in Prilep, 1298).
The aforementioned possible templates do not preclude the possibility of “reconstructing” the process of iconographic shaping of this extraordinary gallery of faces depicted on the icon of the Sinai fathers. However, the remaining observations seem too speculative and not entirely founded. Be that as it may, we will briefly discuss the sixth figure on the left in the top row and its most distinctive facial characteristic: the unusual beard parted into two sections. Although in this case there are no notable monks whose standard appearances we could rely on, it should be noted that details often vary in the depictions of some ascetics. For instance, St. Theodosius the Great (the Cenobiarch) was often pictured with such a beard. We would like to point out frescos from Gračanica and again Dečani, although these are considerably younger examples. Finally, if we were to extend our discussion about the images of the Sinai monks and their possible physiognomic prototypes, we would also need to point out the fourth figure on the right in the bottom row, which strongly resembles a rarely pictured saint – Nikon the Metanoeite.

At the first glance, the icon depicting the martyrs of Raithu seems to have preserved more original faces. Particularly noteworthy are the two elderly monks with very unusual curly hair in the bottom row, the first with a short beard and the second with a very long white beard. Although we cannot speak of direct interdependence between them, it should be noted that the hair of the former has been painted similarly to the way that it was depicted in the representations of a rarely pictured anchorite – Saint Moses Murin (the Ethiopian). His depiction at the catholicon of the “Monastery” in Mariovo is particularly noteworthy (1270/1271).

Another image suggests that the artist used existing physiognomies of various saints as templates for his rich portrait gallery of the monks of Raithu. Painting the fifth figure on the left in the top row, we believe that he used a representation of St. Sabbas the Sanctified, the founder of the famous Lavra Monastery near Jerusalem. Since the Komnenian period, this notable hermit was depicted as a bald old man with a wide, trimmed beard resembling a broom. On this occasion, it will suffice to point out his depictions from Lagoudera, Studenica and Žiča monasteries, or two icons from Sinai monastery.

* 

Based on the above, it seems that the process of iconographic shaping of a quite large group of slain monks has been at least partially elucidated. In a number of cases, the painter seems to have used images of saints whose names and representations in works of art were well known in monastic circles. However, this does not mean that the conclusion about the painter’s originality and his artistic talent – which was unfairly denied to Byzantine artists for a long time – is to be relativized or altered. Despite his use of templates, the richness of his physiognomies is truly astounding. We are more inclined to interpret his use of distinctive physiognomies of saints by their wide recognizability and the extraordinary expressive power of some depictions of famous Orthodox hermits. In other words, their distinctive faces simply could not remain unused in the artistic shaping of an “ideal monastic community” on the icons of the martyrs whose cult shone out from the ancient monastery on Mount Sinai.

In conclusion, the icons in question represent extraordinary works of Byzantine icon-painting achieved by the artist’s perfect balance between static and dynamics, convention and innovation. He brought his gallery to life by discreetly varying the position of their bodies, heads and arms, never overdoing it so as to alter his attention of creating a static group image, i.e. its “iconic modality”.
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There can be no doubt that the well-executed “portraits” of the serene and dignified martyrs of Sinai and Raithu (set on a neutral, gilded background, as is the case with many calendar icons from Mount Sinai) had a powerful effect on the pious observers who approached their holy relics. The artist’s intention to familiarize the monastery’s visitors with the martyrs’ images – always taking care not to make their depictions seem real although he could only speculate about their true appearance – has been fully realized.
The sinaitic iconographical type of Saint Procopios, a work of the painter Peter.

Abstract: The icon of Saint Procopius by the painter Petros refers to an iconographic type created in the Monastery of Saint Catherine on Sinai. The icon’s particular characteristics, focused primarily on the clothing of Saint Procopius, would argue in favor of this assessment. The coronet (stemmatogyrion) on his head, the decorated crimson chlamys fastened by a clasp in front on his chest, the gold tablion, the torc (maniakion) around his neck, the long, olive-green chiton with its gold hem, the luxurious footwear, and the sheath of the sword with its decorated cord form parts of his regalia. All these elements constitute iconographically-distinct features which tend towards presenting the saint more as a high-ranking court official than as a military saint.

Ο σιναϊτικός εικονογραφικός τύπος της εικόνας του αγίου Προκοπίου, έργο του ζωγράφου Πέτρου

O synaitikos eikonografikos typos tis eikonas tou agiou Prokopiou, ergo tou zografou Petrou

The synaitic iconographical type of Saint Procopios, a work of the painter Peter.

Abstract: The icon of Saint Procopius by the painter Petros refers to an iconographic type created in the Monastery of Saint Catherine on Sinai. The icon’s particular characteristics, focused primarily on the clothing of Saint Procopius, would argue in favor of this assessment. The coronet (stemmatogyrion) on his head, the decorated crimson chlamys fastened by a clasp in front on his chest, the gold tablion, the torc (maniakion) around his neck, the long, olive-green chiton with its gold hem, the luxurious footwear, and the sheath of the sword with its decorated cord form parts of his regalia. All these elements constitute iconographically-distinct features which tend towards presenting the saint more as a high-ranking court official than as a military saint.

Στη βυζαντινή τέχνη θα πρέπει να ξεχωρίσουμε δύο διαφορετικούς τύπους παραστάσεων του αγίου Προκοπίου. Ο ένας σχετίζεται με την ολόσωμη ή έφιππη μορφή και ο άλλος με την στηθαία η οποία συγχρόνως πλαισιώνεται από επεισόδια του βίου του. Ο άγιος συνήθως εικονίζεται νέος αγένειος με μαλλιά μεσαίας ανάπτυξης χτενισμένα ίσια. Σύμφωνα με τα τυπολογικά χαρακτηριστικά που αφορούν στην ηλικία και τα μαλλιά μοιάζει με τον άγιο Νεστόριο. Η ενδυμασία του είναι είτε πατρικίου είτε στρατιωτικού. Ανατρέχοντας σε όλες τις παλαιότερες παραστάσεις της μνημειακής ζωγραφικής, οι οποίες εντοπίζονται κυρίως στην Καστοριά και την Καππαδοκία, μπορούμε να σκεφτούμε ότι η εικονογραφική εκδοχή του αγίου με τον χιτώνα και την χλαμύδα είναι η αρχαίτερη, ενώ αυτή του στρατιωτικού καθιερώνεται μετά τον 11ο-12ο αιώνα. Από τα όπλα που κρατάει, ξεχωρίζει το δόρυ χωρίς να σημαίνει ότι είναι το μοναδικό αποκλειστικό χαρακτηριστικό της εικονογραφίας του.

Η σιναϊτική εικόνα του αγίου Προκοπίου ολόσωμου, έργο του ζωγράφου Πέτρου, έχει περιγραφεί λεπτομερώς από την Ντ.Μουρίκη, η οποία έστρεψε κυρίως την προσοχή της στην πολυτελή εμφάνιση του αγίου Προκοπίου και στην εφαρμογή ορισμένων τεχνικών που αφορούσαν στην χρησιμοποίηση καστανού βερνικιού πάνω σε φύλλο από ασήμι. Οι παρατηρήσεις που θα μπορούσαμε να κάνουμε πάνω στην τυπολογία της εικόνας του Σινά, εστιάζονται κυρίως στην στολή του αγίου Προκοπίου. Το στεμματογύριο στο κεφάλι, η πορφυρή διακοσμημένη χλαμύδα που στερεώνεται με πόρπη μπροστά στο στήθος, το χρυσό ταβλίον, το μανιάκιον γύρω από το λαιμό, ο λαδοπράσινος ποδήρης χτιόνης με το χρυσό στρίφωμα, τα πολυτελή υποδήματα και το θηκάρι του σπάθιού με το κοσμημένο κορδόνι, αποτελούν κομμάτια της στολής. Όλα αυτά είναι στοιχεία που συνιστούν εικονογραφικές ιδιομορφίες, οι οποίες τείνουν να παρουσιάσουν τον άγιο περισσότερο ως υψηλόβαθμο παραστάτη και ως στρατιωτικό άγιο. Για την καλύτερη διερεύνηση του θέματος έχει ενδιαφέρον να εξετάσουμε και μια παλαιότερη εικόνα της μονής Σινά του δεύτερου μισού του 11ού αιώνα, την οποία δημοσίευσε ο K.Weitzmann (1983) και στην οποία εικονίζονται ο άγιος Προκόπιος, ο άγιος Δημήτριος και ο άγιος Νέστωρ. Όπως φαίνεται η κοινή παρουσίαση των τριών ολόσωμων μορφών δεν σχετίζεται με το μηνολόγιο (8 Ιουλίου και 26 Οκτωβρίου αντίστοιχα), αλλά με την προσπάθεια απεικόνισής τους ως μάρτυρες.
της πίστεως και αξιωματούχους που έλαβαν την εξουσία από τον βασιλέα για να μοιράσουν τα ενεργετήματα στο λαό. Η ενθυμιασμα των αγίων είναι παρόμοια με αυτή του Προκόπιο στην εικόνα του ζωγράφου Πέτρου. Κρατούν στο δεξί τους χέρι σταυρό και τα μοναδικά εξαρτήματα που τους λείπουν είναι το στεμματογύριο στο κεφάλι και τα όπλα. Επιπλέον ο άγιος Δημήτριος που είναι το κεντρικό πρόσωπο έχει μανιάκον γύρω από το λαιμό του, το ίδιο περίπου που φέρει ο άγιος Σέργιος στα σημείωσή του Θεσσαλονίκης. Ψήλα στο κέντρο της εικόνας και μέσα σε μετάλλιο προβάλλει η μορφή του Χριστού, που εμφανίζεται σαν σε όραμα το οποίο τονίζεται ακόμη περισσότερο από το χρυσό βάθος της εικόνας. Ένα άλλο κοινό χαρακτηριστικό στις δύο εικόνες, είναι η χρήση του πορφυρού χρώματος στις χλαμάδες του Νέστορα και του Προκόπιο και τα χρυσά ταβλία, στοιχεία που δηλώνουν την απομάκρυνση από την καθιερωμένη ιεραρχική απεικόνιση.

Ο άγιος Προκόπιος συγκαταλείγεται στην ομάδα των δημοφιλών αγίων, από την τάξη των πρώτων χριστιανών μαρτύρων. Το κείμενο του Ευσεβίου Καισαρείας στο έργο, «Περί των εν Παλαιστίνη μαρτυρισμάτων» αν και σύντομο είναι πολύ καταπολεμικό για τις συνθήκες κάτω από τις οποίες απολογήθηκε και θανατώθηκε. Ο Ευσέβιος παρουσιάζει τους μάρτυρες της Παλαιστίνης, κατά το διώγμο του Διοκλητιανού, που είχε στην Αρχή του 303. Τις αφηγήσεις του εξέρχονται οι προκηρύκες πράξεις συνεχομένων μαρτύρων. Για κάποιους από αυτούς η εξερμοποίηση είναι εκτενέστερη και δίνονται περισσότερες πληροφορίες, που έχουν την αξία προσωπικής αρχαίας τεκμηρίωσης. Ο πρώτος που εμφανίζεται στην εξερμοποίηση του Ευσεβίου, είναι ο Προκόπιος, ο οποίος αρνείται να κάνει θυσία στους εθνικούς θεούς προκειμένου να σωθεί και απολογείται μέσα από στίχους του Ομήρου (Πλάδα B', 204) «Ούκ άγαθον πολυκοιρανή, εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω, εἷς Βασιλεύς μως» γίνεται ο ένας κοίρανος του Πνεύματος στον Μωυσή και τους προφήτες. Παρόμοια ως προς την ερμηνεία των στίχων εκφράζεται και ο Ιουστίνος ο φιλόσοφος που επιχειρεί σύνδεση με την αρχαία ελληνική γραμματεία και ιδιαίτερα με τον Πλάτωνα. Έτσι χάρη στην πρόνοια του Θεού, σύμφωνα με τους απολογητές οι Ελληνες ποιητές και φιλόσοφοι εμάθησαν την αλήθεια από τους προφητές. Η χρησιμοποίηση των στίχων του Ομήρου κατ αυτόν τον τρόπο από τον Προκόπιο προϋπόθετε την εξοικείωση με το έργο τους. Οι απολογητές του 2ου αιώνα, ειδωλολάτρες φιλόσοφοι προηγούμενως, γνώριζαν πολύ καλά την αρχαία γραμματεία, τα θετικά και αρνητικά στοιχεία του αρχαιοελληνικού κόσμου. Ήταν υποχρεωμένοι να έμμονθουν για τις κατηγορίες που αποδίδονταν στον χριστιανισμό και συγχρόνως να προβάλλουν τα αρνητικά στοιχεία ιδιαίτερα της αρχαίας μυθολογίας και ειδωλολατρίας. Τον ρόλο αυτό αναλαμβάνει μέσα από τη συνοπτική διατύπωση του Ευσέβιου ο Προκόπιος.

Από χειρόγραφα κείμενα, όλα μετά τον 10ο αιώνα, που εντάχθηκαν σε συλλογές Βίων, μαθαίνουμε ότι ο Προκόπιος πριν γίνει χριστιανός ονομαζόταν Νεαίας, γεννήθηκε στην Ιερουσαλήμ και έζησε στην Σκυθόπτηλι της Παλαιστίνης όπου υπηρετούσε στην εκκλησία ως αναγνώστης, μεταφραστής και εξόρκισης. Χάρη στις προσπάθειες της μητέρας του, πήρε από τον Διοκλητιανό τον τίτλο του δούκα της Αλεξάνδρειας και συμμετείχε σε αποστολές του ρωμαϊκού στρατού εναντίον των Σαρακηνών. Σε μια από αυτές κοντά στην Απάμεια είδε όραμα με τον Χριστό
να του δείχνει ένα κρυστάλλινο σταυρό και να του λέει ότι με αυτόν θα βγει νικητής. Στο περιβάλλον της Παλαιστίνης στο οποίο διατυπώθηκαν ιδέες, στάσεις και αξιές δεν είναι δυνατόν να μη υπήρχε εκτενέστερο κείμενο μετά το μαρτύριο του αγίου Προκοπίου στην Καισάρεια. Η εικόνα του Πέτρου, όπως και το περιβάλλον του πατριαρχείου των Ιεροσολύμων (τέλη 13ου αιώνα) με 17 σκηνές από την ζωή του διευρύνει την αφήγηση με περισσότερες λεπτομέρειες, οι οποίες όμως δεν είναι ιστορικά τεκμηριωμένες, αλλά για διαφορετικούς λόγους πέρασαν στην εικονογραφία. 

Η εικόνα του Πέτρου, όπως και το περιβάλλον της Παλαιστίνης στο οποίο διατυπώθηκαν ιδέες, στάσεις και αξιές δεν είναι δυνατόν να μη υπήρχε εκτενέστερο κείμενο μετά το μαρτύριο του Αγίου Προκοπίου στην Καισάρεια. Η εικόνα του Πέτρου, όπως και το περιβάλλον της Παλαιστίνης στο οποίο διατυπώθηκαν ιδέες, στάσεις και αξιές δεν είναι δυνατόν να μη υπήρχε εκτενέστερο κείμενο μετά το μαρτύριο του Αγίου Προκοπίου στην Καισάρεια. Η εικόνα του Πέτρου, όπως και το περιβάλλον της Παλαιστίνης στο οποίο διατυπώθηκαν ιδέες, στάσεις και αξιές δεν είναι δυνατόν να μη υπήρχε εκτενέστερο κείμενο μετά το μαρτýριο του Αγίου Προκοπίου στην Καισάρεια. 

Ο Βίος ενός αγίου συνήθως γράφονταν για να διαβάστε μπροστά σε ακροατήριο την ημέρα της εορτής του. Στο ναό που αφιερώθηκε στον άγιο κοντά στην Ιερουσαλήμ, όπου η έρευνα υπέδειξε ότι τουλάχιστον στον 6ο αιώνα λειτουργούσε προσκύνημα, παρόμοιο κείμενο που υπήρχε. Ο Εφραίμ που αναφέρεται στην επιγραφή κάτω δεξιά συμβάλει στη δημιουργία του προτύπου, εφαρμόζοντας την πρακτική που ακολούθησαν και άλλα υψηλόβαθμα πρόσωπα του Βυζαντίου, ήδη από τα τέλη του 11ου αιώνα και σύμφωνα με την οποία η επιθυμία τους ήταν οι άγιοι προστάτες τους να ταυτίζονται με το ξίφος που κατείχαν. Από την άποψη αυτή παρουσιάζει εξαιρετικό ενδιαφέρον το προγενέστερο παράδειγμα του θαυματουργού αγίου Προκοπίου.

Η σύμπτωση της παραμονής στη μονή του Σινά στην τρίτη δεκαετία του 13ου αιώνα του Πατριάρχη Ιερουσαλήμ Έυσταθίου, του ζωγράφου Πέτρου και του κτήτορα Εφραίμ, συνδυάζεται με την δημιουργία ενός ξεχωριστού τύπου για την εικονογραφία του αγίου Προκοπίου.
The question addressed in this paper is how and why the natural physical environment of the *locus sanctus* of Sinai is depicted and participates in the art and artefacts that complemented the pilgrimage experience. The emphasis on the natural features, which also play a leading role in the Biblical narrative, i.e., on the bush and the rocky ground of the Holy Summit, has quite rightly been interpreted as one of the very few instances in which the depiction of nature in Byzantine art has topographical connotations, relating the episode depicted to a specific natural landscape. Drawing on theological treatises, pilgrim narratives, and art works celebrating the holy places of Sinai, this paper will explore the strong connection between nature and theology at the Sinai shrine.

The pilgrimage was born of the believer’s longing to be in a *locus sanctus*, to see and touch and imitate holy persons, treading in their very footsteps. Pilgrims themselves express this in their journals, describing step by step with emotion how they followed the episodes in scripture or accounts of the lives. They need to know that they are in exactly the right landscape, on the particular spot where the sacred events took place. It is as if eradicating the geographical distance might also circumvent the distance in time, bringing them as close as possible to the presence of the holy persons and their acts. Moreover, the natural formation of the holy place often plays a decisive role in the texts that are one of the motives behind the pilgrimage; and the pilgrims’ contact with the particular landscape of any given pilgrimage affects their religious experience.

Given this, examining the way the natural landscape of the *loca sancta* is depicted and the part it plays in Byzantine pilgrimage art would seem to be a very promising field of research – and to offer a potential exception to the familiar and much debated sketchy presence of physical space in Byzantine religious scenes. This question lies at the heart of my current research on byzantine pilgrimage art: i.e. if, how, and why the natural, physical environment of the *locus sanctus* is depicted and participate in the art and artefacts that completed the pilgrimage experience. The material from which we can derive answers to this question falls into two distinct, but interrelated categories. The first is related to the official art of the *locus sanctus*, i.e the combination of architecture and imagery which decorated and set off the shrine to advantage, but above all defined its theological identity and the experience of the pilgrims within it in artistic terms. The second category of pilgrimage works, which is directly dependent upon the first, covers the more modest creations with rudimentary but emblematic iconography, the pilgrim tokens and *eulogies*.

Examining the material on hand, I will concentrate on the pilgrimage iconography at Mount Sinai, the greatest of the Old Testament shrines to which this round table is dedicated. From the point of view of my research, Sinai is a promising field of research because the features of the landscape in which the shrine is set plays a decisive role in the iconography that identifies the holy place, giving nature as important a role as the people and the episodes depicted.

Sinai is the principal site of Old Testament theophany. According to Exodus (Exod. 3, 1-10), Moses had led the flock of his father-in-law to the wilderness, to Horeb, the mountain of God. There
the angel of the Lord appeared to him in flames of fire from within a bush that was not consumed by the flames. When Moses decided to go over and see this strange sight, the Lord asked him to take off his sandals, for he was standing on holy ground. Then the Lord revealed himself to Moses and sent him on a mission to Pharaoh to bring the Israelites out of Egypt. The Burning Bush had been recognized by the first Church Fathers as one of the biblical prefigurations of the Theotokos, specifically associated with her virginity and her role in the Incarnation of Christ. Furthermore, according to Christian tradition, the soteriological promise made to Moses in respect of the Exodus of the Jews is associated with the mystery of the Incarnation of the divine Logos and thereby with the salvation of mankind. The second theophany at Sinai took place on the Holy Summit, the mountain peak of Djebel Musa, where Moses was given the tablets of the Law after the Israelites had been freed from their captivity in Egypt. Subsequently both the bush and the sacred peak became the two holiest sites at Mt Sinai, which was since the 4th century, numbered among the main pilgrimage destinations of Christendom.

In the sixth century Justinian erected his fortified basilica in the most sacred location on the mountain, the place Moses heard the voice of God and with bare feet venerated the bush which “burned but was not consumed”. Another smaller basilica was erected by Justinian slightly later (between 560-565) on the Holy Summit. The archaeological evidence brought to light by the Hellenic Archaeological Mission to Southern Sinai, showed that the Justinianic church on Djebel Musa had been an opulently decorated church, with mosaics and opus sectile floor, but no part of its decoration can be reconstructed.

So I will concentrate on the Katholicon of the Monastery, in the location of the Burning Bush. Unlike with other early Christian shrines, for Sinai we have a full picture of the official pilgrimage art that delineated the theological character of the locus sanctus, from the sixth century to the present day. I am referring, of course, to the famous Justinianic mosaics on the East wall of the katholikon. These mosaics, which are very well known and have been systematically studied by a host of distinguished scholars from various angles, include the imposing Transfiguration in the apse, with the two majestic panels on the wall above depicting the two scenes of God appearing to Moses: the prophet before the Burning Bush and receiving the Tablets of the Law. In these two scenes, which depict in art the holy places of the Sinaite shrine and were the model for numerous similar images in centuries to come, the depiction of the natural surroundings plays a starring role, almost on a par with that of Moses.

The emphasis on the natural features, which also play a lead role in the biblical narrative, i.e. on the bush and the rocky ground of the Holy Summit, has quite rightly been interpreted as a direct visual reference to the topographical components of Mt Sinai. In other words, as one of the very few instances in which the depiction of nature in Byzantine art has topographical connotations, relating the episode depicted to a specific natural landscape. This rather obvious interpretation seems entirely convincing, especially to anyone who has visited the monastery and experienced the power and incredible energy of the Sinaite landscape. However, Sinai is not the only natural landscape in a pilgrimage destination that possessed power and a particular charm. So why the exceptional treatment of nature in this case? Why, unlike in the other loca sancta of the Holy Land and the great pilgrimage centers of saints and heroes of the Christian Church, is such primacy given to the features of the natural landscape in the pilgrimage iconography of Sinai? To answer these questions I will examine theological treatises and draw on information from pilgrim narratives and art works celebrating the holy places of Sinai.
Aspects of the Sinaitic Landscape from Byzantium to El Greco: Transfigurations of a “locus sanctus”

Abstract: The form, reception and visual interpretation of the landscape of Mount Sinai is the subject of this paper. Through selected examples we will briefly survey the typology, rendering, and manner of visually interpreting this rocky complex with its many religious connotations, a landscape which served as a reminder of the sacred scenes which had taken place in the area. We will see how this “locus sanctus”, famous in both East and West, was represented from early Christian times to the late sixteenth century, gradually acquiring a specific tripartite form. Some references to west European art will be made as well. Finally, we will observe the idiosyncratic manner through which a renowned Cretan artist, Domenikos Theotokopoulos, transformed the iconography of this sacred landscape, blending elements from his Byzantine background and the painterly qualities of Venetian art.

Greek text:

Όψεις του σιναϊτικού τοπίου από το Βυζάντιο στον Δομήνικο Θεοτοκόπουλο: μεταμορφώσεις ενός «ιερού τόπου»

Στις βραχώδεις υπώρειες του όρους Σινά, στις κορυφές του ο Μωυσής οραματίστηκε τη Φλεγομένη αλλά μη καιομένη Βάτο και έλαβε τον ιερό Νόμο από τον Θεό, σύμφωνα με τη βιβλική αφήγηση, ο αυτοκράτωρ Ιουστινιανός ανήγειρε την 6ο αι. την ιστορική φρουριακή μονή με αφιέρωση στην Παναγία. Η ίδρυσή της υπογράμμιζε τη θρησκευτική αλλά και στρατηγική σημασία της περιοχής στην εσχατιά αυτή της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου. Συν τω χρόνω η μονή, ενδιαίτημα αγίων, οσίων και αφοσιωμένων πατέρων, απέβη ένα από τα σημαντικότερα προσκυνήματα της ορθόδοξης χριστιανοσύνης, ενώ ενέπνευσε ευλάβεια και σε καθολικούς και σεβασμό σε Εβραίους και μουσουλμάνους.

Από τους ύστερους βυζαντινούς χρόνους προσδιορίζοταν σε δυτικές αναφορές και ως μονή της Αγίας Αικατερίνης, ήταν άλλωστε καταγεγραμμένη στον βιο της αγίας η παράδοση για τη θαυματουργική ταφή του σώματός της σε κορυφή του όρους Σινά. Η παράλληλη αυτή ονομασία της μονής υπήρξε επακόλουθο της ιδιαίτερης προς την μάρτυρα ευλάβεια, που αναπτύχθηκε στο Σινά, ενώ είχε σημειωθεί τον Μεσαίωνα, από τον 11ο αι., σε μονή της Νορμανδίας στη Γαλλία (όπου είχαν μεταφερθεί λείψανα της αγίας), όπως και στην Αγγλία και αλλού. Μιλονότι υπέρκελσε εν τέλει, γεγονός αξιοσημείωτο, την αρχική αφιέρωση της ιουστινιανάς μονής, δεν μείωσε φυσικά τη λατρεία της Παναγίας (ιδιαίτερα στο παρεκκλήσι της Αγίας Βάτου), όπως δείχνει μεταξύ άλλων και εικόνα του 13ο αι. με συναπεικόνιση της Αγίας Αικατερίνης και της Θεοτόκου ως Φλεγομένης Βάτου πλαισιούμενης από δύο σκηνές με τον Μωυσή (Μονή Σινά). Η τιμή προς την άλλη αγία και το σκήνωμά της, το οποίο μεταφέρθηκε από τους μοναχούς στο καθολικό της μονής για εξυπηρέτηση των προσκυνητών, ενισχύθηκε στην Αγία Μεσαίωνα, μετά την τέταρτη Σταυροφορία και την κατοχή των Αγίων Τόπων από τους Αραβες, Στις συγκυρίες αυτές αποκτούσε ιδιαίτερη σημασία η λατρεία αγίας με ακτινοβολία και στη Δύση, πράγμα που δημιουργούσε ευνοϊκή αντιμετώπιση της μονής από εκκλησιαστικές και κοσμικές αρχές. Η επίσημη αφιέρωση της μονής στην Αγία Αικατερίνη πραγματοποιήθηκε αργότερα.
Η μέριμνα για την υπόμνηση της τοποθεσίας κατά την αναπαράσταση σκηνών από τη βιβλική παράδοση που διεξήχθησαν στα υψώματα του Σινά οδήγησαν από ενωρίς τους καλλιτέχνες σε τρόπους εικαστικής απόδοσης του όρου. Η μορφή του τοπίου καθευτήν συνιστά μια ενδιαφέρουσα παράμετρο της σιναϊτικής εικονογραφίας διαχρονικά. Μέσω επιλεγμένων παραδειγμάτων θα σχολιαστούν ακριβώς η τυπολογία, οι τρόποι πρόσληψης, απόδοσης και εξέλιξης του ιδιόμορφου βραχώδους συμπλέγματος από τους παλαιοχριστιανούς στους πρώιμους μεταβυζαντινούς χρόνους, με λίγες αναφορές και στη δυτικοευρωπαϊκή τέχνη, αλλά και στο έργο του Κρητικού Δομήνικου Θεοτοκόπουλου, ο οποίος με ιδιαίτερο ύψος συνέβαλε στην ομοιότητα της εικονογραφίας του ιερού αυτού τοπίου.

Η απεικόνιση του όρου Σινά απαντά με σχηματικό τρόπο από την παλαιοχριστιανή εποχή σε επεισόδια της Παλαιάς Διαθήκης με τον Ιουδαίο προφήτη, ως υπαινικτικό συστατικό του βάθους των παραστάσεων. Σχετικές σκηνές μνημειακού ψηφιδωτού διακόσμου (το όραμα της Φαλάγης Βάτου-προεικόνιση της Θεοτόκου, η παράδοση του Νόμου στον ιδίο από τον Θεό) σώζονται σε ναούς της εποχής του Ιουστινιανού (Άγιος Βιτάλιος Ράβεννας, καθολικό μονής Σινά).

Κατά τους μεσοβυζαντινούς χρόνους το Σινά απεικονίζεται, σχηματικά και πάλι, σε παραστάσεις από τον βίο του Μωυσή. Άφθονο υλικό παραδίδεται σε εικονογραφημένα χειρόγραφα. Σε μικρογραφία του Βαλτήριου Χλουντώφ (9ος αι.) του Ιστορικού Μουσείου Μόσχας (Ψ ΑΞ), το τοπίο στην Παράδοση του Νόμου στον Μωυσή στον σημαντικό κώδικα του πρώιμου 11ου αι. (Μονή Σινά, κώδ. 1186), με αντίγραφο της «Χριστιανικής τοπογραφίας» του Κοσμά του Ινδικοπλεύστη. Απεικόνιση της ίδιας της μονής Σινά, φανταστική και συνοπτική, σώζεται σε κώδικα του 10ου αι. (Μονή Σινά, κώδ. 1186), με αντίγραφο της «Χριστιανικής τοπογραφίας» του Κοσμά του Ινδικοπλεύστη.
παραδείγματα σώζονται σε πασίγνωστες σημαντικές μνημειακές εικόνες στη συλλογή της μονής. Τη συνέχεια μιας συμβατικής απόδοσης του όρους αντανακλούν και μεταγενέστερες παραστάσεις, όπως η μορφή του τοπίου στην παράσταση του Μωσή με το Όραμα της Φλεγομένης Βάτου, από τις προεικονίσεις της Παναγίας, σε τοιχογραφίες της παλαιολόγειας περιόδου.

Συνεπώς και κατά τις συμβάσεις της βυζαντινής παράδοσης, το σχηματικό τοπίο του όρους Σινά λειτουργεί σε βυζαντινά παραδείγματα ως υπόμνημα του περιβάλλοντος των ιερών επεισοδίων που έλαβαν χώρα εκεί. Συγχρόνως διαμορφώνει από τους μεσοβυζαντινούς χρόνους παραλλαγές τριών κορυφών (χωρίς όμως παγιωμένο το σχήμα και τη θέση τους). Η τριμερής διαμόρφωση, ιδίως όπως διακρίνεται σε βυζαντινά χειρόγραφα, φανταστική επίσης, θα αποτελέσει τον πυρήνα για την επακόλουθη πορεία της απεικόνισης του σιναϊτικού τοπίου, συνήθως με παρατακτική τη διάταξη των βράχων. Αυτοί θα συσχετιστούν συγκεκριμένα, οι δύο με τις τοπικές βιβλικές παράδοσεις και η τρίτη με την Αγία Αικατερίνη (για την οποία άλλωστε αναφέρονταν από παλαιότερα ότι είχε ταφεί στην υπήλιο κορυφή), αντανακλώντας την εξέλιξη της λατρείας της στον χώρο.

Το τρικόρυφο τοπίο θα καθιερωθεί στην πρώιμη μεταβυζαντινή εικονογραφία, όταν πλέον θα είχε διαδοθεί ευρέως η δεύτερη απεικόνιση της μονής Σινά στο όνομα της Αγίας Αικατερίνης. Εν παρέδειας θα σημειωθεί ότι (εκτός από τη μάλλον σποραδική παρουσία της Αχαγίας Αικατερίνης στην δεξαμενή ζωγραφική) θα είχε μια μορφή της αγίας, που ήδη απεικονίζονταν σε τοιχογραφίες της Κρήτης, έχει θέση στην πρώιμη κρητική ζωγραφική χωρίς όμως παγιωμένο το σχήμα και τη θέση τους. Ο ίδιος αναφέρει στη διαθήκη του (1436) ότι κατείχε μια κυκλική εικόνα, προφανώς δημιουργία του, με την Αγία Αικατερίνη, την οποία προορίζει για το ομόνυμο μετόχι του Σινά στον Χάνδακα. Επίσης ρωτάει αν είχε παρατιθεί ευφύστη την πρώιμη κρητική εικονογραφία, όταν πλέον, θα αποτελέσει τον πυρήνα για την κατανομή της αρχαίας της θέσης της λατρείας της στον χώρο.

Το σιναϊτικό ορεινό περιβάλλον σε κρητικά έργα του β’ μισού του 15ου αι. είχε μεταβατική απεικόνιση της μονής Σινά στον όνομα της Αγίας Αικατερίνης. Εν παρέδειας θα σημειωθεί ότι (εκτός από τη μάλλον σποραδική παρουσία της Αχαγίας Αικατερίνης στην δεξαμενή ζωγραφική) άλλες και με χριστολογικές παραστάσεις του τέλους του 15ου αι. Εδώ οι περιστάσεις Σινά, Φλεγομένης Βάτος, Αράδος (Νόμου, Ταφή Αγίας Αικατερίνης) περιορίζονται σε κλίμακα, ενώ το τρικόρυφο συμπληγαίνει κυριαρχεί (δεν είναι σαφές αν απεικονίζονταν και η μονή), μάλιστα όχι σε χρυσό κόμπο αλλά σε γαλανό βάθος. Ενώ δεν υπάρχει μερικά περίπτυχο να ανακαλέσει την εξέλιξη του τοπίου του Σινά σε αυτό δείχνει την προεικονίσια της Παναγίας και για την προσωπική αποφάση.
Η μαζί με τα ιερά θέματα απεικόνιση του ιδίου του μοναστηριού, όταν υπάρχει, υπογραμμίζει τον τόπο αποκρυστάλλωσής της λατρείας της δημοφιλούς μάρτυρος. Μία από τις παλαιότερες απεικονίσεις του στην κρητική ζωγραφική περιλαμβάνεται σε εικόνα του προχωρημένου 16ου αι. (Μόναχο), με την Αγία Αικατερίνη ολόσωμη, με τον τροχό του μαρτυρίου της, σε τοπίο με δύο κορυφές εκατέρωθεν, τη μια με τον Μωσή να δέχεται τον Νόμο και την άλλη με το σκήνωμα της αγίας.

Το τρικόρυφο όρος του Σινά με τα τοπικά επεισόδια και με το μοναστήρι απεικονίζεται, εμπλουτισμένο, σε άλλα κρητικά τρίτπυχα (π.χ. σε αθηναϊκή συλλογή, 16ο αι., στην Πινακοθήκη του Βατικανού, α’ μισό 17ο αι.), στα οποία υποβοσκεί η γνώση δυτικευρωπαϊκών χαρακτηρικών (βλ. και πιο κάτω). Τέλος, διαμορφωμένο τοιοοτοπτός, και ακολουθώντας προφανώς ένα κλίμα ενδιαφέροντος και ζήτησης, το τοπίο του Σινά παρουσιάζεται στην κρητική ζωγραφική του τέλους του 16ο αι. και των αρχών του 17ο αι. με νέες μορφές. Άλλοι διευρύνουν με επιπλέον ιερές σκηνές σιναϊτικού χαρακτήρα, αποδομώντας με ενσωμάτωση δυτικών στοιχείων (Μιχαήλ Δαμασκηνός) και άλλοι εκτεταίρονται με περισσότερα επεισόδια από τον κύκλο του Μωσή και γενικότερα των Ισραηλιτών, αλλά και με όψεις της καθημερινότητας του μοναστικού βίου και του σύγχρονου προσκυνηματικού περιηγητισμού (Γεώργιος Κλόντζας). Ας σημειωθεί ότι την εποχή αυτή διαμορφώνεται, πάλι από Κρητικούς ζωγράφους και με δυτικές επιδράσεις, ο τόπος της ένθρονης Αγίας Αικατερίνης ως πολυμαθός πριγκίπισσας, ο οποίος ενίοτε περιλαμβάνει σκηνές του σιναϊτικού τοπίου. Η τρικόρυφη απεικόνιση του «Σιναϊού όρους» συνεχίζεται και σε υπογραφή καθημερινής εικόνης αλλά και χρυσοκεντήματα και πλήθος μεταγενέστερων ελληνικών χαρακτηρικών.

Μικρή αναφορά στη μορφή του σιναϊτικού τοπίου στη δυτικοευρωπαϊκή ζωγραφική είναι χρήσιμη για την παρακολούθηση της μεταγενέστερης περιόδου του θέματος στην άρμη κρητική ζωγραφική και στον Δομήνικο Θεοτοκόπουλο. Το τοπίο παρατάσσεται σχετικό σε μεταωφακτικά κεραμάτια, πάλι σε σκηνές με τον Μωσή. Αναμφίβολα είναι η γνώση της βυζαντινής παράδοσης, παρουσιάζονται ωστόσο μικρές ιδιαίτερες όψεις, όπως το χαμηλότερο τέταρτο τοπίο του ιερού Μωρίου σε κώδικα (περί το 840) της Βρετανικής Βιβλιοθήκης (Additional MS 10546) και στη μεγάλη Βίβλο του βασίλεως της Γαλλίας Καρόλου του Φαλακρού (823-877) στην Εθνική Βιβλιοθήκη της Γαλλίας.

Όταν πλέον είχε εδραιωθεί στη Δύση, από τον 11ο αι. και εξής, η λατρεία της Αγίας Αικατερίνης, για την οποία αναφεροτάν και σε δυτικές τηγές ότι είχε ταφεί στο όρος Σινά, το τοπίο της περιοχής εμφανίζεται και σε επεισόδια με την ίδια, πάντοτε σχηματικό. Σημειώνεις εδώ παραδείγματα σε μνημειακά έργα του 13ου αι. (π.χ. στο Λονδίνο, στην Πίσα) και του 14ου-15ου αι. (π.χ. στο Los Angeles, στη Ρώμη). Αξιοσημείωτη είναι μια μικρογραφία γαλλο-φλαμανδικής τέχνης στον «Σιναϊκό κώδικα των Ωρών» (Les Belles Heures), που εικονογράφηκε σαν εικονογράφηκε στον Βασίλειο του Νόμα και επιτέλους αυτό το τοπίο του σιναϊτικού τοπίου σε τοπία Μοναχίας και Περιβάλλον του Βασίλειο του 14ου-15ου αι. με νέες μορφές. Αξιοσημείωτη είναι η γνώση της βυζαντινής παράδοσης, ωστόσο, το χαμηλότερο τέταρτο τοπίο του ιερού Μωρίου σε κώδικα (περί το 840) της Βρετανικής Βιβλιοθήκης (Additional MS 10546) και στη μεγάλη Βίβλο του βασιλέως της Γαλλίας Καρόλου του Φαλακρού (823-877) στην Εθνική Βιβλιοθήκη της Γαλλίας.
Το συνεχίζομενο ενδιαφέρον για τόπους προσκυνήματος και φύλαξης ιερών λειψάνων και η ανάπτυξη του θρησκευτικού περιηγητισμού του 15ο αι., οδήγησε και σε άλλες κατηγορίες απεικόνισης των Αγίων Τόπων και γενικά της Ανατολής. Σχέδια περιηγητών και χαρακτικά ενσωματωμένα σε βιβλία από τον 15ο αι. αποτυπώνουν το σιναϊτικό πανόραμα, ενίοτε ταυτίζοντας ιερά κτίσματα, σημεία και διαδρομές στην ευρύτερη περιοχή του Σινά. Παράδειγμα το Liber peregrinationis (1420) του μοναχού Jacobus de Verona (όπου αντιγράφθηκε ιχνογράφημα του 1335) και το τοπογραφικό σχέδιο του 1458 του περιηγητή Gabriele Capodilista.

Μια παράλληλη στη μορφή των βουνών τα εμφανίζει ως έναν σχεδόν ειναιο ρηματικό όγκο με το μοναστήρι στο κέντρο. Παράδειγμα: απεικόνιση του όρου και της μονής σε ξυλογραφίες των Αγίων Τόπων, της οποίας το σχέδιο φιλοτεχνήθηκε επιτοπίως από τον Erhard Reuwich το 1483 και τυπώθηκε το 1502, στο περίφημο ταξιδιωτικό βιβλίο του Bernhard von Breidenbach “Peregrinationio…”. Παρόμοια συμπαθής μορφή του βραχώδους όρου εμφαίνεται σε ξυλογραφία από την έκδοση (1554) των εντυπώσεων του Γάλλου Pierre Belon από το ταξίδι του 1547. Δυτικοευρωπαϊκά χαρακτικά του 16ου αι., όπως εκείνα του Giovanni Battista Fontana (1569), του Christoph Führer von Haimendorf (1570, σε σχέδιο του 1565-66) και του Bernhard von Waltersweil (1587) δείχνουν το σιναϊτικό τοπίο αναπροσαρμόζοντας συστατικά παρόντα στη μικρογραφία των αδελφών Limbourg και εντάσσοντας απεικονίσεις της μονής και ομάδες περιηγητών.

Την ίδια εποχή ιδιαίτερης απόδοσης τυγχάνει το σιναϊτικό τοπίο στο έργο του περιώνυμου Κρητικού καλλιτέχνη Δομήνικου Θεοτοκόπουλου (El Greco), ο οποίος ερμηνεύει με προσωπικό τρόπο το θέμα, ζωγραφίζοντας το τοπίο του Σινά δύο φορές: την πρώτη στο Τρίπτυχο της Μόδηνας, της πρώηνς βενετικής περιόδου του (Modena) και τη δεύτερη, γύρω στα 1570, σε ανεξάρτητο πίνακα (Ιράκλειο Κρήτης). Τα τρία αμφίβια φύλλα του τριπλήχου παρουσιάζουν έξι θέματα, ανάμεσα στα οποία και το Τοπίο του Σινά, στην εξωτερική υφή του κεντρικού φύλλου. Οι τρεις κορυφές του όρου διατάσσονται διαγωνισμοί. Απεικονίζονται μικρογραφικά τα δύο ιερά επεισόδια, η Μουσής δεχόμενος τις πλάκες του Νόμου και η ταφή της Αγίας Αικατερίνης, όπως και το μοναστήρι, στο οποίο κατευθύνονται προσκυνήτες, ενώ διακρίνονται και μικροσκοπικές μορφές Αράβιων.

Ο Θεοτοκόπουλος ασφαλώς γνώριζε την παρατακτική διάταξη των απόκρημνων βράχων σε κρητική έργα του 15ου αι., αλλά και δυτικοευρωπαϊκά χαρακτικά της εποχής του με το τοπίο του Σινά, εξελιγμένα επίσης από προγενέστερες απεικονίσεις. Θεωρεί να έκανε έργα στο Μοναστήρι του Κομοτηνής και το Μοναστήρι του Μοναστηρίου της Παναγίας στην Κομοτηνή, στην Αγία Μουσής δεχόμενος τις πλάκες του Νόμου και η ταφή της Αγίας Αικατερίνης, όπως και το μοναστήρι, στο οποίο κατευθύνονται προσκυνήτες, ενώ διακρίνονται και μικροσκοπικές μορφές Αράβιων.

Ο Θεοτοκόπουλος ασφαλώς γνώριζε την παρατακτική διάταξη των απόκρημνων βράχων σε κρητική έργα του 15ου αι., αλλά και δυτικοευρωπαϊκά χαρακτικά της εποχής του με το τοπίο του Σινά, εξελιγμένα επίσης από προγενέστερες απεικονίσεις. Θεωρεί σε αυτήν τη θέση της Κυρίας Αγίας Μουσής της Παναγίας και του Νέοι Σαββά και της Καθεδρικής Μονής, καθώς και τη δεύτερη, γύρω στα 1570, σε ανεξάρτητο πίνακα.
τοιούτοπρόπως η «θεοφάνεια» που συντελέστηκε εκεί, με την παράδοση των Δέκα Εντολών στον ηγέτη από τον Θεό. Εκατέρωθεν το όρος της Αγίας Επιστήμης (ή του Αρών) και εκείνο της Αγίας Αικατερίνης, με τον ενταφιασμό της στην κορυφή. Στους πρόποδες του όρους του Μωυσή κείται το οχυρό μοναστήρι, με το καθολικό να δεσπόζει. Απεικονίζονται επίσης σκηνές προσκυνητών και μια δυσδιάκριτη ομάδα σαρικοφόρων Αράβων.

Κύρια πηγή της σύνθεσής του Κρητικού ζωγράφου, που βρισκόταν στην Ιταλία, είναι η προαναφερθείσα χαλκογραφία του Βερονέζου χαράκτη Giovanni Battista Fontana, τυπωμένη στη Βενετία το 1569. Αυτή έχει επεξηγηματικό χαρακτήρα, καθώς ταυτίζει τοπωνύμια και δείχνει σκηνές συνδεδεμένες με την τοπική λατρεία, με τον Μωυσή και την Αγία Αικατερίνη.

Η σύντομη επισκόπηση της εξέλιξης του σιναϊτικού τοπίου, σημαντικότατου «ιερού τόπου» (locus sanctus) της ορθόδοξης χριστιανοσύνης, οδηγεί σε ορισμένες διαπιστώσεις.

Η σύντομη επισκόπηση της εξέλιξης του σιναϊτικού τοπίου, σημαντικότατου «ιερού τόπου» (locus sanctus) της ορθόδοξης χριστιανοσύνης, οδηγεί σε ορισμένες διαπιστώσεις.

Η σύντομη επισκόπηση της εξέλιξης του σιναϊτικού τοπίου, σημαντικότατου «ιερού τόπου» (locus sanctus) της ορθόδοξης χριστιανοσύνης, οδηγεί σε ορισμένες διαπιστώσεις.
στο έργο Κρητικών ζωγράφων, ίσως με πρωτοβουλία της ίδιας της μονής, μέσω του ανθούντος μετοχίου της, αφιερωμένου επίσης στην Αγία Αικατερίνη, στον Χάνδακα (το σημερινό Ηράκλειο) της βενετικής Κρήτης. Η παραγωγή σιναϊτικών θεμάτων στην κρητική ζωγραφική του 15ου αι. και η παρουσία τέτοιων έργων στη συλλογή της μονής πιστοποιεί αντίστοιχες παραγγελίες και αφιερώματα, σε εποχή στενών σχέσεων Κρήτης και Σινά, που τεκμηριώνονται από διάφορες πηγές. Υπογραμμίζεται έτσι η πνευματική σύνδεση του ορθόδοξου κοινού της βενετοκρατούμενης Κρήτης με το σημαντικό για το δόγμα τους θρησκευτικό καθίδρυμα σε εποχή κατά την οποία η επικοινωνία με το ηπαρχείο της Κωνσταντινούπολης συναντούσε προσκόμματα λόγω των περιορισμών που επέβαλε η βενετική διοίκηση, και η Ορθόδοξη Εκκλησία της Κρήτης υπαγόταν στη Λατινική.

Στον 16ο αι. οι δεσμοί της Κρήτης με τη μονή Σινά συνεχίζονται. Επίσης, άξιοι Κρητικοί καλλιτέχνες, ανταποκρινόμενοι σε σχετικές παραγγελίες, ανανέωνουν την απεικόνιση των θεμάτων και του τοπίου του Σινά, αφομοιώνοντας δυτικοευρωπαϊκά στοιχεία και εμπλουτίζοντας τις παραστάσεις. Στο γ’ τέταρτο του αιώνα, το πολυσήμαντο αυτό πανόραμα μεταμορφώνεται με μόνο ζωγραφικά μέσα από μια προκικεμένη προσωπικότητα, με βιώματα μεταβυζαντινά της βενετικής Κρήτης και με τρόπο έκφρασης δυτικό, τον Δομήνικο Θεοτοκόπουλο, δρώντα πλέον στην Ιταλία, ο οποίος προσέλαβε και ανέδειξε την εγγενή δύναμη του μοναδικού αυτού «ιερού τόπου».

Το υποβλητικό σιναϊτικό τοπίο, συνεχίζοντας να εμπνέει και να υποβάλλει νέες εικαστικές διατυπώσεις, αποκτά εν τέλει αυτοθυσία, υπαναποτελούμενο μόνο με την όψη του το βαθύτερο νόημα και την πνευματική ακτινοβολία του χώρου. Η ίδια η παρουσία της μονής της Παναγίας και της Αγίας Αικατερίνης στις απεικονίσεις του ιερού πανοράματος τονίζει την προσκυνηματική διάσταση και την αίγλη της αιωνόβιας ορθόδοξης εστίας, που αποτελούσε πνευματική αναφορά για τον Ελληνισμό, τόσο στον Μεσαίωνα όσο και μεταγενέστερα, έχοντας με σοφία διαφυλάξει το κύρος της διαχρονικά και μέσα από ποικίλες δυσχερείς συνθήκες.
Accumulated Expertise: 
Russian Icons in the Collection of St. Catherine’s, Sinai

Abstract: This paper proposes that the surviving Russian icons in the collection of St. Catherine’s reveal notable, non-random patterns of acquisition and preservation. When the Weitzmann archive at Princeton became available in 2015 in a digital format, for the first time researchers were able to confront the comprehensive range of icons amassed at Sinai over centuries. But when it came to Russian icons, the expected treasure trove turned out to be more idiosyncratic and overall less aesthetically enticing than many of us initially hoped. The icon types that appear to have reached the monastery with recurring frequency suggest to me that they represented more than collective and individual devotion. Focusing on Russian icons from the fourteenth through seventeenth centuries, the paper argues that these icons embody strategic information about Russia and accumulated fundraising expertise.

Patterns in the preservation of Russian icons suggest a dialogical understanding of the shifting landscape of sacredness in Russia. The relationship between St. Catherine’s and distant Orthodox communities was multidirectional. The Sinai monks needed an understanding of the changing sacred landscape in Russia including favored saints, major monasteries, and official preferences because these offered pathways for planning an effective approach to potential financial patrons. The monks per formatively shaped and staged the monastery and the Mount for Russian audiences and played the role of gracious recipients of both funds and gifts. Many Russian icons must have entered the collections of the monastery as evidence of effectiveness of fund-raising missions.

The Mount was not a static entity, it was an active intellectual space, shaped through outside gifts, narratives and knowledge. Monastic delegations regularly traveled on fundraising missions to the Muscovite court in the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries. There they reminded Russians about the monastery’s importance and accumulated extensive gifts for the monastery. In order to effectively complete their mission, monastic delegations had to understand Russian narratives and tap into the topographies of power that they were likely to encounter. Icons that had returned to Sinai with previous delegations reinforced these topographies and the narratives associated with them helped the monks to speak effectively not only to the tsars and leading court officials, but also Russia’s wealthiest cities and monasteries.
The icons in the Sinai collection reveal lasting relationships with two urban centers of Russian power - Novgorod and Moscow. Even after it was eclipsed and conquered by Moscow in the second part of the sixteenth century, Novgorod was a very prosperous merchant city, deriving its wealth from trade. The relationship with Novgorod is evident in the icon types which were especially popular in this city. The Novgorodian icons at Sinai include the first Rus’ saints, the princely martyrs Boris and Gleb (important patrons in the military context); Sofia the Wisdom of God (the main icon of the city); as well as Sts. Florus and Laurus (who received ardent popular veneration). These choices of icons reveal a good understanding of the major facets of the Novgorodian society.

The extant icons testify to the good relations that the Sinai delegations established with both court and the church. Icon types that foreground Muscovite myths of primacy in Rus’ and the divine blessing of Muscovite lands form an important part of the collection. Images of Sts Metropolitan Peter, Alexei and Philip testify to successful receptions at the court of the Metropolitan/Patriarch of Moscow. Images of St. Sergius of Radonezh provide evidence of successful fund-raising journeys to the Trinity St. Sergius monastery outside of Moscow, which appears to have produced such images in large numbers as gifts for visiting Orthodox dignitaries. Other icons testify to contacts with wealthy and formidable, but more distant, monastic institutions or their financial representatives in Moscow (Sts. Zosima and Savvatii of Solovki, St. Cyril of Beloozero).
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Among linguists, the term ‘sociolinguistics’ (SL) is notoriously ambiguous. Its peculiar ambiguity has led to different conceptualizations and even misunderstandings within and across the discipline. For example, Trudgill (1978: 1) pointed out, “the difficulty with sociolinguistics […] is that it is a term which means many different things to many different people;” Bolton (1992: 8) argued that “Sociolinguistics, since its beginnings, has regularly faced a range of issues related to the adequate definition of its terms, and there have been frequent debates about its status as a field of study;” and, concerning the nature of the discipline, Lavandera (1988: 2) wrote that “we find among the various parts of the field considerable overlapping along many dimensions, so that two areas that share the same basic subject of investigation may disagree on methodology, while the methodology of one of them may be shared by researchers in an entirely different area of investigation.”

The ambiguity of the term sociolinguistics may relate to the notion that ‘language’ is itself a concept which can only be considered in its social dimension. In 1972, William Labov wrote, “I have resisted the term sociolinguistics for many years, since it implies that there can be a successful linguistic theory or practice which is not social” (Labov 1972: xiii). In this sense, the term sociolinguistics would actually be a pleonasm. However, more wide-spread and detailed definitions of the term, which we also follow for the purposes of our present Round Table (RT), consider sociolinguistics as “a branch of linguistics which studies all aspects of the relationship between language and society” (Crystal 1985: 281) or, as a field concerned with the description of language use as a social phenomenon that attempts—where possible—to establish dialogical or even causal relationships between language and society.

In the light of the complexities of defining sociolinguistics per se, our RT will deal with problems concerning the definition of historical sociolinguistics and its applications in the interpretation of Medieval Greek literature.

Historical Sociolinguistics (HSL) has been conceived of as an independent sub-discipline of sociolinguistics. Romaine (1982) marked the initiation of historical sociolinguistic studies. While she actually uses the label ‘socio-historical linguistics’, since Milroy (1992), the term ‘historical sociolinguistics’ has become the most commonly used term and therefore the one to be used here as well (see Auer 2015: 2), with the exception of Bentein, who prefers Romaine’s label of the discipline.

HSL employs insights and principles from modern-day sociolinguistics according to the so-called uniformitarian principle (Auer et al. 2015: 4; Bergs 2012: 80–98; Joseph 2011: 69–70) which holds “that the processes which we observe in the present can help us to gain knowledge about processes in the past. […] This means that when we analyze a historical phenomenon we should
first look at known causes in order to explain it, before we turn to unknown causes” (Bergs 2012: 80). Within studies in Greek linguistics, Teodorsson (1979) is a salient application of this principle: as to the role of genderlectal variation in Koine Greek, he applied the tenets of contemporary sociolinguistic investigation and interpretation to a past situation (see Joseph 2011: 70). In our RT, Klaas Bentein will look into methodological issues concerning HSL as a discipline, and illustrate how to conduct HSL inquiries by discussing case studies from his own corpus of documentary texts.

HSL also differs from SL in some important regards. While SL focuses on concepts such as *language change in progress* by dealing with its data from the point of view of contemporary language use, HSL concentrates on *variations and changes* from a diachronic perspective, and on the social role played by a language in a given historical speaking community. On this point, I will include examples concerning my studies, undertaken alongside Vrato Zervan, on the loanwords in late Byzantine historiography and the causes which made possible the introduction of these words in both low- and high-register texts.

Additionally, it can be argued that, whereas SL is located at the intersection of mainly two different fields, namely *sociology* and *linguistics*, HSL finds itself dealing with four different fields: *history*, *philology*, *linguistics*, and *social sciences*. Bergs, actually, mentions only three dimensions: “Historical Sociolinguistics (Milroy 1992) or socio-historical linguistics (Romanie 1982) is to be found at the intersection not of two, but of three different fields: *history*, *social sciences*, and *linguistics*. As such, it not only has to incorporate theories, practices, and paradigms from all three fields, but it also has to struggle with and in conflicts that originate in all three areas” (2005: 12; see also figure 1 p. 8). I added a fourth dimension, *philology*, because a historical-philological approach to written sources helps HSL to fight the accusation of ‘ideational anachronism’ (Bergs 2012: 82sqq.) effectively. In fact, we may incur this critique, as “we transpose modern concepts such as *social class*, *gender* or *prestige* to historical settings” (Auer et al. 2015: 5). However, we can solve the problem concerning the validity and the diachronic universality of sociolinguistic principles and categories by studying the socio-cultural context in which a language was used (both by authors and their audiences). Consequently, these studies are indispensable preludes to HSL inquiries (see Auer et al. 2015: 5).

In my presentation, I will discuss some examples to show the limits of HSL studies. In particular, I will focus on concepts such as ‘idiolect’ and ‘sociolect’. As far as the applications of HSL to our discipline (i.e. of philology, Greek linguistics) are concerned, I will particularly stress textual criticism and pragmatics. More specifically, I will demonstrate that interpreting a text according to HSL methodology entails disentangling and privileging that very interpretation which was in line with the *cultural competences* of the receiver, at the time when the text was conceived. The socio-historically legitimate interpretation is only one of endless possible interpretations that every text potentially holds.

So, I will concentrate on the description of an act of communication, popularized by Roman Jacobson. This will allow me to show that *historical sociolinguistic criticism* mediates, so to speak, between *author-oriented criticism* and *reader-oriented criticism*. The first privileges the role of a producer in the act of communication, and aims to recover the authorial intention as the only legitimate way of interpreting messages. This view assumes that every producer/author writes with a deliberate intention to communicate a particular message. Reader-oriented criticism, in turn, considers texts as open works, for they can be viewed as ‘generators of interpretations’, any of which is legitimate as far
as it is economic and coherent in se. (I will discuss Heinz Bergner’s The Openness of Medieval Texts. In: Jucker 1995: 37–54). Reader-oriented criticism also states—paraphrasing Eco’s Postille a ’Il nome della rosa’—that it would be better if an author dies immediately after having completed his work and, if possible, even without entitling his text, for titles influence and limit the free interpretation of the reader. All in all, then, HSL plays the role of a conciliator between these two strands of criticism. In order to demonstrate this, I will develop the concepts of liminal author, reader’s cultural competence, and of contexts of production and reception of texts. Furthermore, I will discuss works by Hirsch (Validity in Interpretation and The Aims of Interpretation), Eco (Open Work of Art and Interpretation and Overinterpretation), and Scholes (Semiotics and Interpretation). Our RT will host two case-studies on hermeneutic concerning Nikephoros Gregoras and Laonikos Chalkokondyles, discussed by Manolova and Akışık respectively. Manolova’s paper will look at marginal comments on Gregoras’ Roman History “penned by the author’s own hand”, which witness contemporary audience’s response. Akışık, in turn, will explore the openness of Chalkokondyles’ text.

My paper will additionally deal with the very well-known issue of the data. In my “Historical Sociolinguistic Pragmatics, Textual Criticism, and Medieval Greek Literature” (in: Cuomo – Trapp 2016), I suggested that we should consider the data that we use as neither ‘bad’ (Labov 1994: 11) nor ‘imperfect’ (as Joseph 2011; see also Janda and Joseph 2003: 14), but rather as ‘difficult to be recovered and used’ (this leads to the problem of the collection of data, with which Wahlgren’s talk in our RT will deal later). On the one hand, it is true that even the most complete collection of data in our field will always be incomplete, if compared with collections in present-day sociolinguistics, as it will be always lacking—at least—first-hand speakers’ perspectives and phonetic records. On this point, Labov (1994: 11) stated that ‘our knowledge of what was distinctive and what was not is severely limited, since we cannot use the knowledge of native speakers to differentiate nondistinctive from distinctive variants.’ On the other hand, as far as Medieval Greek is concerned, I argue that ‘the knowledge of native speakers’ can in fact be recovered (although with difficulty), in so far as the Byzantines used a standardized and codified Greek which they learnt at school and which we, in turn, can learn by analyzing and using their contemporary text books. As an editor of Manuel Moschopulos’ scholia on the Byzantine Triad of Sophocles, I will give some examples of how the Byzantines themselves described the varieties of Medieval Greek. Further discussion on this point is to be found in other presentations as well, namely in those by Valente, Proietti, and Wahlgren. The latter will stress the importance of databases for HSL studies.

In conclusion: historical sociolinguistics deals with any aspect of philological and linguistic analysis, such as phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, meta-textuality, and pragmatics. Note that I refer to pragmatics in the broadest understanding of the term, which considers an act of communication to be essentially depending on the producer, the receiver, as well as linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts (see Bar-Hillel 1970: 271 and the collective volume edited by Jucker 1995). HSL can focus on any historical period, carefully and coherently defined. It studies and describes the social role played by a language in a certain speaking community. It concentrates on hermeneutical issues. It links linguistic approaches—because it uses the language and its variants according to linguistic principles—with a) sociological approaches, for it describes how a society shaped and was shaped by its own language; and b) historical approaches, as it takes into account historically situated social dynamics, political events, and cultural currents as factors of linguistic change.
Historical sociolinguistics: How and Why?
Some Observations from Greek Documentary Papyri

As Hasan (2001: 2) notes, the discipline of linguistics has changed much over the course of the twentieth century. Not so long ago, “context was a notion remarkable by its absence from the discourse of dominant linguistics: to express concern with context was to banish oneself to the outer periphery of the legitimate boundaries of that discipline.” Nowadays, context has captured a center-stage position: after the establishment of sociolinguistics in the 1960s, historical sociolinguistics, too, has come to maturity as a (sub)discipline. Situated at the intersection of corpus linguistics, historical linguistics, philology and sociolinguistics, historical sociolinguistics has as its main goal “applying the tenets of contemporary sociolinguistic research to the interpretation of material from the past” (Conde-Silvestre – Hernández-Campoy 2012a: 1).

In the field of Classics, too, scholars have come to apply the methods of historical sociolinguistics. Diachronic linguists, for example, no longer attempt to ‘reconstruct’ the spoken language on the basis of lower-register texts; rather, they compare evidence from all sorts of texts, approaching Ancient Greek as a corpus language (Bentein 2013). Synchronically, several publications have shown the added value of a sociolinguistic perspective: for example, in a groundbreaking article Lee (1985) pointed out that in the New Testament there is a tendency for linguistic features having a “formal, dignified tone” (such as the adverb εὖ, the optative, the connective particle οὖν, the vocative particle ο, οὐ μή with a subjunctive or future, the verb ὤραω, etc.) to be situated specifically in the words of Jesus, as a sign of importance.

Despite the unanimity regarding the importance of context, there is no generally accepted theory of how context can be captured and related to language, in part because of its seemingly “boundless” nature (see e.g. Cook 1990, who refers to context analysis as an exercise in “capturing infinity”). Several important proposals have been formulated—including Accomodation Theory, Politeness Theory, and Audience Design—but these theories typically focus on specific aspects of context and are less concerned with the workings of language (see further Bentein 2016). One theory that is firmly grounded in linguistic theory, and aims to provide a coherent and unifying account is the Functional sociolinguistic framework, which, in the most general terms, is ‘concerned with explaining language in relation to how it is used’ (Martin – Williams 2004: 120). Within this framework, a number of contextual variables have been developed, and explicitly connected to the functional resources of language (see e.g. Hasan 1995, 1999). By means of these contextual variables, varieties of language or ‘registers’ have been described in various degrees of delicacy.

In this paper, I will be applying the Functional sociolinguistic framework to the language of Post-classical and Byzantine documentary papyri (I–VIII AD) – contracts, letters, and petitions in particular. I will concentrate on one specific area, complementation (see Bentein 2015b). This is an area which underwent considerable change: in Classical Greek, the indicative, optative, subjunctive,
infinitive and participle are used, based on a number of semantic parameters such as factivity, event integration, and aspecto-temporal reference (see e.g. Cristofaro 1996). In later Greek, however, the Classical system is destabilized due to the progressive disappearance of the optative, participle, and infinitive. As a result, context plays an ever more important role when it comes to the distribution of complementation patterns in our corpus. For example, the accusative and infinitive tends to be used in formal texts, most often when officials are addressed. ὅτι with the indicative, on the other hand, is largely avoided in these (con)texts: it tends to be used in informal texts, particularly when family members are writing to each other. Both in higher-register and lower-register contexts, extensions of these patterns beyond their Classical usage can be found, serving a pragmatic function.

Applying a socio-historical methodology to this material has a number of important advantages. First, it allows us to give a much more in-depth account of language change. Second, it allows us to better understand the message conveyed by the ancient document, with language being a key ‘meaning-making’ mode, next to lay-out, handwriting, material, etc. (see Kress – van Leeuwen 1996). Third, it allows us to better understand ‘decontextualised’ texts, that is, texts of which little or no context is known.
Education and Lexicography in the Palaiologan Age: Some Short Remarks

In Italy, between the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth centuries, Dante Alighieri reflected upon the co-existence of two layers of language in his De vulgari eloquentia (1.2f., trans. Botterill 1996: 3, modified):

(…..) I call “vernacular language” that which infants acquire from those who take care of them when they first begin to distinguish sounds; or, to put it more succinctly, I declare that vernacular language is that which we learn without any (grammatical) rule, by imitating our nurses. Of course, we are also given a secondary kind of language, which the Romans called gramatica. The Greeks and others—but not all peoples—also have this secondary kind of language. Few, however, achieve complete fluency in it, since we are only fully instructed in it over time and with persevering study.

Of course, Dante did not know Greek at all, but inferred from his Latin sources the existence of different layers within this language. Dante’s text can by analogy also be applied to the linguistic situation in Palaiologan Byzantium where two strata of language happened to co-exist: namely the κοινή or “Common Greek,” and the fictional Atticist sociolect characterising official culture. The “fashion of Atticism” – as Nigel Wilson (1996: 5) aptly called this phenomenon – still dominated the literary horizon, possibly in a more dogmatic way than in the previous centuries. In order to learn the correct use of Attic language as required for literary composition, old Atticist lexicography dating from the Imperial age to Late Antiquity were rediscovered and re-activated both in form of new transcriptions and as sources for new compilations (Valente 2016; see more generally Gaul 2008 with further ref.).

To this purpose, Terttu Nevalainen’s category of “ideology of linguistic correctness” (2015: 251) can be applied to the Atticist literary production of the Palaiologan age as well (and, in fact, more generally to the previous centuries since this model controlled the Greek language of the cultivated classes). She defines this concept as “a megatrend that crosses linguistic and geographical boundaries. Although its influence varies over time, one of its manifestations is language standardisation, which today is associated with prescription.” Striving to write (and speak) good Attic implied the need to possess Atticist lexicographic and syntactic textbooks containing the codified rules of this linguistic variety. As Paul Canart (2010: 449) rightly stressed, Palaiologan scholars not only produced new editions of classical texts, but also schoolbooks intended for basic education. Among these, there were “des lexiques élémentaires, par example de mots attiques, utiles pour qui veut écrire de manière élégante”, such as Moschopoulos’ Collection of Attic Names. Atticist glosses can also be found in the lexis of the past, such as the etymologica, and were also inserted into more recent works, such as the so-called lexicon of Zonaras dating to the beginning of the thirteenth century. But for the purposes of the present RT, the monographic lexicography dealing programmatically with the Attic dialect are of primary relevance.

Before using Byzantine lexicographical works for historical sociolinguistic research, it is necessary to understand what kind of corpus of texts we possess and how they took effect. The
issues can be subsumed under seven key-words as summarized by Hernández-Campoy and Schilling (2012: 66 and 73f.) concerning the problems faced by historical sociolinguists: “i) representativeness, ii) empirical validity, iii) invariation, iv) authenticity, v) authorship, vi) social and historical validity, and vii) standard ideology.” In particular, we should be aware that the surviving manuscripts represent but a small, randomly preserved sub-set of a much wider scholarly production. Furthermore, each manuscript or even each copy of a lexicon usually represents a new “version”—if not a new “edition”—of a given work: the copyist(s) or the user(s) normally considered the text as a kind of cultural commons that could be shortened, enlarged or modified according to current requirements. Against this background, Labov’s assertion (1972:99) that “historical linguists [...] have no control over their data” and that their great art is “to make the best of this bad data” should always be kept in mind. Moreover, the highly conservative character of Byzantine erudition as well as the standardization of Byzantine education ought to be considered. When using the same sources, lexicographers of different centuries reproduced their content reasonably verbatim while compiling new lexica.

Nevertheless, lexicographical sources can be used to detect the linguistic categories employed by the Palaiologan scholars to analyze their own language—with special focus on the linguistic categories “Attic” vs “Common Greek”—provided that their nature is properly studied. In lexicography, the prescriptive value of the scholarly tradition usually prevented innovation content-wise. Generally speaking, Palaiologan lexicographers inherited their attitude toward the literary sociolect as well as the labels “Attic” and “non-Attic” from their sources – i.e. the distinction between “literary” words which could be used in cultivated literary production and conversation on the one hand, and words to be avoided on the other. For instance, the Atticist lexicon by Moeris (third century CE?) served the needs of Palaeologan scholars particularly well thanks to its binary structure. An entry in this lexicon usually reads: ‘x <say> the Atticists (Ἀττικοὶ), y the Greeks (Ἕλληνες)’, whereby only the Attic term is admitted for the literary production, while the common Greek form is to be rejected as not being attested in the works of the ‘exemplary’ authors contained in the canon of Attic writers. Sometimes, instead of—or in addition to—Ἐλληνες, the second term in opposition is the “common language” (κοινόν): such terms obviously were to be avoided in literary practice as well (Maidhof 1912). The work by Moeris quite neatly suited the needs of Palaiologan scholars. It is not a coincidence that, out of the eight surviving copies of this lexicon from tenth to fifteenth century, six were produced during the Palaeologan age (Hansen 1998: 14–35). They were mostly copied by scholarly hands in miscellany manuscripts, such as the Parisinus gr. 1630, a “personal encyclopedia” copied by the monk Chariton of the Hodegos monastery (Pérez Martín 2011, 2016). Furthermore, Moeris’ lexicon was inserted into the new lexicographic compilations by Palaiologan scholars.

The case of Moeris’ work can be extended to many other Atticist lexica during the Palaiologan age. For instance, Thomas Magistros incorporated newly rediscovered Atticist lexica into his Ecloga of Attic words (Gaul 2008: 184–90). In it, references to classical and more generally exemplary authors were later supplemented on the basis of further readings, at first within the scholarly framework of the author, later on within Nikephoros Gregoras’ circle in Constantinople (Gaul 2007: 296–328). In general, lexicographic texts rarely contain precise hints for reconstructing the setting of their composition and use, thus the textual tradition of Magistros’ Ecloga is an exceptional case. From a different angle, another case is ms. inv. nr. 2626 of the Jagiellonian Library in Kraków (formerly Berolinensis gr. qu. 13, fourteenth century: Maas 1938; Gaul 2005: 693–702; Pontani 2009:10 with
n. 36). It preserves “a much altered and expanded version of Σ [= Synagoge]” (Cunnigham 2003:18). In its margins, an anonymous scholar (or school-master) who lived in the Peloponnese added much heterogeneous material, some of it containing terms and expressions taken from contemporary language as well as remarks concerning his personality and life.

The study of some “minor” lexica can also provide interesting insights. Let us consider, for instance, a small collection of glosses assembled during the Palaeologan age. According to the title in some manuscripts, this is a work by Nikephoros Gregoras. As Sigfrid Lindstam suggested (1929/30: 307), it may well have been a juvenile work of him, possibly inspired by his teacher Johannes Glykys. The lexicographical excerpts were taken from different sources and the entries show no identifiable arrangement but the order in which they had been collected. To date, the only modern publications of this lexicon are transcriptions of the text as it is transmitted in a single manuscript each: the most complete ones were published by Gottfried Hermann (1801: 319–352) on the basis of the Monacensis gr. 529 (fourteenth century; fols. 86–100; see Lindstam 1912: 426f.) and by John Cramer (1841: 245–64) based on the Parisinus gr. 2720 (fifteenth century, fols. 228v–234r). The lexicon is today still known as lexicon Hermanni because of Hermann’s transcription. The study of the text and its relationship to Gregoras’ works is complicated by the fact that there is no critical edition of this lexicon, not even a study of its manuscript tradition (Faranda 2012; Lorenzoni 2013). The intention of the compiler was to select some useful information concerning the meanings and usage of words from a bunch of sources, as well as some syntactic entries with particular focus on Attic usage. I shall consider only two examples.

Concerning lexical varieties, a quite long entry comments upon the dialectal forms of the name λαγός, “hare” (gl. 9 Hermann = p. 245.22–28 Cramer; see Faranda 2012:9f.):

τὸ μὲν λαγός κοινὸν ὄν εὑρίσκει παρὰ Σωφροκλεὶ “γλαύκες, ἵκτικοι καὶ λαγοὶ.” ὥσπερ δὲ ναὸν καὶ λαὸν λεγόντων τῶν κοινῶν ὥς Ἀττικοὶ νεῶν καὶ λεῶν φασίν, οὕτω καὶ τὸν λαγὸν λαγῶν φασίν, καὶ Εὔπολις. “βατίδες καὶ λαγῷ καὶ γυναῖκες εἰλιπόδες,” τὸ δὲ λαγωὸς ἰονικὸν ἔστιν.

“The form λαγός (‘hare’) is common and found in Sophocles (fr. 111): “little owls, kites, and hares”. As the Attic-speakers say νεῶν (temple) and λεῶν (people) whereas the common forms are ναὸν and λαὸν, so they use the form λαγῶν for hare instead of the form with omicron. And Eupolis (fr. 174.2f. Kassel/Austin) says: “skate and hares (λαγῷ) and shambling-footed women.” The form λαγωὸς is Ionic” (my trans., modelled on Olson 2008: 363–65).

There, the focus lies on the opposition between the forms used in the common language and those employed by speakers of Attic. The entry comes from a passage in the epitome of Athenaeus’ Learned banqueters (9.400b/d): “Because our form of the word is λαγός; and just as we say ναὸς (‘temple’) and λαὸς (‘people’), whereas they say νεῶς and λεῶς, so too we say λαγός, whereas they say λαγῶς [ἔπει τὸ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἐστι λαγός, ὥσπερ δὲ ναὸν λεγόντων ἡμῶν ἔκεινοι φασιν νεῶν καὶ λαῶν λεῶν, οὕτω λαγῶν ὀνομαζόντων ἐκεῖνοι λαγῶν ἐροῦσι].” The form of the nominative plural used in Sophocles’ satyr play Amycus (fr. 111 Radt) is consistent with the accusative singular λαγόν: “cranes, tortoises, little owls, kites, hares (lagoi).” The form lαgοί pronounced with an omega and analogous with lagόν, on the other hand, is found in Eupolis’ Flatterers (fr. 174.2–3 Kassel/Austin): “where skate and hares (lαgοί) are present, as well as shambling-footed women.” [... But even Attic authors use lagοs [...]. But as for the phrase (Il. 22.310) “or a cowering hare (lαgόν).” if this is an Ionic form, the omega is superfluous, whereas if it is Attic, the omicron is” (Olson 2008: 363–65).
It is evident how the compiler of the lexicon Hermanni worked when excerpting from his source and how he selected only the relevant information he needed, concerning his Atticist interests in this case. In line with his own interests, the compiler summarised the information he found in Athenaeus concerning the opposition Attic vs common language.

Data concerning dialectal labels in this work—and of course in every Byzantine lexicon—can nevertheless be misleading if not studied within the wider framework of the lexicographic and grammatical tradition. An interesting counterexample may be found in another entry of the lexicon Hermanni (nr. 27 Hermann = p. 247.22 Cramer; see Faranda 2012: 20) concerning the correct name for mallow:

μαλάχη κοινόν· μολόχη Ἀττικόν.

“maläche is the common form, molóche the Attic one”.

This gloss falls within another group of entries taken from Athenaeus (2.58d; trans. Olson 2006: 329):

“Malachē is the Attic form. But, says [Athenaeus], I found the word written with an omicron in many copies of Antiphanes’ Minos (fr. 156 Kassell/Austin): ‘eating mallow (moloche) root’. And Epicharmus (fr. 151 Kassell/Austin): ‘I am milder than a mallow (molocha)’.”

The orthographic question is chiefly Atticist and is attested in many lexica, such as in Moeris (μ 24 Hansen: μαλάχη Ἀττικοῖ· μολόχη Ἑλληνες) and Orus (fr. B 95 Alpers, on the basis of Photios’ lexicon, μ 64 Theodoridis: μαλάχη, οὐ μολόχη· παρ’ οὔδενι γάρ κεῖται κτλ.) (Alpers 1981:234). According to these texts and to the evidence for both forms in the Greek and Byzantine literature, it is clear that the Attic form is μαλάχη. Gregoras—or the compiler of the lexicon Hermanni—either misunderstood his source or made a mistake in excerpting the information from it.

This last case shows the importance of a careful textual analysis in order to offer a usable dataset for historical sociolinguistic research. Before using lexica copied or produced during the Palaeologan age as sources to determine the linguistic categories of the scholars of that period, comprehensive manuscriptological and philological studies of each single work should be carried out. Otherwise, false interpretations may alter the analysis (see Alpers 1990: 31).

An agenda for future synergistic research might therefore consider some of the following items: every single manuscript of each lexicon produced and/or copied in the Palaiologan period should be studied not only from a modern scholarly perspective usually aiming to produce critical editions of the original works, but also applying a more historical attitude aiming to discover those details in each copy which may lead to reveal their user(s) and reader(s): one can consider, for instance, the investigations on the manuscripts of Magistros’ Atticist lexicon (Gaul 2007). Each manuscript can contribute to clarify some aspects regarding the perception of language in the Byzantine world and provide more data for modern historical sociolinguists. Fully searchable and multi-layered editions which distinguish all textual strata and variant (or trivial) readings in each manuscript will therefore be important to a sociolinguistic approach.

Thus, mapping the field of linguistic categories used by the Palaeologan scholars to analyse their own language requires a concurrence of many skills and competences from different disciplines— which is actually what the present RT aims to.
Byzantine Text-Books as a Major Source for Historical Sociolinguistic Studies on Medieval Greek

In my paper I will be concentrating on late Byzantine text-books, the tools by which the Greeks – as well as the historiographers – learned how to use Greek. I will mainly focus on the sociolinguistic relevance of this particular kind of manuscripts, as they reveal how the Greeks themselves considered and described the varieties of Medieval Greek. My paper will be divided into three parts, where I will respectively 1) discuss the concepts of ‘school’ and ‘schooling system’ in late Byzantium; 2) define which sources are necessary, if we want to a) understand how the Byzantines would learn Greek in early Palaeologan era, and b) know how they described the two most important varieties of Medieval Greek, namely ‘Attic’ and ‘Koiné’ Greek; 3) outline the potentialities of historical sociolinguistic studies on Medieval Greek beyond Byzantium.

‘School’ is the inevitable starting point of any inquiry on the relationship between a language and its community. Effectively, it is at school that a society learned its language, and teachers shaped and customized teaching methods, in order to address contemporary social needs. So, the better we know how the Byzantines learned and were taught Greek, the better we can understand the relevance and the social role which Medieval Greek played in Byzantium. This is one of the goals of sociolinguistic studies, the one which I would stress in my presentation.

In the second part of my presentation, I will focus on the definition of ‘text-books’. As it is known, recent studies (e.g. Bianconi 2015) pointed out that ‘text-book’ is a very problematic concept. For example, it is difficult to unequivocally define whether a book, which has been commented and annotated by an erudite on personal use only, was also employed in didactic contexts. Moreover, it is impossible to exclude that very old manuscripts (even these dating back to the IX/X centuries) were used by Palaeologan teachers. However, in a sociolinguistic perspective, whether if it is a book used at school, or annotated by a scholar, the manuscript gives us back the language that was taught, that people wanted to learn and, therefore, that could be studied individually too, and shows how the Byzantines perceived and used their language.

The concept of ‘text-book’ will also enable me to define which are the most important sources for historical sociolinguistic analysis on Medieval Greek, which 1) reveal us how the Greek language was taught in Palaeologan schools; and 2) allow us to reconstruct which words, syntactic constructions, etc., were considered to be ‘Attic’ and which ‘Koine’ by the Byzantines themselves. In respect thereof, I will underline that not only Lexica, but also commentaries on Greek classics, Schedographia, and Erotemata are sociolinguistically relevant genres.

In the third point of my presentation, I will be discussing the problems related to the choice of the corpus of manuscripts, which may enable historical sociolinguistic studies on Medieval Greek. Among Palaeologan scholars, I will focus on Manuel Moschopoulos, the didactic issue being a regular
feature in all his exegetical and grammatical works. Clearly, there is a trail of evidence linking Moschopulos to his educational path and his target audience: Moschopulos’ didactic purposes were in step with the social goals of the educational system of the early Palaeologan era, which was mainly aimed at building civil and religious functionaries and at increasing the social prestige of the educated elites. As mentioned in part two, these were required to master the Atticizing variation of Medieval Greek, as communication and performing skills in this variety of Greek would affect one’s career. As to Moschopulos’ didactic production, I will be looking at 1) the sociolinguistically relevance of his commentaries on Greek classics; 2) the characteristics of his *Schedographia* and *Erotemata*; 3) the success of Moschopulos’ didactic works.

In this part of my presentation, I will also stress two important aspects related to sociolinguistic studies on Moschopulos’ didactic production, namely 1) the difficulties of collecting and storing sociolinguistically relevant data (this will give me the opportunity to link mine to Wahlgren’s presentation on databases); 2) Moschopulos beyond Moschopulos. This last point concerns the fact that Moschopulean manuscripts have been constantly copied throughout the centuries and readers, as well as later users, have added commentaries and notes even to the oldest manuscript witnesses. These notes aimed to bridge Moschopulos’ exegetical gaps, but also reveal how the didactic of Greek had changed during the centuries and in the Renaissance, when western scholars learned Greek on (although not exclusively) Moschopulos’ text-books.

In conclusion: historical sociolinguistic studies are aimed at defining the social role of Medieval Greek within its speaking community cannot be undertaken without a thorough investigation of contemporary Byzantine manuscripts, particularly those related to the teaching of Greek. Manuscripts must be studied both in the context of their production and in the context of their reception, this will disclose new horizons to our research, for Byzantine manuscripts lived long after Byzantium and served to didactic purposes in the Humanistic period as well. Scholars undertaking historical sociolinguistic studies on Medieval Greek should not be discouraged by the amount of data and the difficulty of analyzing these. On the one hand, historical sociolinguistics has sensibly advanced in the last decade: for example, see the series edited by Nils Langer et al. “Historical Sociolinguistics. Studies on Language and Society in the Past”, the Viennese forum for Sociolinguistics (http://www.oeaw.ac.at/sociolinguistics/), the project on Moschopulos’ commentaries on Sophocles (http://www.oeaw.ac.at/byzanz/sophok.htm), the newly established Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics (http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/jhsl). On the other hand, new technologies and advances in the field of Digital Humanities will provide historical sociolinguists with more and more properly designed databases, which are indispensable tools for storing and effectively use the great amount of data.
Database Design and Sociolinguistics: Considerations for ByzTec (the Byzantine Tagged Electronic Corpus)

The chief aim of my presentation is to highlight the need for electronic corpora in sociolinguistic research. First, I will devote some time to presenting a tagged corpus of Byzantine texts (called ByzTec) currently in preparation, as well as to discussing the background of this undertaking and some aspects of the design, aims and content of this corpus. Proceeding from this, I will discuss how such a corpus may be employed in sociolinguistic research.

My own starting-point (which ultimately took me to electronic corpora) was an interest in the use of formal varieties of Greek in Byzantine times, and especially an interest in syntactic rules. It can be said that this kind of Greek has been generally ignored by scholars, and that there has been a tacit agreement that formal Byzantine Greek is nothing but Ancient Greek and not worthy of independent study. Therefore, there has been almost no research undertaken with a view to finding out to which extent Byzantine Greek has a dynamic of its own and follows its own rules—rules that we, if we care to, might be able to identify and describe. However, it should be mentioned that a certain change is in the air, and it can be predicted that Byzantine Greek linguistics will establish itself as an independent branch of scholarship in the years to come. (For an overview of the state of the art, see Hinterberger 2014; yet even here, any discussion of the need for the development of tagged corpora as a research tool is lacking.)

My current research justifying the need for an electronic corpus (i.e. explaining why I have turned to linguistic markup and electronic tagging) is focused on syntactic variation in formal Byzantine Greek of the middle and late periods, especially of the tenth and fourteenth centuries (the concept of “formal Byzantine Greek” is used here in a deliberately vague sense; for different reasons, I do not restrict myself to only the most high-level texts, but I do exclude texts of a clearly Modern Greek type). Focus lies on diachrony and irreversible change: how do all texts of the fourteenth century differ from all texts of the tenth century? Further, attention is paid to register and text type: what correlation is there between language form and subject matter?

Texts of different kinds, from the tenth as well as the fourteenth century, have been included in my corpus. So far, there is a special focus on epistolography (including authors such as Nikolaos Mystikos, Symeon the Logothete, Nikephoros Gregoras and Nikephoros Choumnos) and historiography (including authors such as Symeon the Logothete, Leo Diakonos, Nikephoros Gregoras and Michael Panaretos).

The markup I introduce into the corpus includes tags for case and particles and will, in the next stage, hopefully, also take word order into account. In my research I pursue questions of semantics and pragmatics.
At the outset, data were compiled with highly traditional methods: texts printed on paper were marked up, indices were consulted, and searches in databases such as TLG were conducted. Approximately two years ago, the project went 100% electronic (and we may say that this was the point at which my undertaking became corpus linguistic in a proper sense; it was the moment when ByzTec was born). This was done in order to make data easier to handle and, ultimately, with a view to sharing with others (indeed, the success of a database should probably not be measured by its usefulness to its original compiler but by its interest to others). In the first stage of working electronically, files of texts were collected and basic tags, marking up morphological and syntactic features, were tested out in Word documents. In a subsequent stage, XML-files were produced using the Oxygen XML Editor (see https://www.oxygenxml.com/). During the last half-year, the Arethusa Annotation Framework (“Arethusa Editor” below) available through the Perseids platform (see http://sites.tufts.edu/perseids/) has been used.

Ideally, what editor we use in order to produce XML-files should not be all-important, since the desired result should not be dependent upon the methods used to arrive there (see, however, the following). In my presentation I will discuss the pros and cons of different kinds of editors, with special attention paid to the Arethusa editor, which is a very user-friendly option, but with some pre-set functions. This editor provides readymade solutions for morphological, morpho-syntactic-semantic markup, and for treebanking. I will discuss what these functions are and what we can, and cannot, do with them, and what potential there is for individual adaptation, one problem being functions we could wish for, but do not find included by the designers, another, perhaps more serious, problem being functions designed so as to take us into a specific field of linguistic theory and force us to look at language in a particular way (as exemplified by treebanking, which implies a specific kind of syntactic theory rather than one of the investigator’s choice).

In sum, we have to weigh readiness and simplicity against specific needs. The good news is that technical solutions are rapidly improving, and some of the limitations currently experienced are probably going to disappear within a short period of time.

Finally, my presentation will turn to sociolinguistic research, and I will argue that this could profit by the existence of tagged corpora. These could be designed with different aims in mind, and we will briefly discuss two kinds of corpora that may appeal to the sociolinguist.

First, the sociolinguist may want to use corpora containing linguistic markup of the conventional kind, such as that currently included in my corpus (ByzTec), and I will discuss how ByzTec may be used as a tool for sociolinguistic research already in its present form. The feature of ByzTec most likely to attract the sociolinguist may be that it includes texts written by people with different positions in Byzantine society. There is, in ByzTec, a special focus on epistolography, which is a very promising field for the inquiry into the construction and understanding of social status. The implications of knowing that you write to your superior, or your subordinate, have been an object of some research already but could yield a lot more. Also, questions of gendered language could be addressed. A possibly more subtle link to sociolinguistics could be constructed by putting to intelligent use the fact that texts from the tenth and fourteenth centuries respectively are included in the ByzTec corpus. As I have tried to show elsewhere, it can be argued that there is a subtext, tension, in the fourteenth century because of the existence of a more clearly different kind of Greek in the form of Modern Greek as an alternative. How writers handle this tension may be of interest to the sociolinguist.
Secondly, the sociolinguist could consider the compilation of a metalinguistic corpus dealing with attitudes towards language. This corpus would naturally have a strong focus on descriptive and normative literature, such as that of the grammarians, or rhetorical literature, but it could also include other kinds of texts. There are several ways to proceed here. To establish correlations between words and value judgements pertaining to them (what is “right,” “wrong,” “Attic,” “Koine,” or even “good” or “bad”?) is one way to go. Further, we may want to look into other disciplines and their use of Digital Humanities (Semantic Web?) and discourse analysis.

At last, a very tentative parting shot. The sociolinguistic concerns outlined are very much questions of normativity. However: what is normativity, and how do we recognise it? Some texts on grammar (as indeed some very important ones from Antiquity, such as Dionysios Thrax) are, at least on the surface, strictly descriptive, and they do not (directly) tell us anything about right and wrong. Yet in their reception (at the very latest) they turn out to be highly normative. How do we include them in the equation?
Regulating the Page, Guiding the Experience: 
Practices of Textual Organization in Nikephoros Gregoras’ Roman History

Nikephoros Gregoras (d. ca. 1360) wrote and circulated his *Roman History* in Constantinople in several instalments starting from the 1340s. Today the work is preserved in more than forty manuscripts, two of which—codd. Vat. gr. 165 and 164—were partially copied, annotated and revised by Gregoras himself. The *pinakes* and chapter titles in both codices indicate that the latter were designed as an edition of the first seventeen books of the *History*. My contribution to this RT analyzes the “editorial” decisions the two Vatican manuscripts display, such as the chapter division and its relationship to the *pinax* of each volume, and the role of chapter titles in guiding the readers’ attention, memory, and emotional response or alternatively, in directing how the text should be performed.

In the introduction to his *Roman History*, Gregoras stated that history told the story not only of people, cities and empires, but also of the heavenly movements and thus, provided knowledge of the past, which in turn, together with the ability to read the celestial signs divine providence furnished, assured that people could make predictions about the future: “But now it <history> makes those who come next prophets […], since they guess the future events based on the past.” Eleven books later, on a rather different note, Gregoras remarked that his historical œuvre was not only intended to satisfy the desires of those interested in the new and recent affairs, but also to indulge him as it brought him no small pleasure to pursue the diverse and varied stories.

The beginning of book XII, that is, the beginning of the second instalment of the *History*, written probably after 1344, contains one of the very few autoexegetical reflections related to the meaning of writing history and to the readership of Gregoras’ work (italics mine):

So such among the advantages of the history persuaded me also to describe the events that happened in my time, both to deliver *stories great and worthy of earnest hearing to those men who love the beautiful* and to inspire great comprehension with regard to what is suitable in *those who desire to receive experience of ever newer affairs*. For, in a way, also to me the deed brings not insignificant *gratification* in relation to a certain state of the character, as well as no small *pleasure*, when I pursue more extensively the *diverse* and *varied* among the stories from one to another …

Thus, Gregoras emphasized the appeal of the novel and the importance of the aesthetic principle of diversity or ποικιλία. While the rhetorical character of Byzantine historiography is yet to be explored more thoroughly, the tension between truthfulness and accuracy, on the one hand, and aesthetic appeal and entertainment, on the other, is recognisably essential to ancient and medieval Greek history-writing and has a long tradition going back at least to Lucian and his essay titled *How to Write History*.
The present contribution examines a copy of Gregoras’ *Roman History* which comprises the first seventeen books and is designed as a two-volume edition of the work. Numerous corrections, titles and marginalia are penned by the author’s own hand. The inquiry is particularly interested in two groups of chapter titles and marginal notes. The first group suggests that a particular emotional response is required from the reader, such as lament or sorrow. The second group emphasizes the authorial presence in the (hi)story by pointing out either interpolated orations and letters written by Gregoras, or by referring to his auto-reflections on his own role as a writer of history or simply as the author of the work. Based on the examples surveyed, the autograph interventions in both manuscripts and the larger context of the self-exegetical remarks in Gregoras’ œuvre, the present contribution argues that the *Roman History* was intended not only as an authentic description of recent and eye-witnessed events, but also as a vivid and emotional read, not due to its use of rhetorical devices, but rather to the very nature of the events it told.

The pinakes of both volumes list the chapters each *logos* or ‘book’ is subdivided into. The chapter titles, of which the existing critical edition does not give an indication, usually concern topics such as battles, embassies, the emperor’s coronations, ascension and descent from the patriarchal throne, the death of important historical actor, explanations of the causes of a particular event or of the motivation for an action, especially if performed by the emperor, character descriptions, wars, and speeches delivered, but also more curious topics such as the measuring of a sculpture and its horse indicated on fol. 4r, l. 17 in Vat. gr. 165. In line with Gregoras’s astronomical expertise, celestial phenomena such as eclipses and their descriptions are also singled out.

The chapter titles as found in the pinakes are also found in the margins next to the relevant subsections. Importantly, speeches and orations of every kind are marked as separate chapters and usually labelled as δημηγορίαι. Letters are titled and indicated as separate items as well.

*Case study I: Evoking emotion*

Vat. gr. 165 or *Roman History*, vol. 1 and Vat. gr. 164 or *Roman History*, vol. 2

We find pinax entries suggesting what the readers’ emotional response to a given topic or event should be in Vat. gr. 165 fol. 3r, ll. 13 and 26, both of them indicating terrible events worth lamenting and crying for. Like Vat. gr. 165, the second volume of the *Roman History* also contains marginal notes which guide the reader to noteworthy passages and, moreover, to passages which should evoke a particular emotional response, usually lament, grief and tears, for instance, on fols. 94v and 110r, both written with red ink in the outer margin. Occasionally, the volume’s ‘editors’ note that the feeling should be further intensified, for instance, on fol. 101r.

*Case study II: Authorial presence*

Some chapter titles in Vat. gr. 165 emphasize the author’s involvement, for instance, as listed on fol. 4v, ll. 4, 11 and 12. The same principle is kept throughout Vat. gr. 164 as well, for instance on fols. 43r and 142r.
Laonikos Chalkokondyles’ Revolutionary Classicizing and Audience

Laonikos Chalkokondyles composed his Herodotean style history, Ἀπόδειξις Ἱστοριῶν, concerning the rise of the Ottomans and the fall of the Hellenes sometime after 1464, when Laonikos’ narrative ends with the events of the Ottoman-Venetian war. Information on Laonikos’ biography is scarce and ambiguous and does not allow one to definitively conclude where and when he wrote his History. In the Ἀπόδειξις, Laonikos provided an account about his aristocratic family who were expelled from their native Athens after the murder of the Florentine Duke of Athens, Antonio I Acciajuoli, as well as a story about his father George Chalkokondyles, who was sent on an embassy to the Ottoman Sultan Murad II by Antonio I’s widow. Cyriac of Ancona, in his diary entry for late July/early August 1447 when he was visiting George Gemistos Pletho in Mistra, mentions meeting the youthful Nikolaos Chalkokondyles, who was “remarkably learned in both Latin and Greek literature.” Furthermore, students of Laonikos have noted the inclusion of extensive portions of Ottoman Turkish lore in the Ἀπόδειξις and have pointed out its correspondence with contemporary Ottoman historiographical narratives, concluding that Laonikos must have had access to such material when he was living under Ottoman rule in the aftermath of the fall of Constantinople, Athens, and Mistra to Mehmed II. Laonikos’ narrative on Islam is exceptionally well informed in contrast to Byzantine tradition and he introduces Islam as a cultural system comparable to Christianity and Judaism. In addition, a pro-Venetian and pro-Unionist perspective informs the Ἀπόδειξις from the proem through the end of book 10, when Laonikos sets up Venice as the most worthy and virtuous opponent to the tyrannical rule of Mehmed II. Thus, it is difficult to address questions of audience and authorial point of view as the text is multi-layered and contains shifts in perspective. However, Laonikos’ linguistic and historiographical choices contain precious information on his intended audience, on Laonikos’ authorial persona, and on the correct reading of the text.

On first glance, Laonikos uses a classicizing language, imitating both Herodotus and Thucydides. He indiscriminately employs both the Attic and Ionic forms of the same words. With respect to morphology, Laonikos attempts to reproduce pure Attic forms albeit not systematically. He also imitates Thucydides and Herodotus by repeating phrases that are common to the classical authors. Similar to Herodotus, Laonikos often uses the accusative with infinitive construction. (Darkó II: 350–360) In addition to morphology and syntax, Laonikos consistently adopts a classical vocabulary to refer to contemporary ethnicities and geographies. However, commentators on the text have also noted that Laonikos’ language is artificial, formulaic, and not fluent when compared with other fifteenth-century classicizing Greek texts (private communication with Professor Marc Lauxtermann). It is clear that Laonikos attempted to produce a high-register Greek text, which would only be available, in terms of vocabulary, morphology, and syntax, to an elite group of literati who had extensive education in classical Greek language and classical historiographical models. It is also evident that Laonikos was less than successful in reproducing Attic Greek, when compared
with Kritoboulos, the contemporary eulogizing historian of Mehmed II. While Kritoboulos’ text was not disseminated, only surviving in the autograph copy that was presented to Mehmed II which was not discovered until the nineteenth century, Laonikos enjoyed wide popularity and the Greek text survives in more than thirty manuscripts, and was first printed in Latin translation in 1556. Thus, Laonikos’ success with his audience did not coincide with proficiency in the high register as had been the case with previous classicizing Byzantine historians, possibly indicating a shift in the make-up of the target audience from well-educated native speakers of Greek to western readers less in tune with the demands of the language. While the author delivered a less than perfect version of the high register, the audience was expected not to be surprised at, for example, the interchangeable use of the Ionic and Attic forms, and to be able to follow the language, attesting to schooling in classical Greek. Linguistic virtuosity was not Laonikos’ strong point and the popularity of his text demonstrates that it was valuable to his audience for other reasons, most importantly the innovative Herodotean structure, originality in developing a Hellenic point of view in lieu of the standard Christian-Roman identity of Byzantine historiography, and authentic historical and ethnographic information directly translated from contemporary Turkish sources.

The organization of the Ἀπόδειξις closely follows the Herodotean model. Similar to Herodotus, who had integrated the wide-ranging information by a narrative structure focused on the military campaigns of the Persians, and the dynastic succession of the Persian Kings, Laonikos roughly divided the books according to the reigns of the Ottoman rulers and provided information on numerous peoples that were connected in some way with Ottoman campaigns and the decline of the Hellenes. While Herodotus was not used as a historiographical model but only as a source of information by the Byzantines before the fifteenth century and was virtually unknown in the medieval west, his text was translated into Latin by Lorenzo Valla in 1457. Valla belonged in the intellectual circle of Cardinal Bessarion, a student of Pletho, as well as of Laonikos’ cousin (or brother) Demetrios Chalkokondyles and he had asked Bessarion for help with the translation. Bessarion himself had studied Herodotus along with Pletho in Mistra and copied it in 1436 (Marc. gr. 365) before he emigrated to Italy to become Cardinal. Pletho owned a fourteenth-century copy of Herodotus, now the Laur. gr. 70.06, which still contains a bifolio in Pletho’s handwriting and an epigram on Herodotus, which was composed by Laonikos. Alberti has demonstrated that Valla had used Laur. gr. 70.06, the manuscript closely associated with Pletho’s Mistra Circle, as one of his three master copies for the translation (Alberti 1960: 287–90). By the end of the fifteenth century, Valla’s Latin Herodotus had already been printed three times in addition to its numerous manuscript copies, bearing testimony to its wide appeal. The Byzantine émigrés, who had the requisite linguistic and literary training to bring classical texts such as Herodotus to the west, individuals such as Valla, who had ties with those Byzantine émigrés, and the intellectual openness to revive dormant classical models provided the Italian setting for the renewed interest in Herodotus. While we do not have biographical information on Laonikos to definitively conclude that he was living in the west circa 1464, the congruence of Italian interest in Herodotus, Laonikos’ close study and emulation of Herodotus during the same time, and the proximity of the intellectual circles that revived Herodotus to Laonikos, at least suggest that he was conversant with and responded to that milieu. Thus, we should look for Laonikos’ intended audience among those elite western intellectual circles, having knowledge of classical Greek and receptive towards new trends, as they would be able to decode Laonikos’ Herodotean program and to appreciate the application of an ancient and forgotten model to understand contemporary reality and the imminent Ottoman threat.
Laonikos’ code-switching by referring to the protagonists of his narrative as Hellenes rather than as Romans (the self-representation of the contemporary historians Kritoboulos and Doukas as well as of traditional Byzantine historiography more generally), provides clues to Laonikos’ intended audience and to mutual assumptions about historical memory within that elite group. In the proem, Laonikos was explicit that historically and culturally the people inhabiting the land were Hellenes and drew attention to the dissonance of the onomastic practice of the rulers, who called themselves “emperors of the Romans.”

guarded their (Hellenic) language and customs until the very end because they (Hellenes) were much more numerous than the Romans. However, they (Hellenes) no longer called themselves according to their (Hellenic) hereditary tradition and the name was changed. And, thus, the Emperors of Byzantion were proud to call themselves emperors and autocrats of Romans and never found it worthy to be called emperors of Hellenes”

This passage has been repeatedly quoted in the secondary literature to argue that it presents one of the earliest specimens of Greek protonationalism and Laonikos has been hailed as harbinger of modern Greek identity (Vacalopoulos 1970). However, this anachronistic analysis configures Laonikos, as well as Pletho, whose Advisary Letter to Manuel II concerning the Peloponnese dated 1418 provides the intellectual framework for the systematic and wholesale application of Hellenic identity to contemporaries, to be the only fifteenth-century representatives of an ideological position that looks forwards rather than backwards. Should one contextualize Laonikos as a protonationalist historian working under the formative influence of Tourkokratia and belonging in the Ottoman Peloponnese and Athens? Who was Laonikos writing for? The answer partially lies in the reception of Laonikos’ text. When the Ottoman polymath Kâtip Çelebi (1609–1657) set out to translate portions of the Ἀπόδειξις into Ottoman Turkish as part of a book project focusing on Constantinople, Târih-i Kostantaniyye ve Kayâsire, he used the 1587 Latin print edition, Historia rerum in Oriente gestarum, rather than a Greek manuscript or the 1615 Greek print edition, which illustrates that the text was not as well-known nor as well-circulated in the east as it was in the west. (Kâtip Çelebi, Târih-i Kostantaniyye ve Kayâsire, ed. İbrahim Solak, [Konya, 2010]). The answer is also related to the ways in which intellectuals such as Bessarion and other émigré Byzantines represented themselves as Hellenes, distanced themselves from the Roman-Christian model, conceptualized Roman rule over the Greek east as an external power mechanism, and increasingly invoked a pre-Christian and pre-Roman classical Greek past when they negotiated their identities within the larger Italian society (Akışık 2011; Lamers 2015). Laonikos similarly forged Hellenic identity by distinguishing between the Romans and the native Greeks and by self-consciously invoking the pre-Christian and pre-Roman historiographical model of Herodotus. Laonikos’ formulation does fit in with the assumptions of this western elite group, pointing the way to the circles wherein Laonikos became the most popular fifteenth-century historian writing in Greek.

Laonikos holds a unique and privileged position among contemporaries writing in Greek, Latin, or one of the western vernaculars, for incorporating and translating considerable material from
Ottoman Turkish sources. Furthermore, Laonikos’ surprisingly gracious and veracious presentation of Islam is part of a greater religious discourse, in which he studies the three monotheistic faiths of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam as comparable cultural and administrative systems and does not ascribe metaphysical importance to them. Thus, students of Laonikos sensibly argued that he must have lived, worked, and learned Turkish under Ottoman rule, possibly returning to Athens as a branch of his family resettled there after 1458. However, this conjecture has deterred historians from correctly evaluating his target audience as that western elite group, versed in classical Greek. A close reading of the Ἀπόδειξις reveals that Laonikos negotiated between the Ottoman stories and genuine Islamic practices that he must have experienced first-hand and the expectations of his western audience. Profoundly, in spite of Laonikos’ comparative and relativistic religious framework, the civilized people are invariably Christians and the barbarians are always Muslims in the Ἀπόδειξις, with the exception of the Armenians who interestingly belong among the barbarians. On another note, Laonikos sometimes inserts Turkish words in the text but these are often accompanied by a description, such as when he quotes various Ottoman military posts: “the wine-pourers whom they call σαραπτάριοι,” “the standard bearers who are called ἐμουραλάμιοι”, and “the καρίπιδες, who are called the foreigners coming from Asia and Egypt and also Libya” (Darkó II: 9). Laonikos’ Herodotean model allows for the inclusion of such alien material but these are promptly translated into classicizing Greek for his supposedly uninformed western audience. Laonikos’ repeated references to Mohammed as the hero is the most startling instance of this negotiation process. Laonikos frequently employs this term in speeches by Muslim characters, fictive rhetorical devices expressing the point of view of the orator but also in his own descriptions and commentary on events. Translating the Prophet’s status as the warrior champion in the Islamic context with a value-laden and illustrious term in Greek culture since the time of Homer, Laonikos successfully bridges the gaping space between Renaissance Italy and Ottoman lands, preserving some of the exotic taste while making it at least palatable for his readers.
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Introduction

La période qui s'étend du XIIIe au XVe siècle connut une série d'événements et d'évolutions majeurs qui transformèrent radicalement l'empire byzantin et le monde alentour. La fragmentation de l'Empire, son affaissement économique et militaire face à ses voisins anciens et nouveaux, les profondes transformations de la société et de l'idéologie sont les principales caractéristiques que les historiens lui attribuent. Les nouvelles conditions qui prévalaient dans le monde byzantin et en Méditerranée orientale plus généralement, à partir du début du XIIIe siècle eurent des conséquences sur la production et la circulation monétaires.

Le vif intérêt qui s'est manifesté pour cette période dans les dernières décennies a suscité d'importantes contributions concernant les émissions monétaires de l'empire byzantin, des États voisins et de leurs partenaires commerciaux, traitant de l'interaction et de la coexistence des différents monnayages. Il a conduit aussi à des études de la circulation monétaire dans des zones spécifiques. Néanmoins, on n'a pas encore offert de synthèse couvrant la circulation monétaire dans la péninsule balkanique, l'Asie Mineure et les îles dans le contexte historique de ces derniers siècles. Cette table ronde se propose de combler cette lacune en réunissant des spécialistes des différentes aires concernées du pourtour de la Méditerranée orientale à la fin du Moyen Âge dans le dessein de publier grâce à ces contributions une évaluation à jour du domaine et un instrument d'orientation pour la recherche à venir.
Coin Circulation in Medieval Bulgaria
Recent Coin Finds from the 13th and 14th centuries

The paper covers individual and collective finds from regular archaeological excavations during the last one and a half decades. New information has been processed and generalized based on the huge amount of newly found coins, some of them still unpublished.

Most observations presented in this work are based on preliminary publications of archaeological excavations. Unfortunately in these cases there usually are no detailed informations about the context of these finds provided, nor a complete description of the coins, etc. So sometimes they could be interpreted only in a superficial way, till the detailed final publication is released. Furthermore has to be assumed that the statistical picture of these finds, especially their geographic dispersal is defined by the location the areas of intensive archaeological research in recent years.

Individual coin finds

Over the last 15 years a lot of information about individual coin finds has been gained. It can be noted that a significant number of coins have been found in most of the big medieval cities, like Tarnovgrad (Veliko Tarnovo), Preslav, Lyutitsa fortress (SW of Ivaylovgrad),the Varna region, especially - Kastritsi fortress, Kaliakra fortress, etc. This is related to the role that well protected settlements played. The protective function of the well fortified settlements, the deployment and accommodation of military units, the trade, the good transport connections, etc. All these factors influenced the economic development of the big towns which in turn increased the intensity of coin circulation. This is confirmed by the many numismatic findings located within the boundaries of big towns.

Individual coin finds are much more likely to be accidental losses than deliberate deposits.

The coin-distribution can be divided in two main regions: the hinterland and the Black Sea coastline. There are many similarities in the coin circulations, as well as certain differences.

The hinterland

The coins differ in denomination but smaller denominations generally prevail. The majority of these findings include byzantine coins. The peak of these finds relates to the reign of Emperor John III Doukas Vatatzes (1222-1254) and the reign of Emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos (1282-1328).
In the late 13th century till 1360/1370 the byzantine hyperpyra, especially the issues of Andronikos II with Michael IX Palaiologos and Andronikos II with Andronikos III Palaiologos were extremely popular and used as international currency on the territory of the Second Bulgarian Kingdom. Some of them belong to rare issues (Доцев 2013a, 109-120; Доцев 2013b, 129-138).

It is not surprising to find a lot of byzantine gold coins, struck during the period in question, on the territory of Second Bulgarian Empire. They have compensated the lack of own gold coinage, and were used for the needs of the fast developing trade and money exchange. The perpera of Ivan Asen II (1218–1241) from the numismatic collection of the National Institute of Archaeology with Museum in Bulgarian Academy of Sciences is the only one known Bulgarian gold coin from this period. To answer the need of golden coins at a certain point of time a local imitative coinage of the type Andronikos II with Andronikos III Palaiologos has taken place in Veliko Tarnovo (Доцев 2015b, 83-89).

Similar is the situation with the huge amount of Bulgarian and Latin imitative coins from 13th century, found on the territory of Bulgaria. The main organizer of the production of these coins is considered to be Venice, which aimed to expand its economic influence over the Balkans by continuing the minting of the traditional and well known coins in use, both on the territory of Byzantium and of Bulgaria (Доцев 2009, 19).

The second large group are coins minted by the Bulgarian rulers. Analysis of the numismatic material from the last 15 years shows that money circulation during the 13th century was most active during the reign of Mitso Asen (1256-1263) and Konstantin Asen (1257–1277) and in the 14th century during the reigns of Theodore Svetoslav Terter (1300–1322), Ivan Alexander (1331 – 1371) and Ivan Shishman (1371-1395).

During regular archaeological excavations of the fortress of Lyutitsa (SW of Ivaylovgrad) a lot of clipped or cut copper coins have been found (Петрунова, Петрунов 2015, 664-665). The phenomenon of secondary treatment of coins begins after 1242, as consequence of political instability, mostly due to the large tributes which had to be paid to the Mongolian khans of the Golden Horde and it leads to hyper devaluation (Доцев 2009, 20).

A huge amount of coin finds of Mitso Asen and Konstantin Asen have been found in Preslav, Turnovgrad and Ovech fortress during last 15 years (Жекова 2013, 304-310; Мялев 2014, 515-527). Through the monetary reform of Konstantin Asen the denomination of the copper coinage has been overcome.

The coin finds from last 15 years are also source of new information about the Bulgarian coinage. An unpublished legend type of the silver issue of the Bulgarian Tsar Georgi I Terter (1280-1292) has been found during archaeological excavations of Missionis fortress (NE of Targovishte) (Конаклиев 2008, 564).

Other interesting finds from Lyutitsa fortress are tornesi of the Principality of Achaea, mainly of Guy II de la Roche (1287-1308), Duke of Athens (Петрунов, Пеевски 2015, 11-12), which shows that the new vassal states of the Latin Empire tried to extend its control of the market in Bulgaria.

In big cities like Tarnovgrad, Preslav, Drastar (Silistra), Cherven fortress (S of Ruse), Gradishte fortress (NE of Tvarditsa town) coins of John II Orsini (1323-1335), the Despot of Epirus have been found.
As a consequence of Venice’s effort to take control over the trade routes on the Balkans some Venetian grossi have been found at Asen’s Fortress (S of Asenovgrad). They were clipped and after that used as akçe during 16th and 17th century (Морева-Ара́бова et al. 2015, 700). Venetian individual coin finds have been unearthed at Urvich fortress (Петрунова et al. 2012, 453). In 1346/47 and in 1352 trade contracts between Bulgaria and Venice were signed. Nevertheless the amount of Venetian silver coins remains low. The intensive Bulgarian silver mining increased the own silver minting, so there was no need of use of foreign silver coins (Лазаренко 2005, 219).

There are only a few written sources, which contain information about individual coin finds of Serbian coins from the hinterland. One of the sites is the medieval fortress Urvich (near the village of Kokalyane), where such coins have been found during regular archaeological excavations (Петрунова et al. 2012, 453). As a whole the percent of Serbian coins in the hinterland remains limited.

Coins of Sigismund, the King of Hungary (1387-1437) have been found in the area of Shumen fortress and Preslav (Ваклина́ова et al. 2013, 379; Жекова 2001, 429–443).

A rare silver coin minted by Mircea the Elder (1386-1418), the ruler of Wallachia has been discovered during excavations of the medieval monastery „Kireka” (near Madara, Shumen district).

One of the coins originates in workshop situated far from the place of discovery, such as the gold coin struck in the name of the Abbasid Caliph al-Hakim II (1341-1352). It has been found at Urvich fortress (Овчаров et al. 2015, 723). According to Ovcharov the Indian coin might have been brought by the Mongol troops.

The Black Sea coastline

The coin finds from the Black Sea coastline follow mainly the pattern of the hinterland, but there are two main differences. Compared to the hinterland at the sea coast more Venetian, Serbian, Wallachian and Mongolian coins have been found. In the last decades the systematic archaeological excavations of Kastritzi fortress and Kaliakra fortress brought a huge amount of individual coin finds (Плетньов et al. 2015, 678-681).

The Wallachian coins of Mircea the Elder from the Kaliakra fortress belong to his reign in the area from 1404 till 1417 (Петрунова et al. 2013, 421).

In Anhialo (Pomorie) a gros tournois of the King of France Louis IX (1226-1270) has been discovered. Only in Kastritsi fortress coins of John II Orsini (1323-1335) have been found in the same amount as in the hinterland.

One case of contramarked coins is known from the Kaliakra fortress. Two grossi of Stefan Uroš IV Duša (1336-1355) have been contramarked by Dobrotitsa, the ruler of the Principality of Karvuna and the Kaliakra fortress. The secondary reworking of coins is a common practice of Dobrotitsa. The control of a large territory and the political situation created the need of intensive coin flow and forced the authorities to clip and contramark coins to supply the market (Петрунова et al. 2010, 536-537). The coins were also clipped to reduce their weight and to match the late grossi issues of Ivan Alexander (1331–1371) and to the Wallachian dinars of Vladislav I (1364 – 1377).

A gold hyperpyron fourrée, which imitate the official issue of Andronikos II with Andronikos III Palaiologos (1341-1360?) has been found at the Kastritsi fortress during regular archaeological excavations in 2011. Two more exemplars are already known from Bulgaria. (Доцев 2014, 624-625).
**Hoard**

Archaeological excavations revealed more than 22 coin hoards from medieval times. Some of them include only Byzantine gold coins like the coin hoard from Sozopol, which includes Byzantine Hyperpyra from the Palaiologan period (Пенчев 2013, 261-263). The coins were clipped, probably by the financial authorities in Bulgaria. That practice is well known from other hoards with Byzantine gold coins (Михайлов 2011, 171-177).

A particularly interesting case is that of the hoard found at Dolishte village (Аксаково Municipality). The hoard includes a total of 13 gold Hyperpyra of Johannes III. Dukas Vatatzes and a secondarily reworked Hyperpyron of Michael VIII Palaiologos (Дочев 2015a, 74). A practice of secondarily treatment (overstruck or reworked with engraving tools) of gold Byzantine coins is well known from the territory of Bulgaria (Дочев 2013с, 93-99).

Other hoards contain only copper coins, like the hoard from Silistra (Пенчев 2012, 139-142), but those of silver coins predominate and mostly contain coins of different origin like the coin hoard found near Galabovo village (Смолян region). It is composed of 79 coins, struck between 1205 and 1354 and includes 5 Byzantine Hyperpyra, 73 Venetian grossi and one undated silver coin. The disposal of the coins is possibly connected with the Ottoman invasion (Бориславов 2008, 147). The presence of Venetian grossi in collective finds confirms their role in the coin circulation on the Balkans at the end of 13th – the first half of 14th century.

In Preslav a coin hoard, consisting of 56 silver grossi has been found. The hoard includes Venetian original grossi and imitations from the period 1268 to 1311 and Serbian original grossi and imitations from the period 1281 to 1361 (Конаклиев, Дончева 2009, 247-252). In the last quarter of 13th century the Serbian weight matched to the Venetian standard weight. At the beginning of 14th century the weight standard of Serbian, Bulgarian and Byzantine silver coins begins to significantly differ from the Venetian grosso. As a consequence the light Venetian soldino was inept for coin circulation on the Balkans.

Therefore another coin hoard found in Varna is of high interest. The coin hoard includes 26 silver coins mostly Venetian soldini from the period 1329 to 1342 and Serbian grossi from 1331 till 1355 (including several contramarked Serbian grossi) and Wallachian and Bulgarian coins from the period 1331 to 1396 (Лазаренко 2005, 215). It has been suggested that the soldini reached the medieval town of Varna between 1346 and 1352, before Genoa gained dominating influence in this region or were brought from Italian Seamen who, in 1366, joined the army of Amadeus VI, Count of Savoy.

By the late 13th century Varna had turned into a thriving commercial port city frequented by Genoese and later also by Venetian and Ragusan merchant ships. Varna and other large trade centres, mostly along the Black Sea, the Danube River, etc. introduced its own accounting perpera, so that the exchange rate was fixed by a treaty. From ca. 1350 until the end of the 14th century in many cases the payments, mainly in silver coins, were done by measuring the whole weight of the total payment amount.

At the end of the reign of Ivan Alexander Bulgaria lost big parts of her silver mining which resulted in weight lost of the Bulgarian grosso. The grossi got under 1 Gramm which corresponded to the weight of the soldini.

As a result of the decentralisation of the state, the Ottoman invasions, territorial losses, plague diseases, paying of war tributes, etc. a permanent devaluation of the silver coinage started. The
shortage of copper coins in the coin circulation leads to the production of large amount of unofficial imitative coinages, which were used even after the Ottomans conquest (Дочев 2009, 22-23).

**Coin finds with grave-context**

Some of the coins were deliberate deposited grave goods. One of the biggest grave depositions was the collective find from Sozopol, which contain 69 coins of the Principality of Achaea from 1246 till 1364 and two Venetian grossi.

There are more than 20 cases of medieval coins from burial context in recent years. The coins were recovered from around the skull, most likely originally placed in the mouth. They could be interpreted as a medieval version of Charon's obol. Bulgarian, Byzantine and Venetian coins from different denomination, mostly copper coins, sometimes cut in small pieces are part of the inventories.

The Coin Circulation in Medieval Bulgaria includes local and foreign coins, which had to match a certain weight standard. To fulfill the need for huge amounts of coins - Byzantine, Venetian and Serbian coins were adapted by clipping, contramarking or by secondary engraving them by the financial authorities.
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Circulation of non-Byzantine coins in the two coasts of the Aegean

Let me begin by emphasizing the broadness of this topic, that is to say all coins which are not Byzantine for a good two and a half centuries along the coasts of the Aegean Sea, which are actually geographically and also conceptually three to four coasts, namely the area from Cape Maleas in the Peloponnese to Mount Olympus, from the Thermaic Gulf to the Dardanelles, from the latter to Rhodes and Kasos, and finally the north coast of Crete. Including eastern Thrace and Constantinople, and the central Aegean islands would add further complexity.

The vastness of the endeavour is further increased if one were to believe, as I do, that the role of Byzantine coins after 1204 in all of these areas, even those controlled by the empire, were as a rule marginal and that therefore by definition most monetisation was non-Byzantine. This begs of course the question of what is to be considered Byzantine and not. For instance, are the trachea known as Bulgarian and Latin imitatives, which constituted the last pan-Aegean copper-based coinages, Byzantine by virtue of their monetary tradition or non-Byzantine because of their issuing authorities? A very similar question may be asked of the hyperpyra in the name of John III Vatatzes, issued by Byzantines and Latins, which again was the last large Byzantine-style gold issue which one could readily encounter in places as diverse as the Peloponnese, Macedonia, or the Anatolian coast. The matter becomes even more complex, in fact leading to an almost futile exercise, when one begins to look into bullion, metrology, and denominations. The stravaton and aspron denominations which were the result of the monetary reform of John V Palaiologos in ca. 1372 were presumably minted from a mix of Venetian and Bulgarian silver coins according to Neapolitan and Ottoman weight standards, so how are they to be considered Byzantine in any meaningful sense?

The best way to get to grips with this subject matter is to define and confine it. Firstly, I will focus very precisely on the lands bordering on the Aegean Sea since in my experience, for instance in Thrace or in Anatolia, the difference in coin usage between the immediate coastal area and inland regions could be very large. This is testimony to the fact that coin circulation was after a certain point in time mostly commercial in character and seabornd. The major shift in this respect took place in the middle of the thirteenth century, before which, in the shape of the coinages which have already been mentioned, larger cross-Aegean coin movements were still mostly military. Second, my focus will be precisely on circulation rather than on production, since of course the Aegean Sea hosted a number of mints emitting non-Byzantine coins from the thirteenth century onwards. Finally, I will proceed not so much by giving a complete history of foreign coins in the later medieval Aegean, but by isolating a few of the most poignant chapters and making some postulations regarding each of these. The most important insight is that more coinages than traditionally assumed are to be considered pan-Aegean, whereas others are clearly not.

The first is this:
1) During the Third and Fourth Crusades Western and Eastern Coins Came to the Aegean in Significant Quantities, and Some Remained in Circulation for a Considerable Time

A lot has been said about the kinds of coins which the participants of the various crusades brought with them, and also about the routes which these crusades took. I would like to underline a few aspects here: some of the relevant coins appear to have been lost “en route” through the Aegean, for instance on the island of Thasos, Ainos in Thrace, or in Lycia, or on the internal routes through the Balkans and Anatolia in the case of the Third Crusade, but there are still countless Aegean finds, for instance from Corinth and other parts of the Peloponnese, from Izmir or Samos, which are apparently less connected with direct crusading movements. This observation requires one to move away from Metcalf’s concept of traveller’s hoard, first formulated in the 1960s but going back to the work of previous numismatists such as de Vogué or Schwabacher, which is further undermined by the sheer quantity of these coinages, constituting in terms of value a significant part of monetization between ca. 1190 and 1210. Also stray finds suggest a wider usage, hoards can mix eastern and western coins so are not one-time accumulations, and finally, as has been observed more recently in the case of hoards from Samos, Izmir, and Ainos, or even that of Lindos on Rhodes, their dates of concealment may indeed have been at later points of the thirteenth century or even after. In summary, we witness here coinages that came to the area at certain points of entry, very frequently as part of the crusades themselves, but were then further used, hence their distribution across other parts of the Aegean, and their losses, which might have occurred significantly later. Some of these same coinages might also have entered the Aegean as part of other movements of people, mostly trade related. There are also some other possible secondary manifestations in this respect, for instance the transfer of relatively early Champagne pennies from Italy, which they reached from the famous fairs, to the Aegean as part of the involvements of the Hohenstaufen, and especially the Anjou, dynasties. Such movements also introduced southern Italian pennies. Typical crusader manifestations are the following: the French feudal issues of Valence, Le Puy, Melgueil, and specifically for the Fourth Crusade Limousin, Turenne, Limoges, and others. From Italy we should point to the omnipresent Lucca pennies, important for crusaders and traders alike, and the Veronese and Venetian pennies which are more closely associated with early commerce. Again, for some of these Italian coins the differences between twelfth and thirteenth century productions and usages are often difficult to establish. From the East, the crusaders brought Antioch and Edessa coppers, and later pennies; anonymous Byzantine-style copper coinages which have traditionally been attributed to Trebizond under the Gabrades but are now considered to be Syrian. Corinth in particular has also been the source of more traditional Seljuq coppers.

The Fourth Crusade and the events following it were milestones in the monetization of the Aegean: they produced and proliferated the so-called Bulgarian and Latin imitative coinages which have been mentioned, and they also drew Anatolian Seljuq issues into the Aegean, to places such as Naxos and Crete, and they introduced two very important western coinages which go beyond the mere crusader dimension, French tournois and English sterlings.

The next postulation is the following:

2) The French and Frankish Denier Tournois Was a Pan Aegean Coinage

The importance of the denier tournois coinage produced at the Latin mints in Greece, especially Clarentza, Thebes, and Naupaktos, from the 1260s to the 1340s has long been noted. These coins are contained in many collections and found in many Greek hoards, and are identified...
as such as a large coinage by any measure. There are two lesser known matters which I would like to impress on you today. The first is that in significant parts of the Aegean, for instance Thasos, Ephesos, and Constantinople, and in fact all the surrounding areas of Thrace and northern Anatolia, these Greek issues took a very significant place in the local circulation at a stage between Byzantine and Ottoman silver coins. This was a process which began in the 1280s. The second is that before this occurred tournois of French abbatial, royal and feudal mintage were already available in very diverse areas, often together with English sterling pennies to which they related domestically in northern France, the Low Countries, and western Germany. The areas, away from the Peloponnese and Central Greece, are Thessaly, Macedonia and Thrace, Constantinople, the central and eastern Aegean islands including Crete. This is a tradition which began with the Fourth Crusade, as has been noted, but continued then over the different decades. In fact we can identify amongst the coins specific issues of the Abbey of St. Martin and of sterling classes 1-4 which date just before 1204, and other coins postdate this. There are diverse reasons for these movements, internal monetary policy in Capetian France, Louis IX and the Seventh and Eighth Crusades which introduced tournois to the Mediterranean, the Anjou take-over of Sicily and the Treaties of Viterbo, Achaian political ascendancy, and the growth in international trade.

3) The Venetian Grosso Was a Pan Aegean Coinage

The Venetian grosso was conceived well before the Fourth Crusade but became prominent in the Aegean only from the 1220s, perhaps a little bit earlier in parts of Epiros and Sclavonia according to Greek and Latin documents. The grosso was therefore not a crusader coin, as had been believed in the past, neither one intended for the fledgling colonial empire of the republic, nor specifically for international trade. In fact the areas which Venice was most active in, politically and economically, that is to say parts of the Peloponnese, Negroponte, Crete and the Cyclades, and Constantinople itself, were dominated by other western coins for much of the thirteenth century, whereas the grosso developed gradually as the main higher value coinage of choice precisely in Epiros, Thessaly, and then in Macedonia. By about 1300 the entire Aegean became unified in its usage of the grosso. In combination with the tournois this was the main monetary system of the area, at the basis of the different regional hyperpyra of account, for instance in the Peloponnese, Thebes and Negroponte, Sclavonia, Crete, Chios, and Macedonia. The only other regional differences which continued to exist at this point was the level and nature of the petty copper coinages below, and the veneer of Byzantine gold above, which certainly still defined the monetary system of the imperial capital, although even for Macedonia we may ask ourselves how much gold coinage was effectively present. The unified Aegean area was again broken up in the course of the 1330s and 1340s, the reason being the introduction of new Venetian denominations in Greece and Crete, the infiltration of new grossi from the Balkans, and different developments for the Anatolian beyliks. These topics will be discussed below. The grosso however continued belatedly its success story in Thrace and the imperial capital, becoming arguably the basis also there for the accounting system as the Byzantine gold coinage declined. The second type of Venetian grosso, minted from 1379, is usually absent from the Aegean and noted only for the Levant, but has now been identified in Thrace in a hoard and as strays. This opens up two interpretative possibilities which require verification: perhaps this area continued to attract international trade despite of the internal instabilities; and perhaps such imported coins continued to support a local standard of account beside the less trustworthy hyperpyron based now on the new Byzantine stavrata and their fractions?
4) The Circulation of Coinages of the Carlino Tradition from Provence, Naples and Sicily Was Significantly Different in Eastern Central Greece and Western Anatolia

The main currency to be considered here is the gigliato of Robert of Anjou (1309-1343). This has been found in some quantities in Attica, Boiotia, Ephesos, Miletos, Kasos island and surrounding areas. This body of material has traditionally been viewed together, also because little differentiation could be made between the coins. Nevertheless, few global interpretations have been offered and any remarks made were very casual, for instance Metcalf evoked again the idea of traveller's hoards, especially in the case of Catalan Greece; and Spufford the Crusade of Smyrna. Gigliati in the name of Robert can now be confidently divided into Provencal and Neapolitan issues, the Neapolitan issues have been grouped into about six or seven groupings which date successively from the 1310s to more than a century later, and local Aegean imitations can now be easily identified. Robertini are variously grouped with gigliati of the earlier Charles II of Anjou or new issues from Aragonese Sicily, or Rhodian and Chiot issues from the Aegean. This added detail shows that between the 1300s and the 1330s the Catalan presence introduced this currency more or less systematically to Attica and Boiotia, where it was used, but then discontinued probably in favour of Venetian soldini and then torneselli. It was only at this point that this currency established itself primarily in the emirates of Anatolia and in Hospitaller and Genoese territories, and eventually Byzantium. The link between Greece and the east may therefore be different to what has been traditionally assumed. This circulation and usage in Anatolia was in fact primarily commercial and then political in character, but the importance of warfare and crusade may be mostly discounted. The heights of gigliato importations were precisely the periods of peace, in the 1330s and again the 1350s, but in fact the currency reached Anatolia also in later periods. Much as the second Venetian grosso type, these later gigliati add to this idea of positive trade balances with the west in periods in which this may not have been expected.

5) The Venetian Tornesello and Soldino Were More Pan-Aegean Coinages Than Has Previously Been Believed

The stories of the soldino and the tornesello are very well known, thanks mostly to the work of Stahl: they put the Venetian domestic and colonial systems of account on new and cheaper footings, with the aim of operating more efficiently and cheaply and exploiting the colonies at greater profit. These coinages also forced many of the pre-existing coinages out of production and circulation. The fact that soldini and torneselli dominated the Adriatic, Greece, and Crete, has long been noted, but recently they have been identified at distinct locations in the northern and eastern Aegean. Add to this the fact that soldini were for instance minted at Lesbos, and tornesi from 1372 at Constantinople, one must move towards regarding these lower to medium-range denominations as pan Aegean, short lived ones in the case of soldini from the 1340s to ca. 1400, but more lasting ones for torneselli.

6) Western Gold Coinages Seem to Have Had A Different Circulation in Greece and Anatolia, but This is Difficult to Assess

The ducat and florin in the Aegean is again a large chapter, on which there has been ample if sporadic literature. Again, I would suggest to split Greece from Anatolia, in terms of chronology and intensity. Greek finds are very rare but some private acts from urban contexts, and from the higher eschelons of political life, suggest that especially ducats were available in the central years of
the fourteenth century. This is certainly also the period in which ducats first reached Anatolia and the eastern islands, but the prolific issues which have now been attributed especially to the mints of Chios and of Ephesos, less so to Pera and Lesbos, identify the years around 1400 as the high point of availability. I would surmise that these local issues came about through the re-mintage of imported Italian coins of the same type and are therefore a good indication of circulation. Technically and chronologically it is not imaginable that Byzantine gold had much of a hand in this process.

7) Serbian and Bulgarian Coins Intermittently Penetrated the Aegean Region Between the 1340S and the 1380S

There was a short phase around 1300 when the new Serbian grossi of Venetian style became prominent in the Aegean, but this was a matter of general circulation since it appears to be that anywhere in the Adriatic and beyond a certain percentage of all grossi happened to be Serbian by virtue of their good quality. More distinctive and enigmatic is the later Serbian and then the Bulgarian silver issue penetration into the Aegean area. Much as in the case of the gold which has just been discussed, the presence of Serbian grossi bearing the cross, 'de cruce', is indicated more strongly in Ragusan and other sources than it is in the numismatic record. Why this is the case is difficult to tell. The fact is however that for a couple of decades from the 1330s to the 1350s, on the evidence of this, Thessaly and especially Macedonia saw Serbian grosso circulation. This evidently had political motivations, but as a phenomenon was always marginal. The movement of Bulgarian grosi into the Aegean was later and unrelated, though even here much remains enigmatic. The uncertainties surround the datings of the joint issues of Ivan Aleksandur and Michael, officially ending in 1355. The typological work of Penchev and Youroukova suggest that they were produced well into 1360s or later. This coinage was also quite large, which begs the question of how the Second Bulgarian Empire at this stage of its existence managed to maintain such a significant silver currency. According to relatively recent numismatic evidence, grossi of this types reached Aegean Thrace, Constantinople, and even Anatolia, mostly in the 1360s. How it was drawn there is perhaps easier to explain, the Ottoman penetration along the Maritsa river and the Byzantine campaigns on the Black Sea under John V.

8) The Importance of Ottoman Coinage from the Last Third of The Fourteenth Century is Difficult to Assess but May Have Been Larger in Inland Areas Away from the Aegean

Islamic coinages in the Aegean before the Ottomans made very sporadic appearances indeed. We have heard about a few Seljuq specimens from the time of the Fourth Crusade. The great Anatolian coinages from Armenia and Trebizond came to the Aegean sporadically in the 13th century and a bit later, partially perhaps because of the Mongol unification of large territories. A coin from Mongol Crimea has been found in the Peloponnese. Nevertheless, beylik coinages after 1300 are mostly known from collectors’ catalogues and have seldom been analysed in archaeological, geographical and numismatic context, save for rare occasions as was the case with the great Isa Bey hamam hoard from the lower town of Seljuk. In this period, perhaps the 1370s, gigliati and akces might have had separate circulations and usages there. The Ottoman mints of Edirne and perhaps Bursa managed to augment their productions under Murad I, again in the 1360s and especially 1370s, and this was the first period that these akces mix themselves in with the prevailing currencies, in due course mostly the Byzantine stavrata and aspers. Byzantine and Ottoman issues can rarely be separated in the written sources, which are anyhow not particularly plentiful outside of certain urban contexts in Thessalonike.
and Constantinople. Actual Ottoman coin finds are very rare indeed, for example the whole of Greece is largely devoid of them until the later fifteenth century, a couple of coins from the Athenian Agora and Corinth provide exceptions. An interim period hoard from Thasos is a very rare additional manifestation from the Aegean. In the Balkans, most early Ottoman coin finds are from Bulgaria. The fact of the matter is that the new Byzantine silver currencies did not themselves have the reach to propel also the Ottoman silver coinage into more faraway parts of the Aegean.

9) The Overall Quantity of Foreign Coins Reaching the Aegean Region After 1420 Appears to Have Been Much Smaller Than Previously, Although There are Some Outstanding Questions in This Regard

This is in the way of a conclusion. The aforementioned torneselli were wound down in the 1410s and 1420s, as were Neapolitan and Rhodian gigliati. Older soldini and tournois were falling out of circulation, Serbia and Bulgaria had been defeated, stavrata, and Ottoman and Byzantine aspers, did not offer much in terms of wider coverage, and it is difficult to see what currencies most inhabitants of the Aegean would have used on a daily basis. The gold coinages provide an increasing enigma, to which we must add a second currency, the anonymous grossi of Chios in the name of the city and King Conrad which are very difficult to date. It is nevertheless very likely that these need to be seen in a later 15th century context, grouped together with other new coinages such as the tournois from Campobasso, colonial Venetian coinages from Dalmatia and eventually Crete and Cyprus, as much as the second type of Venetian tornesello around 1500. As it stands the period from the 1420s to the 1450s was the low point in Aegean monetization largely due to a dearth in imports.
Provenances of the coins of Trebizond from A. D. 1081 to 1458.

The provenances of particular coins can be discovered in several ways, from recorded hoards, from official excavations and, often overlooked, acquisitions made by travellers in the past, a time not too long ago, after the recording of this information was recognised as being of importance but before local antiquity laws began to be tightened. The heyday of this appears to be the three decades of the 1950’s, 1960’s and 1970’s.

Hoard of the coins of the empire of Trebizond are comparatively few and not well recorded. There are about five hoards of the coins of Andronikos Gidon (1222-1235), one apparently from the Crimea, another from north-east Turkey, one of copper coins of Gidon acquired by M. O’Hara north of Ankara, while another hoard of the same types is reported to have been found in Trebizond and to reside in the Istanbul museum.

Of later coins, particularly aspers, many hoards have appeared in trade over the years without any secure provenance except for the 1938 hoard of aspers of Manuel I (1238-1263), John II (1280-1297) and Theodora (1285) from Platana, a suburb of Trebizond. Thirty-nine aspers of Manuel I found in excavations in Sudak in the Crimea may possibly represent a hoard; however, this short paper will not consider finds in the Crimea which was part of the empire of Trebizond in its early years and had close connections through Genoese trade with their colony at Caffa and indeed specimens of virtually every Trapezuntine ruler with the exception of Alexius IV (1417-1429) has been found there.

It can be seen that all these hoards with even the most general provenance have been found within what at the time was been the boundaries of the empire. This is by no means the case with finds of single coins although, of course, by far the majority, especially copper coins, have been found in Trebizond itself.

However, before considering the coins of the empire we should also consider those rare issues struck in Trebizond under Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118) and the Gabrades family in the very late eleventh and first years of the twelfth centuries and to do this we must turn to the acquisitions of collectors working or travelling in eastern Anatolia. These coins, 13 types, a number unknown before and several linked by overstrikes and all by the use of polygonally clipped flans, were, as a series, unrecognised until the mid 1970’s. That this happened was due to the sale at that time of the coins collected in Trebizond by David Winfield who worked there for seven months each year between 1958 and 1962 on the restoration of the church of Haghia Sophia and other local churches. Over these years he collected some 150 coins, 41 of the period of Alexius I and the Gabrades and over a hundred of the Empire.

As a result of the identification of this series it was possible to identify more provenances for the coins of these types found outside the bounds of what became the Empire of Trebizond. Specimens
have been found in the west in excavations in both Athens and Corinth, while in the east specimens were acquired in the 1960's in Konya, Kayseri and Diarbakır. In the 1960's such copper coins could be bought for a minimal amount, a few pence, and those acquired in provincial towns in the east will have been found locally since there would have been no imperative to transport such low value single copper coin great distances. This, of course might not have applied to hoards of silver aspers and coins acquired in Istanbul can be discounted as these could have come from anywhere.

That these Trebizond coins of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries were well known to the south and southeast is surely confirmed by the fact that the designs of certain types were copied, one by the Danishmend Amir Ghazi Gumushtigin (1104-1134) in Malatya and another type by Salduk ibn Ali (1157 – 1164) in Erzerum, while both these types appear to have also been copied by Tancred of Antioch, ruling ca. 1097 - 1112, while the coins of the Seljuks of Syria probably produced in Aleppo, were also struck on polygonally clipped flans.

There exists an extremely crude anonymous type with simply a cross on each side. This type was identified by both Sabatier and Wroth, surely correctly, as an issue of Trebizond in the mid- twelfth century since over 20 specimens have been found there. At least one was acquired in Konya. Importantly, one of these coins has been overstruck on a coin of Tancred which seems to indicate that not only did coins flow south from Trebizond but that Crusader coins travelled in the opposite direction.

The copper coins of the empire of Trebizond seem to indicate a general provenance similar to those of the twelfth century coins of the city. Again the majority are found in and around Trebizond. David Winfield acquired about a hundred and his friend Professor A. Bryer bought an uncertain number on his visits to the city over several years. These he donated to the Barber Institute but unfortunately they cannot be identified today.

Giorgi Jangiva, the Georgian consul in Trebizond for a number of years at the beginning of this millennium, also formed a collection locally and published those he considered the rarest. Apart from a single, unique, copper coin of Andronicus Gidon acquired by Professor George Bates in 1962 in Samsun, which was part of the Trapezuntine empire at that time, generally finds other than those from Trebizond itself tend to be found to the south and possibly southeast with Diarbakır, Kaiseri and Iskanderun being mentioned as places where individual coins were acquired although others have been apparently found in Greece and Bulgaria.

The majority of these coins were acquired by Nicholas Rhodes in his travels to eastern Turkey during his university vacations in 1965 and 1966. Although noted as an expert on the coinage of Nepal, a member of whose Royal family he married, at this time he seems to have had a particular interest in the coins of Trebizond although he does not seem to have visited the site. Certainly his friend and fellow student, numismatist Dr. Marcus Phillips, at present editor of the Numismatic Chronicle, related to the writer the difficulty Nicholas Rhodes had in finding a copy of Retowski at that time. Rhodes acquired 14 coins in Konya, apparently 12 in 1965 and two in 1966. In 1966 he appears to have acquired two of George (1268-1280) and I in 1965, one of John II (1280-1297), one of John III (1342-1344), one of Michael (1344-1349), four of Alexius III (1349-1390), three later anonymous coins, one of the late thirteenth century and two of the mid- fourteenth century and an anonymous coin of Trebizond of the early 12th century. These coins can hardly be a single hoard since they seem to have been acquired in two successive years and there are no coins of the emperors ruling between 1297 and 1342 while there is some difference in the patination on the later coins.
In the mid 1970's Rhodes sold these coins to a private collector whose collection of Trebizond coins has recently been acquired by the Ashmolean Museum [P.J. Donald] and two coins to the writer [S. B.]. Rhodes noted the provenances while the private collector [P.J.D] who has travelled in Turkey has mentioned Diarbakır and Iskanderun as sources of individual coins. Further south such coins do not appear to be found although the writer [S. B.] did acquire an asper from a Lebanese dealer, the only coin of Trebizond the dealer had ever seen and the only one the writer had seen in 20 years dealing with and from this region. Interestingly, it was not a common asper of Manuel I, John II or Alexius II but an extremely rare asper of Michael for whom even today possibly less than a dozen are known. Does this indicate a local find? One of the most interesting finds outside the empire was a hoard of 13 aspers of Alexius IV (1417-1429) which Nicholas Rhodes acquired in Tabriz in Iran on a later trip to the east in 1967. These coins are in considerably finer condition than those of this emperor found within the empire which are usually very worn and which had obviously circulated in the reign of David (1459-1461), Alexius’ brother, and surely later. Presumably these coins were carried in trade and, if so, it is interesting that such poor coins were acceptable for trade or travelling expenses outside the Empire.

All this information is sparse and little can be gleaned from it. However, it does seem that, with the exception of the Tabriz ‘hoard’ and possibly the asper of Michael from the Lebanese market, all these coins found outside the empire appear to be copper. In the earlier Byzantine empire, copper coins from the mint of Carthage are not uncommonly found in Anatolia but then the empire had a unified monetary system. Trebizond was different. Even under Alexius I it was rather cut off and had a certain degree of autonomy.

From this sparse evidence we have, however, while single coins both of the time of Alexius I and the empire might be found even as far west as Greece and Bulgaria it does seem from these reported finds and the copying of certain types by Islamic rulers and perhaps Tancred it does seem that Trebizond’s major connection by land was, apart from Georgia, with the Levant in the south.
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The Large and Small Module Trachea of the Thirteenth Century: Revisited Evidence

A peculiarity regarding coin production during the thirteenth century is the existence of trachea of at least two different sizes, which in the relevant bibliography are commonly described as large and small module trachea. Their metrological characteristics (theoretical weight and diameter), as well as their relative value (to each other, but also to the gold hyperpyron and the silver trikephalon) remain unknown. This paper presents new evidence that will shed light on these obscure thirteenth-century issues.
Coin circulation in medieval Serbia

The centuries-long domination of the Byzantine monetary system in the Central Balkans was definitely disrupted by the fall of Constantinople in 1204 and the weakening of the political and economic power of the remaining parts of the once powerful empire. The creation of new states and the start of minting in Bulgaria and Serbia, together with a substantial internationalization of the monetary market, led to changes in the monetary systems and the circulation of coins. These processes were gradual and multidirectional.

Initially, the first, modest signs of the internationalization of the monetary market appeared already at the time of the Komnenoi in the northern border areas and on the Adriatic coast. Coins minted by Hungarian rulers and Friesach entered circulation along the Danube border as the result of the increased population, the development of agriculture, the expansion of market-places and the renewal of trade in the Danube Basin. Thus the circulation of coinage minted by the Árpáds and Friesach was recorded in the main Byzantine Danube border forts of Belgrade and Braničevo. In the Central Balkans, however, the key role was played by the issues of gold, silver and copper coinage minted by Byzantine rulers, from John II Komnenos (1118-1143) to Alexios III Angelos (1195-1203).

Byzantine coinage played the same role on the eastern coast of the Adriatic, which was connected to Mediterranean city networks by sea routes. As attested in the documents of the Dubrovnik Archives, it retained this role in the first half of the 13th century. Thus it was stipulated in an agreement of 1232 that Dubrovnik must pay its annual tribute to Venice in the amount of 100 old gold hyperpyra of correct weight – ὑπέρπερος αὐρεος ὕπερτος ρήτης κοντέμου. In the second half of the thirteenth century, Byzantine gold coinage was being displaced by the new currency, that is, the Venetian grosso, whereas the memory of the earlier monetary system remained permanently recorded in the name of the money of account – the perperi. Already in 1252, Dubrovnik paid its tribute of 112 gold hyperpyra in Venetian grossi.-

As regards the issues of gold coinage, there is no doubt that they were the hyperpyra minted by John III Vatatzes (1222-1254), which also circulated largely in the interior of the Central Balkans. The most important find from this period is the hoard of coins discovered during archaeological research at Ćuprija. It contained seven hyperpyra minted in the period from the reign of Alexios I Komnenos (1081-1118) to the reign of John III Vatatzes, and sixty-three Friesacher pfennige. From Smederevo, Čitluk, Aleksinac, Džervin, Niš and Pirot there are stray finds of hyperpyra of John III Vatatzes.

Besides Byzantine gold coins, two Dubrovnik documents from 1242 and 1244, respectively, also mention the augustales of Frederick II (1220-1250). Even though the share of this coinage in the circulation of gold coins in the area was not substantial, it heralded new streams of money that resulted in the emergence of the Florentine florin and the Genoese genovino d’oro in 1252 and the Venetian ducat in 1284, which soon became predominant in the markets of the eastern Adriatic coast and the Central Balkans.
Similar to the fate of the Byzantine *hyperpyron* was that of Byzantine silver coins, which in the northern regions subsided before the issues of Central European coinage and in the southern and central regions before the Venetian *grossi*. Byzantine silver coins remained in circulation in the Central Balkans until the third decade of the thirteenth century. A unique deposit of electrum trachea of Theodore Komnenos-Doukas (1225-1230), minted in Thessalonica, came from the vicinity of Niš.

As already pointed out, the Friesach pfennig and Hungarian silver coinage had a large share in the circulation of coins. There are also the rare silver dirham minted at Sivas by the sultan of the Seljuks of Rum Ghiyath-ud-Din Kai Khusraw II (1237-1246) found during the archaeological excavations in Studenica.

Like the silver coinage, Byzantine issues of billon coins, which contained a low percentage of silver, were in circulation in the north of the Central Balkans until the fourth decade of the thirteenth century, at the latest, as evident from the numerous hoards of the coins deposited in this area.

This period also saw issues of coins minted by Serbian King Stefan Radoslav, whose *trachea* had a limited range of circulation. The coinage of Stefan Radoslav has been unearthed at the fort of Ras, as well as the remains of his mint, attested by finds of partially minted billon trachea, 19 flans and two ingots.

Finds of trachea of the second half of the 13th and the 14th centuries are quite rare. From Porečka reka near Donji Milanovac there are a tetarteron of Andronikos II and Michael IX, Constantinople and a stamenon of Andronikos III (1328-1341), Thessalonike and from Knjaževac a trachy of Andronikos II (1282-1328) struck in Thessalonike. A great number of byzantine coins of the 12th–14th centuries is recorded from Turn Severin (Iron Gates). They present a find-series of great importance.

Another area wherein copper coins were in circulation was the Adriatic coast, where autonomous cities, such as Dubrovnik and others, minted copper coins for local use. In addition to the local coins, foreign coins from faraway places were also in circulation in this market. Namely, in 1294, the Commune of Dubrovnik banned the use of counterfeit and foreign *follari*, as large amounts of them were in the city, causing damage to the economy. Listed among them are *stameni de Dyrachio et Romania* and *follari* from Armenia and Turkey, both old and new. The new coin finds from the Benedictine Monastery of St Mary in Dubrovnik contribute to the evidence of circulation of coins of the Sultanate of Rum, Persia and Egypt at the end of the 13th and beginning of the 14th centuries.

Following numerous changes in the thirteenth century, the end of the century saw the introduction, during the reign of king Dragutin (1276-1282/1316), of the Serbian dinar which represented one of the main currencies in the Central Balkans until the Ottoman conquest, due to the important exploitation of silver ore in numerous mines (Brskovo, Rudnik, Novo Brdo, Srebrnica, etc...). In addition to influencing the overall development of the economy and trade, the introduction of the dinar also influenced the process of monetization, which was not evenly developed in all parts of the state. The level of monetary exchange was much higher on the Adriatic coast than in the interior, where barter trade still played an important part. The monetization process was by all means accelerated by the introduction of the first local coinage, initially encompassing mining centers and major settlements. The monetary system was based on monometalism - minting in silver, except in the Littoral were the communes struck copper coins - *follari*.
The issues of the dinars de bandera of kings Dragutin and Milutin (1282-1321), relying on the increased production of precious metal in Serbia, became a commodity in great demand and the object of trade, for the most part via Dubrovnik to Venice. The outflow of precious metal is attested by records from the archives of Venice, Bologna and Dubrovnik, as well as numerous finds of Serbian medieval coins in hoards in northern Italy and other regions as Bulgaria, Greece and Asia Minor. Written documents from Bologna notify that Serbian dinars circulated not only in Bologna although in a broader area - in aliis civilitatis et provinciis Romaniole, Tussiae, Lombardie et Marchie.

The earliest hoards of Serbian coins - dinars (Rudine, Dućina, Studenica, Srem or northern Serbia, Postenje and Dobrište), deposited on the territory of the Serbian medieval state, contain primarily local coins, implying the withdrawn of foreign currencies for recasting and striking dinars mainly of lesser value. Judging by the Ragusan and Kotor archive documents the Venetian grosso and ducat played a significant role in monetary transaction in the Littoral.

After 1320 the area of the circulation of Serbian coins - the dinars de cruce - diminished significantly and was mainly restricted to the territory of the Serbian state and bordering regions. It should be noted that numerous monetary transactions in Dubrovnik and Kotor were nevertheless realized in dinars de cruce.

The reign of Stefan Dušan (1331-1355) was marked by an extensive monetary production and large issues of coins which was connected with the expansion of the Serbian state. His dinars greatly surpass those from all other periods in the number of surviving examples. Judging by the hoards with primarily Serbian coins we observe the persistence of the withdrawal of foreign coins from circulation.

On the other part, in the southern parts of the Serbian state the Venetian grosso played a significant role, which is testified by several hoards (Kičevo 1959, Stobi, Ohrid 1965), containing the official issues, as well as the imitations of Venetian grossi. The territory to the south of the line Ohrid-Bitolj-Prilep should be viewed as a bordering zone of the circulation of Serbian medieval coins in the second half of the 14th century.

The circulation of coins in the time of despots Stefan Lazarević (1389-1427), Đurđe Branković (1402/1427-1456) and Lazar Branković (1456-1458) is characterized by the internationalization of the monetary market. The hoards and site finds of coins (Beograd, Stalać and Novo Brdo) indicate the distribution especially of coins from Hungary and Ottoman empire. The Hungarian coins prevail in the northern regions of the Despotate, and the Ottoman in the southern territories. In Novo Brdo the circulation of Ottoman coins begin already with the issues of sultan Bayezid I (1389-1402), followed by the akches of Emir Suleyman (1402-1411). The distribution was restored somewhat later with the issues of akches of Murad II (1421-1444, 1445-1451) and continued by Muhammad II’s (1444-1445, 1451-1481) coins. The second period was marked by the circulation of a large number of copper mangirs used in everyday exchange.

Mihailo Lukarević, who traded in the vicinity of Novo Brdo around 1440, registered in his account book the sums in ducats, in most cases Venetian, and in fewer in Hungarian, Ottoman akches and Serbian dinars. The interrelationship between gold coins in circulation is attested by the deposit of the despot Đurđe Branković in Dubrovnik: Among 50,000 deposited ducats 43,553 (87.11%) were Venetian, 6,134 (12.27%) Hungarian and only 313 (0.63%) Ottoman.

The process of the internationalization of the monetary market in the Central Balkans, which had its modest beginnings in the middle of the thirteenth century, would be in its full swing in the fifteenth century and continue throughout the period of Ottoman rule, when numerous issues minted by European states and cities were in circulation in the area side by side with local issues.
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Money and Currencies in Lower Macedonia: the Post-1204 Realities

The monetary and thus numismatic fragmentation of the Byzantine economy in the aftermath of the sack of Constantinople by the troops of the Fourth Crusade, 1204, resulted to the segmentation of the economic life in the Southern Balkans. Lower Macedonia, i.e. the part of the historic Macedonia belonging to the present-day Greece, share epitomic features concerning the trends of change and monetary exchange in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204.

Among others, a major side effect of the economic fragmentation was the creeping inflation of the monetary economy at least in the first decades of the 13th century. A common indication of such inflation was the production and the wide circulation of the Latin imitative coinages; since their metallic value was low, they overwhelmed the money markets and they were extensively hoarded all over Lower Macedonia.

The dissolution of the Latin Kingdom of Thessalonike and the annexation of the region to the State of Epiros (1224), and subsequently to the Empire of Nicaea (1246), did not improve the local economies. Presumably, the monetary exchanges were made in earlier currencies, even of the 12th century, which were more reliable thanks to the higher percentages of silver in their alloy.

Soon after the recovery of Constantinople in 1261, and throughout the first half of the 14th century, donations, privileges and fiscal exemptions were made possible through imperial chrysobulls in favor of lay aristocrats of land (e.g. Kantakouzenoi, Deblitzenoi, Tsamplakones) and the Athonite monasteries (in Chalkidike, Strymon valley, Thessalonike etc.). The free villages of independent peasants were more or less diminished and the great majority of the latter became paroikoi, i.e. tenant farmers, inhabiting humble dwellings around monastic metochia or aristocratic estates. Gradually, the weak Byzantine coinage retreated and foreign currencies intruded the money markets. Those who are wealthy e.g. monks, entrepreneurs and landowners, made business mainly in Venetian grossi, while Frankish deniers tournois, issued by principalities of the Southern Greece, also circulated. In spite of the fact that the Western economic factor opened new venues for international trade, the base of the social pyramid framed its activity in bounded localities. In other words, daily economic exchange of low value did not diminish, but was drastically restricted, as evidenced by the Athonite documents along with the isolated and collective finds.

 Political instability, military activity (Catalan Company, civil wars, Turkish assaults and Serbian occupation) and the Black Death resulted to the exhaustion of the natural resources and depopulation of many villages in Lower Macedonia. The long lasting effects of all these calamities caused severe underdevelopment, demographic crisis, devastation of settlements and, therefore, economic shrinkage during the last decades before the final fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks.

The above historic narration will be the framework for the drawing of an updated sketch of the monetary economy and the numismatic circulation in Lower Macedonia using information of published and unpublished site coins and hoards.
Catalogues de monnaies byzantines tardives et projets numériques :
le présent et l’avenir


Les recherches des deux dernières décennies ont donc bien permis de clarifier la nature des monnayages divers qui avaient cours en Méditerranée orientale après 1204; et nous disposons désormais pour la plupart d’entre eux d’ouvrages de référence, soit d’articles de fond. Leur classification et leur localisation est quasiment assurée et ne devrait plus être modifiée que sur des points déterminés, par exemple l’attribution des hyperpères d’imitation de Jean III Vatatzès et d’autres autorités, la distinction de certaines émissions d’Andronic II et Andronic III. Toutefois, l’information des ouvrages de référence reconnus est bien incomplète. Hendy cite et illustre certes des types non représentés à Dumbarton Oaks mais a arrêté de le faire dans les années 1980 et les planches publiées dans DOC 4 ont été composées vers 1984 et publiées telles quelles à l’exception de la planche finale de supplément. Quant à Grierson, s’il a illustré quelques tricéphales (« silver trachea ») de Michel VIII d’autres sources, il s’est contenté d’insérer les types manquant à D.O. dans les tableaux descriptifs du volume 5/1. L’identification d’un type ou l’étude des émissions d’un règne ou d’un atelier demande donc encore de recourir à des publications dispersées.

Il apparaît donc que la numérisation d’autres collections ou séries sera le moyen, dans un premier temps d’enrichir la documentation et d’autre part d’en faciliter la recherche. Plusieurs musées ont déjà mis l’ensemble (Harvard, Londres, New York et Paris) ou une partie de leurs ressources en ligne (j’en donnerai une liste et des exemples lors de la Table Ronde). Mais, à l’exception du site de l’American Numismatic Society spécialement dédié à la monnaie, ces sites « généralistes » souffrent du défaut d’avoir été conçus pour un ensemble d’objets (ainsi au Harvard Art Museum) où la monnaie doit se couler dans un format qui ne lui est pas adapté, voire pour un ensemble encore plus vaste comprenant comme à la Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF) non seulement des objets et des monnaies, mais aussi des estampes, des photos et des livres.

Mais la situation progresse comme l’ont montré les tables rondes du XXe Congrès international de numismatique de Taormine en septembre 2016. J’attirerai ici l’attention sur deux projets en cours...

Dumbarton Oaks a commencé, en utilisant son format propriétaire PLONE, la numérisation d’une partie de ses collections de sceaux (www.doaks.org/resources/seals). Le projet de numérisation des quelque 11 000 monnaies a suivi, mais au lieu de commencer par la mise en ligne des exemplaires déjà publiés, accessibles dans la version papier des DOC, il a été décidé au contraire de commencer par mettre à la disposition du public les quelque 700 monnaies acquises par Grierson et moi-même après la publication des différents volumes. Cet ensemble compte quelque deux cents monnaies tardives, dont de nombreuses rares ou de monnaies manquant à la collection américaine, ainsi dans la numismatique du Despotat d’Épire. À l’avenir il sera possible de recourir à des corpus rassemblés pour faciliter les recherches, en reproduisant une approche similaire à celle d’un catalogue papier traditionnel (http://gallica.bnf.fr/html/und/objets/monnaies), médiation déjà bien avancée pour les monnaies grecques.

L’un des avantages de ces notices est la qualité de leur mise en page qui permet de faire voir sur un seul écran l’ensemble des informations à côté de l’image du droit et du revers : datation, description, dimensions, origine, légende, commentaire, bibliographie. Les inscriptions sont données dans la police Unicode et OpenType de caractères spéciaux ATHENA RUBY (par ailleurs mise gracieusement à la disposition de tous les chercheurs par Dumbarton Oaks - voir http://www.doaks.org/resources/athena-ruby/athena-ruby-intro). La haute résolution des images permet de les agrandir autant que nécessaire (elle peut être déjà observée sur la série de portraits monétaires impériaux en ligne sur http://www.doaks.org/museum/online-exhibitions/byzantine-emperors-on-coins/). La Table Ronde sera l’occasion de tester certains exemples et certaines fonctions de recherche sur ce site dédié et de recueillir les réactions (le feedback) des participants.
L’avenir sera certainement le web de données (ou Linked Data) qui permettra de relier entre elles ces données pour accroître le potentiel des recherches, comme le montre déjà l’exemple de OCRE (http://numismatics.org/ocre/). Pour l’étude de la circulation monétaire d’autres projets de nos collègues antiquisants ont déjà montré la voie mais nous n’en sommes pas encore là. Le travail de terrain pour la fourniture des données et le travail de critique et d’analyse de l’archéologue, du numismate et de l’historien reste primordial pour construire et utiliser les “big data”.
Coin Circulation in Anatolia after 1204

The capture of Constantinople by the Latins in the aftermath of the Fourth Crusade greatly affected Anatolia, which until then was divided between three states: the Seljuk sultanate of Rum, the Kingdom of Armenian Cilicia and the newly created Empire of Trebizond. After 1204 another two states came to be added: the Latin empire of Constantinople and the Empire of Nicaea. Each of these states minted its own coinage and contributed to the complexity of coin circulation in Anatolia. This complexity was to be maintained even after 1261, when the territories of the Empire of Nicaea became part of the revived Byzantine empire, and increased with the creation of the beyliks, the progression of the Ottomans and the infiltration of western coinages. In the present paper I will discuss the circulation of Byzantine or Byzantine style coinages in the territories of Anatolia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

The main problem faced by anyone trying to study coin circulation in Anatolia is the lack of evidence. Systematic excavations in the region tend to concentrate on ancient sites (Aphrodisias, Ephesus, Sardeis, Troy, Priene) that have been abandoned or loosely inhabited in the period considered here. This is especially true for the Palaiologan period. Pergamum presents an exception to the rule, since coin finds from the excavations conducted there between 1973 and 1981 produced numerous late Byzantine coins. The picture offered by Pergamum can now be complemented by the excavation material from Anaia (present day Kadıkalesi, near Kuşadası) that is currently being studied by the author. Along with this material the paper will take into consideration the hoard evidence and the testimony of the written sources.

It has long been observed that two different circulation patterns can be seen in the territories of the Byzantine empire in the twelfth century: the copper tetartera and half-tetartera were the only small denominations circulating in southern Greece, whereas Byzantine Anatolia was supplied by the more valuable stamena. A similar differentiation can be seen with regard to the precious metal denominations. In the Greek mainland the hyperpyra prevail, whereas Anatolia is characterised by the preponderance of trikephala, both in hoards and as single finds. This circulation pattern, introduced under the reign of John II (1118-1143), will continue until 1204.

Whatever the reasons behind this particular twelfth-century circulation pattern, the fact remains that in accordance to it, the low denomination produced by both Nicaea and Trebizond during the first decades of their existence was the stamenon, and the highest denomination was the trikephalon, although slightly altered. Unlike the twelfth-century trikephalon that was made of electrum, an alloy of gold and silver, and had an average weight of 4.3g, the trikephala of the successor states weighed a little less than 3g and were made out of pure silver. This reduction in fineness and weight has been attributed to the limited financial resources of these small empires. However, it should rather be interpreted as an adjustment of the metal content and weight of their precious
metal coins to the model offered by the Seljuk dirhem and the tram of the Kingdom of Armenian Cilicia, both made out of silver and weighing ca 3g. After all, these non-Byzantine Anatolian states were henceforth their close neighbours, with which commercial relations were maintained.

A shift from this situation will become evident in the 1230’s and 1240’s. In the case of Trebizond, this shift took the form of a crystallization of the rapprochement with the other Anatolian states. Around 1230, two zones of precious metal coinages can be discerned in Anatolia: the first one includes the empires of Nicaea and Trebizond, where silver concave trikephala of Byzantine inspiration circulate; the second one encompasses the Seljuk Sultanate and Cilician Armenia, where the Seljuk dirhem and the Armenian tram, both flat silver coins weighing ca. 3g., of Islamic and Crusader style respectively, form the circulating medium. At an unknown date, Manuel I Grand Komnenos (1238-1263) broke with the Byzantine tradition and introduced a new coinage based on the asper, a flat silver coin of ca. 3g. The iconography of the Trapezuntine asper remained Byzantine, but the new coinage was clearly modelled on the Seljuk dirhem and the Armenian tram, with which it shared its metal content, form and weight.

With Manuel’s reform of the Trapezuntine coinage, a new monetary situation was established in Anatolia, where three different but absolutely compatible coinages were now circulating: the Trapezuntine asper, the Seljuk dirhem and the Armenian tram. They were all flat silver coins weighing ca. 3g. Unfortunately, the evidence from Anatolia regarding these currencies is scarce. If hoards including thirteenth-century silver coins have been recovered, they must have been dispersed through commerce and silver coin finds from excavations are rare.

A different evolution is traceable in the case of Nicaea. Initially Nicaea, like Trebizond, only minted silver trikephala and copper stamena. Probably in 1227, the gold hyperpyron was included to its coin production, while later, the copper tetarteron was also added to it. As we have seen, both denominations were absent from Asia Minor during the twelfth century. With these additions, the empire of Nicaea under John III Vatatzes (1221-1254) produced the full range of denominations issued by the Byzantine empire before 1204. This evolution has often been interpreted as part of Vatatzes’ propaganda regarding his claim to the throne of Constantinople. I would argue, however, that it is more than that. The beginning of the hyperpyra minting is dated in 1227 in association with a new indictional cycle and Vatatzes’ conquests of Latin territories in north-western Asia Minor. The quantities of minted gold coins constantly increased, reaching a peak in the 1240’s, when the Nicaean empire significantly expanded its territories by annexing Macedonia and Thrace. The increase in gold production was certainly aided by a famine in the Seljuk sultanate, that Nicaea fully exploited by providing corn and other foodstuffs in exchange for gold. The fact, however, that the empire was now expanding to territories characterized by the use of gold – and not electrum or silver – coins is certainly relevant. Likewise, the tetartera issues seem to belong to a late date in John’s reign and could again be associated with his European conquests, where this denomination was normally circulating.

With regard to coin circulation and the monetization level in Anatolia during this period, the evidence is restricted and does not always allow us to draw conclusions. In the case of the empire of Nicaea, however, some observations can be made. Twelfth-century coins continue to circulate, as can be deduced from the hoard evidence (e.g. Bayindir, Bursa, Pergamum II). They circulate along with the so-called “Bulgarian” or faithful imitations –whose important presence in Asia Minor is
another argument against their attribution to the second Bulgarian empire –, the Nicaean issues, which start being minted probably in 1208, and the Latin imitative coinages of large module. Unlike the Balkans, small module Latin imitations seem to be less common. The same holds true for the issues of the other successor states (Despotate of Epiros and Empire of Thessaloniki). In general, however, the creation of a state in Asia Minor in the thirteenth century seems to have contributed to a higher monetization level in comparison with the twelfth century.

The evidence for the period after 1261 becomes even scarcer, since no coin hoard is known for it and any conclusions must rely on the restricted single finds. The material from Pergamum and Anaia, however, seems to suggest that coin circulation under Michael VIII Palaiologos (1261-1282) continued to be characterized by the same trends as under the Laskarids. This was to a lesser extent true for the reign of Andronikos II (1282-1328), who is the last emperor to be represented in some quantity in the numismatic material for the area, a fact that reflects he gradual loss of the cities of Asia Minor to the Ottomans (Ephesos, Miletos, Sardeis and Tralleis in the first decade of the fourteenth century, Bursa in 1326, Nicaea in 1331, Nicomedia in 1337).
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